

# Not All Bias is Bad: Balancing Rational Deviations and Cognitive Biases in Large Language Model Reasoning

Liman Wang\*  
ssee02131@gmail.com

Hanyang Zhong\*  
hanyang.zhong@york.ac.uk

## Abstract

This paper investigates the nuanced role of biases in the decision-making processes of large language models (LLMs). While conventional research typically aims to eliminate all biases, our study reveals that not all biases are detrimental. By examining rational deviations, involving heuristic shortcuts that enhance decision-making efficiency, we highlight their potential benefits when properly balanced. We introduce the concepts of heuristic moderation and an abstention option, allowing LLMs to abstain from answering when uncertain, thereby reducing error rates and improving decision accuracy. Using our newly developed BRD (Balance Rational Deviations) dataset, our findings demonstrate that appropriately scaled bias inspection enhances model performance and aligns LLM decision-making more closely with human reasoning. This balance improves the reliability and trustworthiness of LLMs and suggests new strategies for future enhancements. Our work offers a fresh perspective on leveraging biases constructively to enhance the practical applications of LLMs, from conversational agents to decision support systems and beyond.

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, the challenge of bias in LLMs has become increasingly prominent. Extensive research has focused on identifying and mitigating social biases rooted in vast training datasets (Bang et al., 2024; Gallegos et al., 2024; Minaee et al., 2024; Gallegos et al., 2024). Another crucial aspect that warrants attention is the cognitive biases that arise during the inference process, which mirror human cognitive tendencies and pose significant challenges (Suri et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024b). Rational deviations within LLMs, particularly in chat models, present a nuanced problem. The theories of Gerd Gigerenzer suggest that 'bias' is not

\* Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Prediction accuracy and error rates on the BRD dataset for LLMs balancing rational deviations, with and without the option to abstain. 'Sta' represents the Standard used for comparison.

always detrimental. In psychology, rational deviations refer to intentional departures from strict logical reasoning to achieve practical decision-making efficiency (Gigerenzer, 2006). These deviations allow for heuristic or shortcut thinking, which can simplify complex cognitive processes and enhance adaptability in uncertain environments (Gigerenzer, 2006). However, this approach often leads to cognitive biases, resulting in systematic errors and suboptimal outcomes in judgment and decision-making (Kruis et al., 2020; Berthet, 2022). In LLMs, rational deviations manifest through design choices that optimize model performance and efficiency by balancing computational constraints and accuracy. LLMs like GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) use a context-driven token prediction mechanism to generate text (Brown et al., 2020). This method relies on maximum probability estimates, predicting the next word in a sentence based on statistical likelihood from its training data (Radford et al., 2018). While effective in generating coherent and contextually appropriate responses, this approach




Figure 2: QA examples from GPT-4. The Conjunction Fallacy is a subset of cognitive biases. **Scaling the scope of bias inspection can influence rational deviations**, thereby impacting the outcomes of LLMs’ reasoning.

introduces a degree of imprecision and a tendency to ensure context coherence, which can lead to reasoning shortcuts (Brown et al., 2020; Silva, 2023). These shortcuts, similar to heuristic thinking in humans, prioritize efficiency but can result in cognitive biases, leading to suboptimal or erroneous decision-making outcomes (Wang et al., 2024b).

Our research tackles these challenges by proposing a balanced approach that integrates rational deviations with techniques to mitigate cognitive biases. Drawing inspiration from the phenomenon depicted in Fig. 2, we introduce heuristic moderation and an abstention option for LLMs. The abstention option allows LLMs to refrain from making decisions when uncertain, thus reducing error rates and enhancing decision accuracy. Meanwhile, bias inspection techniques encourage LLMs to analyze problems more rigorously. Using the newly developed BRD dataset, we show that carefully scaling bias inspection and incorporating an abstention option can substantially enhance model performance, as illustrated in Fig. 1, bringing LLM decision-making closer to human reasoning’s ground truth.

## 2 Related Works

Research on mitigating cognitive biases and rational deviations in LLMs is extensive. Suri et al. (Suri et al., 2023) find that GPT-3.5 exhibits human-like biases, such as anchoring, representativeness, and framing effects. Bubeck et al. (Bubeck et al., 2023) and Binz and Schulz (Binz and Schulz, 2023) discuss irrational behaviors and cognitive biases in

models like GPT-4 and GPT-3, highlighting challenges such as the framing effect and conjunction fallacy. Similarly, Wang et al. (Wang et al., 2024b) demonstrate that LLMs often rely on stereotypes rather than statistical reasoning, underscoring the presence of the representativeness heuristic. Advancements in multi-modal and multi-agent systems (Jiang et al., 2024) show promise for enhancing LLM rationality. Awadalla et al. (Awadalla et al., 2023) and Bai et al. (Bai et al., 2023) demonstrate that grounding decisions in a broader sensory context can mitigate hallucinations and improve decision-making. Yang et al. (Yang et al., 2024) and Wu et al. (Wu et al., 2022) explore using external knowledge sources to overcome parametric model limitations. Multi-agent systems employing consensus and debate mechanisms, discussed by Du et al. (Du et al., 2023) and Cohen et al. (Cohen et al., 2023), offer innovative methods for refining LLM decision-making. Echterhoff et al. (Echterhoff et al., 2024) and Wang et al. (Wang et al., 2024c) emphasize the need for robust evaluation metrics to measure LLM rationality and avoid cognitive biases. Recent works by Abbasi-Yadkori et al. (Yadkori et al., 2024) and Xin et al. (Xin et al., 2021) address mitigating hallucinations and improving confidence in LLMs through abstention and selective prediction techniques. Piché et al. (Piché et al., 2024) introduce self-restraint via iterative self-reflection, reducing hallucinations by teaching models to abstain when uncertain.

