

Chain-of-Thought Prompting for Out-of-Distribution Samples: A Latent-Variable Study

Yu Wang¹, Fu-Chieh Chang^{1,2} and Pei-Yuan Wu¹

¹Graduate Institute of Communication Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

²MediaTek Research, Taipei, Taiwan

r11942152@gtu.edu.tw, d09942015@ntu.edu.tw, peiyuanwu@ntu.edu.tw

Abstract

Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting has emerged as a powerful technique to improve in-context learning (ICL) in large language models (LLMs) by breaking complex reasoning into intermediate steps. However, the ability of CoT to generalize under distribution shift remains poorly understood. In this work, we extend a latent-variable framework for CoT prompting and study its behavior on two prototypical out-of-distribution (OOD) scenarios: (i) the latent variables for CoT steps are permuted into novel combinations, and (ii) the latent variables uniformly scaled by a factor. Our experiments demonstrate that CoT inference generalizes effectively to OOD samples whose latent variables closely resemble those seen during training, but its performance degrades as this similarity decreases. These findings provide foundational insights into the strengths and limitations of CoT prompting under OOD conditions and suggest directions for developing more resilient reasoning strategies in future LLMs.

1 Introduction

In-context learning—a capability emerging from auto-regressive models—has been shown through theoretical studies (e.g., [ZZYW23, XRLM22]) to stem from pre-training data that effectively encodes the prior distribution needed for this learning process. However, the success of in-context learning in large language models (LLMs) heavily depends on the training data, and prior research has indicated that LLMs often struggle to perform out-of-distribution (OOD) inference using standard in-context learning methods [WWYW25]. Conversely, chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning enables models to address reasoning tasks step-by-step, facilitating improved OOD inference through enhanced length generalization [XL24, CCA+24]. This observation prompts an important research question: can incorporating CoT demonstrations for OOD examples within in-context learning demonstrations effectively promote OOD generalization? Addressing this question is critical for understanding and potentially overcoming current limitations in OOD generalization capabilities of large language models. Our contribution can be listed as follows: Our contributions are as follows:

- We extend an existing latent-variable framework [HZCY24] for modeling Chain-of-Thought prompting to handle out-of-distribution (OOD) sample in-context demonstrations and queries.
- We demonstrate two representative OOD scenarios:
 1. **Permuted combinations of latent variables:** The latent variables for CoT steps are permuted into novel combinations.
 2. **Scaled variants of latent variables:** The latent variables uniformly scaled by a factor.
- We empirically measure test losses in each OOD scenario to reveal the conditions under which CoT prompting succeeds or fails to generalize.

2 Related Works

In-Context Learning for OOD Samples: Recent literature explores both the potential and limitations of applying in-context learning (ICL) to out-of-distribution (OOD) inference scenarios. [ALP23]

highlighting transformers’ superior robustness compared to set-based multilayer perceptrons (MLPs) in mild distribution shift scenarios. Nonetheless, both transformer-based models and MLPs experience significant degradation in their ICL performance under severe distributional shifts, indicating a common limitation when facing more drastic OOD conditions. Furthermore, [WWYW25] scrutinize the widely reported capability of ICL models to learn abstract labels not encountered during training. Their empirical and theoretical analyses investigate scenarios where ICL models are pretrained across multiple tasks. They identify a clear bias toward ”low-test-error preference,” in which ICL models preferentially adopt pretrained functions that minimize test error within the current context, thus limiting their generalization effectiveness in genuinely OOD tasks.