While these studies lay important groundwork for enhancing model reliability, our research builds

upon these foundations by focusing on balancing rational deviations and cognitive biases in LLM decision-making. Our approach uniquely integrates heuristic moderation and the option for LLMs to abstain from making certain judgments when uncertain, thereby enhancing decision accuracy and reducing the risk of incorrect judgments. Additionally, our research specifically targets the challenges of various cognitively biased questions, aiming to improve the robustness and fairness of LLM reasoning and prediction.

### 3 Methodology

This section outlines the challenges and novel approaches for LLMs to make rational decisions.

#### 3.1 Phenomenon and Method Formation

Multiple-choice questions (MCQs) are commonly used in experiments to assess the reasoning abilities of LLMs (Minaee et al., 2024). However, compared to open-ended question-and-answer formats, MCQs have an inherent limitation: they presuppose that a choice must be made, even when refraining from making certain judgments and choices might be more appropriate (Polat, 2020). While LLMs sometimes exhibit behaviours akin to abstention, such as refusing to provide a definitive choice or avoiding binary decisions, traditional MCQ methodologies do not typically accommodate the option of not selecting a certain choice. This is problematic because many questions are context-dependent and do not have absolute answers; their correctness can vary under different circumstances. In human decision-making, rational biases often lead to making seemingly optimal judgments under limited information, which has evolutionary benefits for survival (Gigerenzer, 2006). Consequently, responses derived from human professionals' logical reasoning are often used as benchmarks, or ground truth, against which the performance of LLMs is measured. To enhance the alignment of LLM responses with human-like reasoning, prompts are adjusted to modulate the heuristic thinking and rational bias of LLMs (Wang et al., 2024b), aiming to make their answers as close to the ground truth as possible.

To systematically evaluate the performance of LLMs, it is essential to quantify key metrics that reflect their decision-making abilities. Therefore, we define the decisiveness rate ( $D$ ), error rate ( $E$ ), and valid vote accuracy ( $A$ ) as follows:




Figure 3: The inverse-like relationship between decisiveness rate and accuracy (valid vote accuracy). The optimal point is (1, 1).

$$D = \frac{N_v}{N_t} \quad (1)$$

where  $N_v$  is the number of valid vote choices and  $N_t$  is the total number of questions.

$$E = \frac{N_e}{N_t} \quad (2)$$

where  $N_e$  is the number of erroneous choices.

$$A = \frac{N_c}{N_v} \quad (3)$$

where  $N_c$  is the number of correct choices.

During pre-testing, we observed that when heuristic thinking is strongly constrained, limiting shortcut reasoning, the LLMs may refuse to provide clear options. We define this refusal to make a specified option choice as abstention. While this abstention can be considered reasonable, our goal is for LLMs to emulate human decision-making, employing rational bias appropriately while avoiding cognitive biases. Therefore, we have introduced the option of "abstention" in MCQs, allowing LLMs to indicate that a certain choice cannot be made after rigorous logical reasoning. Our observations indicate an inverse relationship between the decisiveness ( $D$ ) and valid vote accuracy ( $A$ ) of LLM responses, as illustrated in Fig. 3. When decisiveness decreases ( $D \downarrow$ ), LLMs tend to choose the abstention option. This reduces the number of incorrect answers ( $E \downarrow$ ) because fewer risky decisions are made. Consequently, while the overall number of answered questions may decrease, the proportion of correct answers among the chosen responses (valid vote accuracy,  $A$ ) may improve. This relationship can be summarized as follows:

$$D \downarrow \Rightarrow E \downarrow \rightsquigarrow A \uparrow \quad (4)$$

where  $E$  represents the error rate. As the error rate decreases ( $E \downarrow$ ), the accuracy among the answered questions increases, potentially leading to higher valid vote accuracy ( $A$ ).

To enhance LLM decision-making, characterized by decisive choices while avoiding cognitive biases, LLMs need to relax strict logical rationality and incorporate rational deviations. We optimize this process using a two-step strategy:

1. **Enhancing Valid Vote Accuracy:** We transition from point  $P_1$  to point  $P_2$  in Fig. 3. This step involves suppressing heuristic thinking and strictly enforcing logical reasoning. While this improves accuracy, it inadvertently reduces decisiveness.
2. **Encouraging Decisiveness:** We then move from point  $P_2$  to point  $P_3$ . This step focuses on resisting the tendency to abstain and encouraging more decisive choices, even if they are not perfectly rational. It aims to balance logical rigour with practical decision-making.

Overall, the optimization process from  $P_1$  to  $P_2$  to  $P_3$  seeks to balance valid vote accuracy ( $A$ ) and decisiveness rate ( $D$ ), striving to reach the ideal target point (1, 1) where both accuracy and decisiveness rate are maximized.

### 3.2 The Reasons for LLMs' Abstention

Introducing an abstention option, where models can choose "I am not sure which choice is the best," helps mitigate heuristic thinking. This approach offers several potential benefits:

**Avoidance of Guessing:** Models force to guess may provide incorrect answers based on superficial patterns. Allowing abstention encourages responses only when the model is confident, thereby reducing reliance on superficial cues (Balepur et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024a; Kapoor et al., 2024).

**Encouragement of Deeper Processing:** The option to abstain motivates the model to engage more thoroughly with questions, promoting rigorous reasoning and reducing premature conclusions based on incomplete information (Wang et al., 2024a).

**Alignment with Human Behavior:** Humans often refrain from answering when unsure. Allowing models to abstain aligns their behaviour more closely with human decision-making, potentially

leading to more natural and trustworthy interactions (Wei et al., 2024).

These potential benefits suggest that incorporating abstention could enhance the accuracy and reliability of decision-making in models, aligning their responses more closely with human reasoning. Upon introducing the "abstention" option to LLMs, we observe a shift in their decision results, as illustrated by the curve trend from point  $P_1$  to  $P_2$  in Fig. 3. This shift marks a decrease in decisiveness accompanied by an improvement in accuracy.

### 3.3 Scaling The Inspection Scope

In conventional research, it has been shown that providing LLMs with cues about cognitive bias can improve their accuracy in answering biased MCQs (Echterhoff et al., 2024). However, a major issue that has been overlooked is the ineffective scaling of corrective behaviour for cognitive bias, which restricts our ability to effectively explore the benefits of applying rational deviation in a balanced manner. Correcting cognitive bias is akin to adjusting the focus for someone with poor vision: the correction must be precise, as too much or too little adjustment won't yield the best results. Our findings indicate that when a large model is asked to define a broad concept, such as "What is Cognitive Bias," before answering questions, it becomes more cautious. In contrast, when it defines a specific concept like "What is Conjunction Fallacy," a type of cognitive bias, it is less cautious. This increased caution with broad concepts leads the model to choose the "abstain" option more frequently. While this might slightly improve accuracy, it significantly reduces decisiveness, making the overall approach less effective. Therefore, to enhance the decisiveness of LLMs, we need to appropriately adjust their self-inspection scope. This adjustment will ensure a balanced approach, improving both accuracy and decisiveness in handling cognitive biases.

## 4 Dataset and Experimental Setup

This section delineates the newly established dataset, along with the experimental design and evaluation methods employed in this study.

### 4.1 Dataset Setup

As discussed, the dataset employed in this study consists of MCQs, each supplemented with an "abstention" option. Diverging from conventional data collection methodologies (Suri et al., 2023; Wang

Misjudgment of Probability	Errors in Judgment
Base Rate Fallacy (40)	Regression Fallacy (35)
Conjunction Fallacy (15)	Anchoring Bias (20)
Insensitivity to Sample Size (30)	Overconfidence Bias (30)
Gambler’s Fallacy (20)	Sunk Cost Fallacy (15)

Table 1: Categories and Quantities in the BRD Dataset

et al., 2024b), this study specifically addresses issues related to probability misjudgment (e.g., Base Rate Fallacy, Gambler’s Fallacy) and prediction errors (e.g., Overconfidence Bias, Sunk Cost Fallacy) within the context of dataset construction. For more details on the dataset composition and question design paradigm, please refer to Fig. 6, Table 8-11 in Appendix A. To specifically evaluate the decision-making capabilities of LLMs, this study employs the BRD (Balance Rational Deviations) dataset, meticulously compiled for this purpose. As shown in Table 1, the BRD dataset includes 205 MCQs: 105 addressing probability misjudgments and 100 focusing on prediction and judgment errors in AI testing. This dataset is designed to assess the targeted performance of LLMs by applying rational deviations from diverse perspectives. Detailed descriptions of each fallacy and bias subcategory are provided in Fig. 6 Appendix A.

## 4.2 Models and Prompting

In our study, we evaluated the performance of three leading LLMs: GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), Gemini (Pichai, 2023), and LLaMA3-70B (Meta, 2024). To thoroughly assess their capabilities and decision-making processes, we employ a variety of prompting techniques aimed at either mitigating or encouraging heuristic thinking. These techniques are crucial for understanding how LLMs navigate complex cognitive tasks and biases.

### Abstention Prompting

Abstention prompting allows the model to refrain from making a decision when uncertain:

*If you prefer not to make a decisive choice, then select option E.  
E: I am not sure which choice is the best to select.*

This reduces incorrect answers by avoiding guesses and improving accuracy by encouraging the model to make decisions only when confident. The option E is designed to aid the final result statistics.

### Non-Abstention Prompting

Non-abstention prompting forces the model to make a choice:

*You can only choose one option.*

This evaluates the model’s performance under pressure by requiring it to make decisions even when uncertain. It assesses the model’s ability to handle forced-choice scenarios, revealing its strategies for making informed guesses despite uncertainty.

### General Bias Inspection (GBI)

GBI prompts the model to consider a broad range of cognitive biases:

*Please provide the definition of cognitive bias, then avoid these biases.*

GBI encourages the model to conduct a comprehensive self-check for any biases that could influence its decision. By reflecting on a wide array of cognitive biases, the model is expected to enhance its awareness and mitigate the impact of these biases on its responses, promoting more reliable and accurate decision-making.

### Specific Bias Inspection (SBI)

SBI focuses on a specific cognitive bias:

*Please provide me with the definition of [specific bias], then avoid these biases.*

This prompting technique targets specific biases most relevant to the question at hand. By concentrating on particular biases, models can more effectively mitigate their impact, improving accuracy in scenarios where those biases are prevalent. This targeted approach enables more precise and context-sensitive bias analysis (examples in Appendix Table 12, 13, 14).