Chain-of-thought Prompting for OOD Samples: Despite the inherent difficulty in handling out-of-distribution (OOD) samples within in-context learning settings, Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting demonstrates enhanced capability in managing such scenarios. [XL24] presents a theoretical investigation into Length Generalization (LG), which describes a scenario wherein models trained on reasoning tasks of shorter lengths struggle when confronted with tasks of greater complexity or size. This study outlines and verifies the necessary conditions for achieving LG in reasoning-based learning tasks. Based on this theoretical perspective, [CCA⁺24] introduces the concept of position coupling, a straightforward yet powerful approach that integrates task structure directly into the positional encoding of decoder-only Transformers. Empirically, they demonstrate that models employing position coupling, trained on addition tasks involving numbers up to 30 digits, successfully generalize to additions with numbers up to 200 digits. Theoretically, they establish that a single-layer Transformer with position coupling can solve addition tasks involving exponentially more digits. Furthermore, [WHS⁺25] explores the use of CoT prompting to enhance OOD generalization. Through extensive experiments on complex, composite tasks, the study reveals that generalization performance improves significantly with finer-grained CoT data, highlighting the critical role of data granularity. Nevertheless, despite these advancements, the studies discussed have not explicitly addressed the effects of in-context learning mechanisms on the efficacy of CoT prompting.

3 Problem Formulation

In this section, we describe how to integrate out-of-distribution (OOD) Chain-of-Thought demonstrations into in-context learning. We begin by introducing a latent-variable statistical model for CoT. We then show how to augment in-context prompts with OOD examples, focusing on two canonical OOD scenarios: (i) novel permutations of the CoT latent variables, and (ii) uniform scaling of those latent variables.

3.1 Latent Variable Model of CoT

We adopt the settings from [HZCY24]. In this formulation, a latent variable encodes the underlying task or concept that governs how a reasoning chain is generated. We first define the notations for this formulation, and then show the key component for this formulation.

3.1.1 Notations

- θ : A latent variable that represents the underlying task or concept. For example, θ may encode the procedure required to solve an arithmetic problem or answer a commonsense question.
- Θ : The domain (or space) of all possible latent tasks. We assume that θ is drawn from a prior distribution $\pi(\theta)$ on Θ .
- n : The number of demonstration examples provided in the prompt.
- H : The length (number of steps) of the chain-of-thought associated with a task in Θ . In each demonstration s^i , the chain consists of one input, $H - 1$ intermediate steps, and one final output.
- Υ_n : The set of demonstration examples provided in the prompt. When there are n demonstrations, we write

$$\Upsilon_n = \{s^1, s^2, \dots, s^n\}.$$

- Each demonstration s^i is a full chain-of-thought example sampled conditionally on the latent task, and is structured as a sequence of tokens (or steps)

$$s^i = (z_0^i, z_1^i, \dots, z_H^i),$$

where:

- z_0^i represents the input (or question) for the i th demonstration.
- $z_1^i, z_2^i, \dots, z_{H-1}^i$ denote the intermediate reasoning steps (the “chain-of-thought”).
- z_H^i denotes the final answer (or output) for the i th demonstration.
- Test Query and Final Output
 - For a test instance, the input is similarly denoted by z_0^{test} .
 - The LLM is prompted with the full prompt

$$\text{prompt}_{\text{CoT}}(n) = (\Upsilon_n, z_0^{\text{test}}),$$

and it then autoregressively generates a chain-of-thought $z_1^{\text{test}}, \dots, z_H^{\text{test}}$ that leads to the final answer.

3.1.2 The Generative Process

Given the above notations, we first specify the task-specific distribution $\mathbb{P}(\cdot \mid \theta)$, which generates the data for the CoT prompts. For each $\theta \in \Theta$, θ consists of the combination for a sequence of latent variables $\theta = (\vartheta_0, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \dots, \vartheta_H)$, and we generate each reasoning sequence $s_i = z_{0:H}^i$ according to the following stochastic dynamic model:

$$\mathbb{P}(s^i \mid \theta^* = \theta) : \quad z_0^i = f_{\vartheta_0}(\zeta^i), \quad z_h^i = F_{\vartheta_h}(z_0^i, \dots, z_{h-1}^i, \epsilon_h^i), \quad \forall 1 \leq h \leq H \quad (1)$$

where $\{\zeta^i, \{\epsilon_h^i\}_{h \in [H]}\}_{i \in [n]}$ are i.i.d. noise variables, while f_θ and F_θ are functions parameterized by $\theta \in \Theta$. This framework also applies to the test sequence $z_{0:H}^{\text{test}}$, defining the target distribution that the LLM learns from during prompting.