## 4.3 Evaluation Criteria

In evaluating the reasoning outcomes of LLMs, we categorize the reasoning process and results using the notations TT, TF, FT, and FF. These represent the following scenarios: a correct reasoning process with an incorrect result (TT), an incorrect reasoning process with a correct result (TF), a correct reasoning process with a correct result (FT), and an incorrect reasoning process with an incorrect result (FF). Additionally, the symbol O is used to denote instances of "abstention," where the model selects option E. For statistical analysis, the decisiveness rate is calculated as the ratio of the number of questions not abstained (i.e., excluding O) to the total

Model / Accuracy	+ Non-Abstention			+ Abstention		
	Standard	GBI	SBI	Standard	GBI	SBI
GPT-4	33.2	68.3 (+35.1)	79.0 (+45.8)	48.4 (+15.2)	73.8 (+25.4)	<b>93.5</b> (+45.1)
Gemini	44.4	71.2 (+26.8)	<b>80.0</b> (+35.6)	44.6 (+0.2)	75.5 (+30.9)	91.1 (+46.5)
LLaMA3-70B	22.4	43.9 (+21.5)	50.2 (+27.8)	18.3 (-4.1)	37.1 (+18.8)	54.8 (+36.5)

Model / Error Rate	+ Non-Abstention			+ Abstention		
	Standard	GBI	SBI	Standard	GBI	SBI
GPT-4	66.8	31.7 (-35.1)	21.0 (-45.8)	38.5 (-28.3)	10.7 (-27.8)	<b>3.9</b> (-34.6)
Gemini	55.6	28.8 (-26.8)	<b>20.0</b> (-35.6)	47.8 (-7.8)	12.7 (-35.1)	6.3 (-41.5)
LLaMA3-70B	77.6	56.1 (-21.5)	49.8 (-27.8)	76.1 (-1.5)	40.5 (-35.6)	31.7 (-44.4)

Table 2: Prediction accuracy and error rate of GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B in Non-Abstention and Abstention experiments (%) on the BRD dataset with different prompting strategies. Bold numbers indicate the relative extrema. Differences between Standard groups with and without abstention are shown with  $\pm$  values in black.

number of questions. The accuracy rate is defined as the ratio of correctly answered questions (TT) to the number of questions not abstained. It is important to highlight that the ground truth answers are manually annotated as options without including the reasoning process content. Consequently, the correctness of the LLM’s reasoning process is assessed by manually examining the dialogue context to ensure accuracy.

## 5 Experimental Results

This section presents the findings from our experiments, evaluating the prompting techniques and their impact on LLMs reasoning.

### 5.1 Scaling Bias Inspection Effect Findings

In the context of Non-Abstention, with "Standard" serving as the control group, significant improvements in accuracy are observed for GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B on the BRD dataset when employing the prompting techniques GBI and SBI, as shown in Table. 2. Notably, the accuracy enhancement is more pronounced with SBI. Specifically, GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B achieve accuracy rates of 79%, 80%, and 50.2%, respectively, when utilizing SBI in Non-Abstention. This underscores the effectiveness of the GBI and SBI prompting strategies. The heightened accuracy with SBI, attributed to its narrower and more targeted cognitive bias scope, supports our hypothesis that specific guidance in bias inspection can significantly boost the accuracy of LLM responses.

### 5.2 Abstention Effect Findings

The analysis of the abstention effect, based on the Standard groups in Table 2, reveals a significant shift in model performance metrics (More details in Appendix Table 3,4). Introducing the abstention option results in most models exhibiting a higher valid vote accuracy but a lower overall number of decisions, as indicated by the changes in the grey statistical bars shown in Fig. 4.

For GPT-4, the valid vote accuracy increases from 33.2% to 48.4% when abstention is introduced, indicating that the model is effectively avoiding incorrect answers by opting to abstain when uncertain. Similarly, Gemini’s valid vote accuracy rises from 44.4% to 44.6%. However, LLaMA3-70B shows a decrease from 22.4% to 18.3%. This decline can be discussed in the context of its already low accuracy of 22.4%, indicating that its inference ability is inferior to the first two models. The decrease to 18.3% suggests that LLaMA3-70B struggles more with decision-making, even with the option to abstain, highlighting its relative weakness in handling uncertainty. Error rates also show significant changes with the introduction of abstention. GPT-4’s error rate decreases from 66.8% to 38.5%, demonstrating a substantial reduction in incorrect answers. Gemini’s error rate changes from 55.6% to 47.8%, while LLaMA3-70B’s error rate drops from 77.6% to 76.1%. These reductions in error rates across the models suggest that abstention helps mitigate the risk of incorrect decisions, aligning the models’ decisions more closely with the ground truth. Overall, allowing the models to abstain when uncertain proves to be a valuable strategy. It enhances decision-making accuracy by reducing the likeli-




Figure 4: The combination of TT, TF, FT, FF, and O rates for GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B on the BRD dataset using different prompting strategies. 'NA-' denotes Non-Abstention, 'A-' denotes Abstention, and 'Sta' represents the Standard used for comparison. The detailed distributions of the TT, TF, FT, FF, and O rates for GPT-4 Gemini and LLaMA3-70B are elaborately listed in Appendix Tables 5, 6 and 7.




Figure 5: Distribution chart of abstention rates for GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B across different question types in the BRD dataset with Abstention enabled and using different prompting strategies.

hood of errors, although it may result in fewer valid vote decisions.