3.1.3 Pretrained LLM + CoT Prompting

Here we describe how a large language model (LLM), after being pretrained on a massive corpus of text, is utilized to perform Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting. The key points are as follows:

Pretraining of the LLM: The LLM is first pretrained via maximum likelihood estimation on a large dataset. Specifically, the LLM is pretrained using $\mathcal{L}$ instances. Each instance is independently generated according to the model described in Eq.(1), parameterized by a task-specific concept θ , drawn independently from distribution π for each $\ell \in [\mathcal{L}]$. Each instance $\ell \in [\mathcal{L}]$ comprises n demonstrations $\{s^{i,\ell}\}_{i=1}^n$, independently sampled from the same model (Eq.(1)) under the fixed task latent variable θ , with each example represented as $s^{i,\ell} = (z_0^{i,\ell}, \dots, z_H^{i,\ell})$. Therefore, the entire training dataset consists of $\mathcal{L}n$ examples spanning diverse latent variables. Let $\{\mathbb{P}_\rho \mid \rho \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{LLM}}\}$ denote the conditional probability distributions generated by the LLM parameterized by ρ , with parameter space $\mathcal{P}_{\text{LLM}}$. Pretraining the autoregressive LLM thus corresponds to obtaining the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) $\hat{\rho}$, formally expressed as:

$$\hat{\rho} = \arg \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{LLM}}} \frac{-1}{\mathcal{L}n(H+1)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^H \log \mathbb{P}_\rho \left(z_h^{i,\ell} \mid \Upsilon_{i-1,\ell}, \{z_j^{i,\ell}\}_{j=0}^{h-1} \right)$$

where $\Upsilon_{i,\ell} = \{s^{k,\ell}\}_{k \in [i]}$ represents the first i examples from the ℓ -th instance.

Autoregressive Generation and In-Context Inference: With the model parameters fixed after pretraining, the LLM uses the prompt

$$\text{prompt}_{\text{CoT}}(n) = (\Upsilon_n, z_0^{\text{test}})$$

to autoregressively generate the corresponding chain-of-thought for the test input. That is, it produces a sequence of intermediate steps $z_1^{\text{test}}, z_2^{\text{test}}, \dots, z_H^{\text{test}}$, culminating in the final output.

3.2 CoT with In-Context OOD Demonstrations

We have so far described CoT prompting when all demonstrations share the same latent variable $\theta \in \Theta$. In practice, a user may instead provide examples from an out-of-distribution latent variable $\theta' \in \Theta'$. We also assume the test input z_0^{test} is drawn from this OOD latent variable, so that the true conditional distribution of the answer is

$$Q(y^{\text{test}} | z_0^{\text{test}}) = \mathbb{P}(y^{\text{test}} | z_0^{\text{test}}, \theta').$$

The CoT prompt then becomes

$$\text{prompt}_{\text{CoT}}(n) = (\Upsilon_n^{\theta'}, z_0^{\text{test}}), \quad \Upsilon_n^{\theta'} = \{s_1^{\theta'}, \dots, s_n^{\theta'}\}, \quad (2)$$

where each demonstration $s = (z_0, z_1, \dots, z_H)$ is sampled from the multi-step latent-variable model conditioned on θ' , using Eq. (1). We focus on the case $\Theta' \cap \Theta = \emptyset$, detailed below.

$\tilde{\Theta}$ – Permuted Combinations of Latent Variables: Assume each latent variable ϑ_i can take M distinct values, written as $\vartheta_i^{(m)}$ for $m \in [M]$. The full latent variable space is

$$\Theta^* = \{(\vartheta_0^{(m_0)}, \vartheta_1^{(m_1)}, \dots, \vartheta_H^{(m_H)}) \mid m_h \in [M], h \in [H]\}.$$

We then choose two disjoint subsets $\Theta, \tilde{\Theta} \subset \Theta^*$. Define

$$\text{FlattenSet}(\vartheta_0, \dots, \vartheta_H) = \{(\vartheta_h, h) \mid h = 0, 1, \dots, H\}.$$

We require

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta} \text{FlattenSet}(\theta) = \bigcup_{\tilde{\theta} \in \tilde{\Theta}} \text{FlattenSet}(\tilde{\theta}), \quad (3)$$

so that Θ and $\tilde{\Theta}$ contain exactly the same set of (ϑ_h, h) pairs, merely combined in different ways.

$\bar{\Theta}$ – Scaled Variants of Latent Variables: Here we introduce a second OOD scenario by scaling each latent variable in Θ . Formally, we define

$$\bar{\Theta} = \{\bar{\theta} \mid \bar{\theta} = (p\vartheta_0, p\vartheta_1, \dots, p\vartheta_H), \theta = (\vartheta_0, \vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_H) \in \Theta\}, \quad (4)$$

where $p \neq 1$ (either $p > 1$ or $p < 1$) is a constant scaling factor. In this definition, p is a constant value such that $p > 1$ or $p < 1$. Here, p is a non-unit constant ($p > 1$ or $p < 1$). To ensure $\bar{\Theta} \cap \Theta = \emptyset$, we let

$$\Phi = \{\vartheta \mid \vartheta \text{ appears in some } \theta \in \Theta\}$$

be the set of all latent values occurring in Θ , and p should satisfies

$$p\vartheta \notin \Phi \quad \text{for all } \vartheta \text{ in } \Theta. \quad (5)$$

4 Experiments

In the followings, we present a simplified example. Suppose $H = 2$, $\vartheta_h \in \{-2, -1, 1, 2\}$ for all $h \in [H]$. The noise ζ is from a uniform distribution $[-0.5, 0.5]$ where $\epsilon_h = 0$ for all $h \in [H]$. The generation function $f_{\vartheta_0}(\zeta) = \text{LeakyRelu}(\zeta + \vartheta_0)$ and $F_{\vartheta_h}(z_0, \dots, z_{h-1}, \epsilon_h) = \text{LeakyRelu}(z_{h-1} + \vartheta_h)$ which is defined as

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0.5 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In this example, the set of Θ^* consists of:

$$\begin{array}{llll} \theta_0 = (-2, -2, -2) & \theta_1 = (-2, -2, -1) & \theta_2 = (-2, -2, 1) & \theta_3 = (-2, -2, 2) \\ \theta_4 = (-2, -1, -2) & \theta_5 = (-2, -1, -1) & \theta_6 = (-2, -1, 1) & \theta_7 = (-2, -1, 2) \\ \theta_8 = (-2, 1, -2) & \theta_9 = (-2, 1, -1) & \theta_{10} = (-2, 1, 1) & \theta_{11} = (-2, 1, 2) \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \theta_{60} = (2, 2, -2) & \theta_{61} = (2, 2, -1) & \theta_{62} = (2, 2, 1) & \theta_{63} = (2, 2, 2) \end{array}$$