### 5.3 Combination Test Findings

Before conducting the combination tests, we assessed whether the gains from the Abstention technique surpassed those from GBI and SBI. Table 2 reveals that the improvements attributed to the abstention rights (indicated by the blue numbers) are generally less significant than those achieved by GBI and SBI.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that GPT-4 benefits more from abstention rights than Gemini and LLaMA3-70B. Under the Abstention condition, GPT-4 achieves its best performance when paired with SBI, whereas Gemini reaches its peak performance with SBI under the Non-Abstention condition. Additionally, Fig. 4 indicates that GPT-4 tends to abstain more frequently than Gemini when abstention rights are available, following a "fewer decisions, fewer mistakes" strategy. While this ap-

proach showcases emergent intelligence, excessive abstention carries potential risks, which will be further examined in subsequent subsections. As shown in Fig. 4, Overall Accuracy (TT), defined as the proportion of correct answers in both reasoning and results relative to the total number of questions, is illustrated by the green bars. This proportion increases with the addition of GBI and SBI. However, the green bars decline when Abstention is introduced, consistent with previous findings on Overall Accuracy. Conversely, the Error Rate (FF), which represents the proportion of incorrect answers in both reasoning and results relative to the total number of questions, decreases with the addition of Abstention, GBI, or SBI.

Among the combinations, **Abstention+SBI** enables all three LLMs to achieve the highest valid vote accuracy of **93.5%** and the lowest Error Rate of **3.9%**, as detailed in Table 2. Specifically, GPT-4 and Gemini using the combination of Abstention+SBI achieved near-zero Error Rates of **3.9%**

and **6.3%**, respectively, highlighting the benefit of a minimal Error Rate in reducing decision risk.

#### 5.4 Abstention Patterns for Question Types

We observe that when LLMs are permitted to abstain, the distribution of their abstention rates across various question types exhibits trends that closely align with the overall pattern. Specifically, the abstention rates initially increase and then decrease, as illustrated in Fig. 5. However, there are certain types of questions where the abstention trends deviate slightly, highlighted in colour. These include the Sunk Cost Fallacy, Anchoring Bias, Overconfidence Bias, and Regression Fallacy.

Notably, these four types of questions, highlighted in colour, are categorized under Errors in Judgment within the BRD dataset. This phenomenon likely stems from the relative infrequency of some Errors in Judgment conceptions in the LLMs' training data compared to Misjudgment of Probability conceptions, making them more prone to oversight. When LLMs are prompted for cognitive bias testing solely using GBI, they often fail to recognize these traps, resulting in overconfidence and low abstention rates. In contrast, when SBI accurately prompts these bias traps, LLMs demonstrate improved detection of question traps and exhibit increased caution, leading to higher abstention rates. Therefore, when a clearer definition of a specific bias conception, such as the "Sunk Cost Fallacy," is provided, it may prompt LLMs to broaden their scope of bias inspection, resulting in a slight deviation in the abstention rate from the mainstream trends.

#### 5.5 Summary of Experimental Results

Our experiments evaluated different prompting techniques and their effects on LLM performance. We observed that using SBI significantly improved accuracy compared to GBI. Allowing LLMs to abstain when uncertain increased their effective voting rates but caused a slight decrease in overall accuracy, as some correct answers were abstained from. Combining SBI with the abstention option produced the best results, showing the lowest error rates and highest valid vote accuracy, especially for GPT-4 and Gemini. Interestingly, GPT-4 abstained more frequently than Gemini and LLaMA3, indicating a strategic approach to avoid errors by making fewer decisions. This "fewer decisions, fewer mistakes" strategy suggests an emerging intelligence in GPT-4. Additionally, the distribution

of abstention rates across various question types showed consistent patterns, with specific deviations in subcategories like Sunk Cost Fallacy and Overconfidence Bias, likely due to their relative infrequency in the LLMs' training data compared to Misjudgment of Probability conceptions. These results underscore the practical importance of balancing rational deviations and cognitive biases in LLMs. By incorporating heuristic moderation and an abstention option, we can better align LLM decision-making with human reasoning ground truth, enhancing their reliability and trustworthiness in diverse applications.

## 6 Conclusion

In this study, we have explored the nuanced role of cognitive biases and rational deviations in the decision-making processes of LLMs. Our research shows that, instead of solely aiming to eliminate biases, incorporating heuristic moderation and allowing models to abstain from decisions when uncertain can greatly improve the performance and reliability of LLMs. By employing the BRD dataset, we have shown that SBI combined with abstention reduces error rates and aligns LLM decision-making more closely with human reasoning. The findings underscore the practical importance of integrating rational deviations into LLMs to improve their decision-making accuracy and trustworthiness. The strategic use of abstention has proven particularly effective in mitigating incorrect decisions and enhancing valid vote accuracy, especially for models like GPT-4 and Gemini. This approach reflects an emerging intelligence in LLMs, aligning their behaviours more closely with human decision-making patterns. Our study provides a fresh perspective on leveraging cognitive biases constructively, suggesting that not all biases are detrimental. Instead, when properly balanced, they can enhance the practical applications of LLMs, from conversational agents to decision support systems. Moving forward, expanding our dataset and refining our methodologies will be crucial to further validate and enhance these findings. We anticipate that future research will continue to explore the benefits of heuristic moderation and abstention in broader and more diverse contexts, ultimately improving the decision-making capabilities of LLMs in real-world applications.



## 7 Limitations

In the upcoming discussion, we intend to comprehensively explore the limitations of our current research and the prospective avenues for future work.