To be more concrete, we show some samples s_i generated by $\theta \in \Theta^*$ in the followings:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta = (-2, 1, 2) &\Rightarrow s_1 = (-1.55, -0.28, 1.72), s_2 = (-1.40, -0.20, 1.79), s_3 = (-1.89, -0.44, 1.55) \\ \theta = (1, -2, 1) &\Rightarrow s_1 = (-0.22, -1.11, -0.05), s_2 = (-0.86, -1.43, -0.21), s_3 = (1.02, -0.49, 0.51) \\ \theta = (1, 1, -1) &\Rightarrow s_1 = (2.45, 3.45, 2.45), s_2 = (3.94, 4.94, 3.94), s_3 = (0.77, 1.77, 0.77)\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate CoT generalization under OOD samples, we consider the two scenario of $(\tilde{\Theta})$ and $(\bar{\Theta})$. For the permuted-combination scenario $(\tilde{\Theta})$, we split the full parameter set Θ^* into a training subset Θ and its OOD variants $\tilde{\Theta}$ or $\bar{\Theta}$, and we vary the ratio $|\tilde{\Theta}|/|\Theta|$ to assess its impact on test loss. For the scaled-parameter scenario $(\bar{\Theta})$, we generate $\bar{\Theta}$ by multiplying each $\vartheta_h \in \Theta$ by factors $p = 1 \pm \delta$ with $0.05 \leq \delta \leq 0.5$. We then train and evaluate our GPT-2-based toy model. The details are shown in the following sections.

4.1 Settings

For our experiments, we adopt GPT-2 [RWC⁺19] as the backbone model, but we replace each token’s word embedding with a single scalar value z_h for $0 \leq h < H$, while leaving the positional embeddings unchanged. On the output side, the model produces one scalar, which we interpret as the prediction for z_{h+1} . We pre-train the model following the procedure in Sec. 3.1.3. However, we fix the prompt length to $n - 1$ demonstrations during training. Besides, since the output is a scalar, we optimize using the mean squared error (MSE) loss:

$$\hat{\rho} = \arg \min_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{LLM}}} \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}(H+1)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{L}} \sum_{h=1}^H \left(\mathbb{F}_{\rho}(\Upsilon_{n-1,\ell}, \{z_j^{n,\ell}\}_{j=0}^{h-1}) - z_h^{n,\ell} \right)^2,$$

where $\mathbb{F}_{\rho}(\Upsilon_{n-1,\ell}, \{z_j^{n,\ell}\}_{j=0}^{h-1})$ denotes the scalar output given the first $n - 1$ demonstrations and the first $h - 1$ reasoning steps. After pre-training, we evaluate the step-wise test loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{test}}(h) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}'} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\mathcal{L}'} \left(\mathbb{F}_{\rho}(\Upsilon_{n-1,\ell}, \{z_j^{n,\ell}\}_{j=0}^{h-1}) - z_h^{n,\ell} \right)^2,$$

where $\mathcal{L}'$ is the number of test instances. In our experiments, we set $\mathcal{L} = 768,000$, $\mathcal{L}' = 7,680$, and $n = 20$. The specific test sets are described in the following section. For better reproducibility, we make our implementation publicly available¹.




Figure 1: Testing loss evaluating on $\tilde{\Theta}$ v.s. Θ .

4.2 Experiments on the Testing Sets of $\tilde{\Theta}$ and $\bar{\Theta}$

In this section, we evaluate one in-distribution scenario and two out-of-distribution scenarios:

- **Testing Set Θ .** We use the same latent variables $\theta \in \Theta$ as in the training set, but generate each instance via Eq. (1) with a different random seed of ζ . Hence, the samples follow the same distribution yet are distinct from the training examples. Fig. 1 and 2 show that, despite the new random seed, the LLM achieves losses on these unseen instances that are nearly identical to those on the training set.

¹https://github.com/d09942015ntu/cot_ood_latent




Figure 2: Testing loss evaluating on $\bar{\Theta}$ v.s. Θ .