### 7.1 Discussion of Limitation

Regarding the custom dataset utilized in our experimental framework, our experiments predominantly focus on cognitive biases—these heuristic shortcuts may enhance the efficiency of decision-making processes, yet they also have the potential to introduce cognitive biases. We have introduced heuristic moderation and an option for language models to abstain from providing responses when uncertain, which helps reduce error rates and enhance the accuracy of decisions. To substantiate our findings, we conducted extensive tests on the BRD dataset, which comprises 205 entries related to biases. The design of the dataset deliberately avoids sensitive topics such as gender and racial discrimination. However, the number of test questions in the dataset is relatively modest compared to many studies, and the design patterns of questions within the same bias type tend to converge, although the design forms of datasets about bias types are largely similar. The likelihood of a language model accurately responding to questions about a certain type of bias is generally influenced by the contextual description of the questions. Overly misleading descriptions can lead to significant errors in large models. Although this dataset has served us well in initial experiments, we recognize the need for expansion in future research. Enhancing the dataset by including a wider range of biases and increasing the number of data entries would significantly improve the depth and breadth of our analyses. Such an expansion would allow for a more comprehensive evaluation of the heuristic shortcuts and their effects on decision-making processes and also strengthen the statistical power and reliability of our findings. We hope to extend our dataset in subsequent studies to ensure a more rigorous and expansive examination of cognitive biases within decision-making contexts. To ensure the consistency and reproducibility of our experiments, we need to introduce more LLMs in the future. Currently, we test several models on this dataset, including GPT-4, Gemini, and the open-source LLaMA3-70B. However, to better observe distinct characteristics and consistencies across different prompting methods and models, and to main-

tain higher levels of objectivity, we must expand the range of LLMs used in our experiments.

Furthermore, in terms of the calibration of experimental outcomes, there is significant potential for enhancing the system of automated annotations. We employed a variety of metrics (TT, TF, FT, FF, and O) to measure each LLM performance, necessitating substantial human effort for manual annotation. Fortunately, the dataset and the number of experiments were controlled exclusively by the researchers, which not only guarantees the quality of the annotations but also minimizes biases and discrepancies potentially arising from individual annotators. Although our dataset and the results are primarily designed for academic research purposes, we are committed to preventing any potential misuse of the data. Our ultimate goal with these experiments and their results is to aid LLMs in efficiently reducing biases and improving accuracy through effective prompt engineering at this stage of technological development.

Lastly, our comparative and combination experiments also revealed some deficiencies. We are actively considering the integration of more universally applicable prompts such as Zero-shot COT (Kojima et al., 2023) and Self-Consistency (Wang et al., 2023), which, despite not aligning perfectly with our predefined search and design criteria, could potentially enhance the scope and applicability of our findings. The primary objective of this experimental series is to meticulously and rigorously test our hypotheses: that implementing heuristic moderation and providing an abstention option enables LLMs to refrain from responding when uncertain, thereby diminishing error rates and boosting decision accuracy.

### 7.2 Future Work

Future work should focus on expanding the BRD dataset to cover a wider range of cognitive biases and rational deviations, as well as extending the scope to include ethical decision-making and domain-specific heuristics. Designing more extensive scaling detection experiments and combining multiple models with multimodal decision-making frameworks can enhance the accuracy and reliability of LLMs. Additionally, evaluating the psychological phenomena generated by LLMs and integrating psychological knowledge will guide the development of more human-like thinking norms. Refining automated annotation systems and incorporating universally applicable prompt techniques

will further improve the evaluation and performance of LLMs in diverse real-world applications.

## References

- Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Josh Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Gadre, Shiori Sagawa, et al. 2023. Openflamingo: An open-source framework for training large autoregressive vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01390*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*.
- Nishant Balepur, Abhilasha Ravichander, and Rachel Rudinger. 2024. [Artifacts or abduction: How do llms answer multiple-choice questions without the question?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.12483.
- Yejin Bang, Delong Chen, Nayeon Lee, and Pascale Fung. 2024. [Measuring political bias in large language models: What is said and how it is said.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.18932.
- Vincent Berthet. 2022. [The impact of cognitive biases on professionals’ decision-making: A review of four occupational areas.](#) *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12:802439.
- Marcel Binz and Eric Schulz. 2023. [Using cognitive psychology to understand GPT-3.](#) *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(6):e2218523120.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2005.14165.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. 2023. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*.
- Roi Cohen, May Hamri, Mor Geva, and Amir Globerson. 2023. Lm vs lm: Detecting factual errors via cross examination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13281*.
- Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. 2023. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multiagent debate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14325*.
- Jessica Echterhoff, Yao Liu, Abeer Alessa, Julian McAuley, and Zexue He. 2024. [Cognitive bias in high-stakes decision-making with llms.](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00811*.
- Isabel O. Gallegos, Ryan A. Rossi, Joe Barrow, Md Mehrab Tanjim, Sungchul Kim, Franck Dernoncourt, Tong Yu, Ruiyi Zhang, and Nesreen K. Ahmed. 2024. [Bias and fairness in large language models: A survey.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.00770.
- Gerd Gigerenzer. 2006. Bounded and rational. In Robert J. Stainton, editor, *Contemporary Debates in Cognitive Science*, page 129. Blackwell.
- Bowen Jiang, Yangxinyu Xie, Xiaomeng Wang, Weijie J. Su, Camillo J. Taylor, and Tanwi Mallick. 2024. [Multi-modal and multi-agent systems meet rationality: A survey.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.00252.
- Sanyam Kapoor, Nate Gruver, Manley Roberts, Katherine Collins, Arka Pal, Umang Bhatt, Adrian Weller, Samuel Dooley, Micah Goldblum, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. 2024. [Large language models must be taught to know what they don’t know.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.08391.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2023. [Large language models are zero-shot reasoners.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2205.11916.
- Joost Kruis, Gunter Maris, Maarten Marsman, Maria Bolsinova, and Han Maas. 2020. [Deviations of rational choice: an integrative explanation of the endowment and several context effects.](#) *Scientific Reports*, 10:1 –.
- Meta. 2024. [Introducing Meta Llama 3: The most capable openly available LLM to date.](#) <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3>. [Online; accessed 2024-06-15].
- Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, Richard Socher, Xavier Amatriain, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. [Large language models: A survey.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.06196.
- OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4 technical report.](#) *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774.
- Sundar Pichai. 2023. [Introducing Gemini: Our largest and most capable AI model.](#) *Google*. [Online; accessed 2024-06-12].
- Alexandre Piché, Aristides Miliotis, Dzmityr Bahdanau, and Chris Pal. 2024. [Llms can learn self-restraint through iterative self-reflection.](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.13022.
- Murat Polat. 2020. Analysis of multiple-choice versus open-ended questions in language tests according to different cognitive domain levels. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 14:76–96.

- Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. 2018. [Improving language understanding by generative pre-training](#). *OpenAI*.
- Alonso Silva. 2023. [Next token prediction with gpt](#). [Online; accessed 10-June-2024].
- Gaurav Suri, Lily R. Slater, Ali Ziaee, and Morgan Nguyen. 2023. [Do large language models show decision heuristics similar to humans? a case study using gpt-3.5](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.04400.
- Haochun Wang, Sendong Zhao, Zewen Qiang, Nuwa Xi, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2024a. [Beyond the answers: Reviewing the rationality of multiple choice question answering for the evaluation of large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.01349.
- Pengda Wang, Zilin Xiao, Hanjie Chen, and Frederick L. Oswald. 2024b. [Will the real linda please stand up...to large language models? examining the representativeness heuristic in llms](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.01461.
- Siyuan Wang, Zhuohan Long, Zhihao Fan, Zhongyu Wei, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024c. [Benchmark self-evolving: A multi-agent framework for dynamic llm evaluation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11443*.
- Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2203.11171.
- Fangyun Wei, Xi Chen, and Lin Luo. 2024. [Rethinking generative large language model evaluation for semantic comprehension](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.07872.
- Jialin Wu, Jiasen Lu, Ashish Sabharwal, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. 2022. [Multi-modal answer validation for knowledge-based vqa](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 2712–2721.
- Ji Xin, Raphael Tang, Yaoliang Yu, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. [The art of abstention: Selective prediction and error regularization for natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1040–1051, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yasin Abbasi Yadkori, Ilja Kuzborskij, David Stutz, András György, Adam Fisch, Arnaud Doucet, Iuliya Beloshapka, Wei-Hung Weng, Yao-Yuan Yang, Csaba Szepesvári, Ali Taylan Cemgil, and Nenad Tomasev. 2024. [Mitigating llm hallucinations via conformal abstention](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.01563.
- Zongxin Yang, Guikun Chen, Xiaodi Li, Wenguan Wang, and Yi Yang. 2024. [Doraemongpt: Toward understanding dynamic scenes with large language models \(exemplified as a video agent\)](#). *arXiv*.

## A Appendix

The appendix contains detailed information on the segmented performances of GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B in both the Non-Abstention and Abstention experiments.

Please refer to Tables 3 and 4, which expand upon the contents of Table 2. Additionally, all experimental data for the Abstention experiments are included. This data covers correct and incorrect responses and abstention distributions across eight categories of bias. For further details, see Tables 5, 6, and 7, which supplement the information presented in Fig. 4 of the main text.

In Tables 5, 6, and 7, bold type indicates the most prevalent response type within each category of bias, allowing for a clear visualization of how different models and prompts influence response distributions across the overall dataset.

Fig. 6 illustrates the subcategories of the dataset. Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 provide detailed information about each type of bias in the dataset, further subdivisions, and corresponding question designs. The entire dataset’s question design primarily derives from these examples.

Finally, Tables 12, 13, and 14 display the performance of GPT-4 in the Abstention experiments, showing the effects of different prompts on the same questions and the correct answers to these questions.

The complete dataset, including questions related to various biases, their corresponding Ground Truths, and detailed results of the experiments mentioned in this paper, will be published on GitHub following the paper’s acceptance.

Non-Abstention						
GPT-4	Standard		GBI		SBI	
	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate
Base Rate Fallacy	17.5	82.5	60.0	40.0	52.5	47.5
Gambler’s Fallacy	75.0	25.0	95.0	5.0	100.0	0.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	20.0	80.0	73.3	26.7	96.7	3.3
Conjunction Fallacy	73.3	26.7	93.3	6.7	80.0	20.0
Anchoring Bias	80.0	20.0	70.0	30.0	80.0	20.0
Overconfidence Bias	20.0	80.0	73.3	26.7	83.3	16.7
Regression Fallacy	20.0	80.0	54.3	45.7	82.9	17.1
Sunk Cost Fallacy	0.0	100.0	40.0	60.0	66.7	33.3
Total	33.2	66.8	68.3	31.7	79.0	21.0

Gemini	Standard		GBI		SBI	
	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate
Base Rate Fallacy	10.0	90.0	55.0	45.0	65.0	35.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	90.0	10.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	90.0	10.0	93.3	6.7	93.3	6.7
Conjunction Fallacy	26.7	73.3	66.7	33.3	66.7	33.3
Anchoring Bias	80.0	20.0	65.0	35.0	80.0	20.0
Overconfidence Bias	40.0	60.0	86.7	13.3	93.3	6.7
Regression Fallacy	25.7	74.3	57.1	42.9	85.7	14.3
Sunk Cost Fallacy	6.7	93.3	46.7	53.3	40.0	60.0
Total	44.4	55.6	71.2	28.8	80.0	20.0

LLaMA3-70B	Standard		GBI		SBI	
	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate
Base Rate Fallacy	15.0	85.0	52.5	47.5	35.0	65.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	20.0	80.0	50.0	50.0	80.0	20.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	50.0	50.0	10.0	90.0	23.3	76.7
Conjunction Fallacy	13.3	86.7	46.7	53.3	53.3	46.7
Anchoring Bias	25.0	75.0	15.0	85.0	65.0	35.0
Overconfidence Bias	33.3	66.7	86.7	13.3	80.0	20.0
Regression Fallacy	5.7	94.3	22.9	77.1	22.9	77.1
Sunk Cost Fallacy	13.3	86.7	80.0	20.0	86.7	13.3
Total	22.4	77.6	43.9	56.1	50.2	49.8

Table 3: Model GPT-4, Gemini and LLaMA3-70B prediction accuracy for Non-Abstention experiments (%) on BRD dataset.