- **Testing Set $\tilde{\Theta}$.** We obtain $\tilde{\Theta}$ by randomly partitioning Θ^* into two disjoint subsets according to Eq. (3). Different partitions yield various ratios $|\tilde{\Theta}|/|\Theta|$, whose impact is plotted in Fig. 1. As the ratio $|\tilde{\Theta}|/|\Theta|$ decreases, larger portion of combinations of ϑ are included in the training set, and hence the test loss on $\tilde{\Theta}$ also decreases. Although $\tilde{\Theta} \cap \Theta = \emptyset$, both sets share the same elements ϑ in different combinations, and hence CoT could generalize to this OOD setting. Moreover, we find that the test error at $h=2$ exceeds that at $h=1$, suggesting that errors accumulate as the CoT unfolds.
- **Testing Set $\bar{\Theta}$.** We construct $\bar{\Theta}$ via Eq. (4), setting $p = 1 \pm \delta$ for $\delta > 0$, and both $1 + \delta$ and $1 - \delta$ should satisfy Eq. (5). Fig. 2 illustrates results for several values of δ . When δ is small, the value of latent variables ϑ in $\bar{\Theta}$ remain close to those in Θ , leading to reduced testing error, despite the fact that $\bar{\Theta} \cap \Theta = \emptyset$. This further demonstrates CoT’s ability to generalize to these nearby OOD samples. Moreover, the test error is higher for $p = 1 + \delta$ than for $p = 1 - \delta$, because increasing ϑ generates more z_h values that lie outside the training distribution. Hence, in evaluating OOD generalization, we should account not only for the latent parameter space ϑ but also for the range of intermediate values z_h .

5 Limitations

We demonstrate the simplification of CoT examples in this work. However, real-world CoT is often complicated by ambiguous natural language, diverse reasoning strategies, long-range dependencies across multiple steps, and the need to integrate external knowledge sources. Besides, the model chosen in this work is GPT-2, which is small compared to modern large language models with orders of magnitude more parameters and more sophisticated architectures. Although our findings may not directly generalize to larger, more sophisticated models, they nonetheless provide foundational insights into the strengths and weaknesses of CoT inference on OOD samples.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we have extended a latent-variable framework for Chain-of-Thought prompting to the out-of-distribution setting, characterizing two representative OOD scenarios: novel combinations of latent variables ($\tilde{\Theta}$) and uniform scaling of those latent variables ($\bar{\Theta}$). Through synthetic experiments with a GPT-2-based toy model, we confirmed that CoT inference generalizes effectively when OOD latent variables share similar elements as those seen during training, while also revealing that errors accumulate across reasoning steps and grow under larger shifts of latent variables ϑ_h and input distributions z_h . These findings offer foundational insights into when and why CoT prompting succeeds or fails under distribution shift. Looking forward, our simplified setting suggests several avenues for future work: (i) extending the analysis to natural-language CoT prompts and real-world LLMs with rich token vocabularies; (ii) investigating mechanisms to mitigate error propagation across steps; and (iii) integrating external knowledge or adaptive prompt selection to further enhance OOD robustness. We hope this study paves the way for more resilient reasoning strategies in next-generation language models.

References

- [ALP23] Kartik Ahuja and David Lopez-Paz. A closer look at in-context learning under distribution shifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16704*, 2023.
- [CCA⁺24] Hanseul Cho, Jaeyoung Cha, Pranjal Awasthi, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Anupam Gupta, and Chulhee Yun. Position coupling: Improving length generalization of arithmetic transformers using task structure, 2024.
- [HZCY24] Xinyang Hu, Fengzhuo Zhang, Siyu Chen, and Zhuoran Yang. Unveiling the statistical foundations of chain-of-thought prompting methods, 2024.
- [RWC⁺19] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. Technical report, OpenAI, 2019.
- [WHS⁺25] Ru Wang, Wei Huang, Selena Song, Haoyu Zhang, Yusuke Iwasawa, Yutaka Matsuo, and Jiaxian Guo. Beyond in-distribution success: Scaling curves of cot granularity for language model generalization, 2025.
- [WWYW25] Qixun Wang, Yifei Wang, Xianghua Ying, and Yisen Wang. Can in-context learning really generalize to out-of-distribution tasks? In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [XL24] Changnan Xiao and Bing Liu. A theory for length generalization in learning to reason. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00560*, 2024.
- [XRLM22] Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference, 2022.
- [ZZYW23] Yufeng Zhang, Fengzhuo Zhang, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. What and how does in-context learning learn? bayesian model averaging, parameterization, and generalization, 2023.