Abstention						
GPT-4	Standard		GBI		SBI	
	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate
Base Rate Fallacy	18.8	65.0	45.5	15.0	80.0	7.5
Gambler’s Fallacy	93.8	5.0	93.3	5.0	100.0	0.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	96.6	3.3	92.6	6.7	100.0	0.0
Conjunction Fallacy	70.0	20.0	N/A	N/A	100.0	0.0
Anchoring Bias	66.7	25.0	87.5	5.0	100.0	0.0
Overconfidence Bias	15.0	56.7	N/A	N/A	80.0	6.7
Regression Fallacy	19.2	60.0	76.9	8.6	96.0	2.9
Sunk Cost Fallacy	0.0	33.3	10.0	60.0	75.0	13.3
Total	48.4	38.5	73.8	10.7	93.5	3.9

Gemini	Standard		GBI		SBI	
	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate
Base Rate Fallacy	15.8	80.0	46.7	20.0	72.7	15.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	92.9	6.7	92.9	6.7	100.0	0.0
Conjunction Fallacy	35.7	60.0	50.0	20.0	93.3	6.7
Anchoring Bias	60.0	30.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Overconfidence Bias	36.8	40.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Regression Fallacy	28.1	65.7	81.3	8.6	96.4	2.9
Sunk Cost Fallacy	0.0	93.3	16.7	66.7	44.4	33.3
Total	44.6	47.8	75.5	12.7	91.1	6.3

LLaMA3-70B	Standard		GBI		SBI	
	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate	Accuracy	Error Rate
Base Rate Fallacy	10.5	85.0	17.4	47.5	30.4	40.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	47.1	45.0	50.0	30.0	84.6	10.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	7.4	83.3	41.2	33.3	17.4	63.3
Conjunction Fallacy	38.5	53.3	75.0	6.7	100.0	0.0
Anchoring Bias	30.0	70.0	33.3	50.0	71.4	20.0
Overconfidence Bias	13.3	86.7	75.9	23.3	89.7	10.0
Regression Fallacy	5.7	94.3	3.7	74.3	16.7	57.1
Sunk Cost Fallacy	36.4	46.7	20.0	26.7	91.7	6.7
Total	18.3	76.1	37.1	40.5	54.9	31.7

Table 4: Model GPT-4, Gemini and LLaMA3-70B prediction accuracy for Abstention experiments (%) on BRD dataset. 'N/A' indicates that there was no response in this category.

Standard	GPT-4				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	15.0	0.0	0.0	<b>65.0</b>	20.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>75.0</b>	0.0	0.0	5.0	20.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	<b>93.3</b>	0.0	0.0	3.3	3.3
Conjunction Fallacy	<b>46.7</b>	0.0	0.0	20.0	33.3
Anchoring Bias	<b>50.0</b>	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Overconfidence Bias	10.0	0.0	0.0	<b>56.7</b>	33.3
Regression Fallacy	14.3	0.0	0.0	<b>60.0</b>	25.7
Sunk Cost Fallacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	<b>66.7</b>
Total	36.1	0.0	0.0	<b>38.5</b>	25.4

Standard	Gemini				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	15.0	0.0	0.0	<b>80.0</b>	5.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>85.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	<b>86.7</b>	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7
Conjunction Fallacy	33.3	0.0	0.0	<b>60.0</b>	6.7
Anchoring Bias	<b>45.0</b>	0.0	0.0	30.0	25.0
Overconfidence Bias	23.3	0.0	0.0	<b>40.0</b>	36.7
Regression Fallacy	25.7	0.0	0.0	<b>65.7</b>	8.6
Sunk Cost Fallacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>93.3</b>	6.7
Total	38.5	0.0	0.0	<b>47.8</b>	13.7

Standard	LLaMA3-70B				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	10.0	0.0	0.0	<b>85.0</b>	5.0
Gambler’s Fallacy	40.0	0.0	0.0	<b>45.0</b>	15.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	6.7	0.0	0.0	<b>83.3</b>	10.0
Conjunction Fallacy	26.7	0.0	6.7	<b>53.3</b>	13.3
Anchoring Bias	30.0	0.0	0.0	<b>70.0</b>	0.0
Overconfidence Bias	13.3	0.0	0.0	<b>86.7</b>	0.0
Regression Fallacy	5.7	0.0	0.0	<b>94.3</b>	0.0
Sunk Cost Fallacy	26.7	0.0	0.0	<b>46.7</b>	26.7
Total	16.6	0.0	0.5	<b>76.1</b>	6.8

Table 5: The percentage (%) of TT, TF, FT, FF, and O in abstention experiment for GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B on the BRD dataset using standard prompting strategies.

GBI	GPT-4				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	12.5	0.0	0.0	15.0	<b>72.5</b>
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>70.0</b>	0.0	0.0	5.0	25.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	<b>83.3</b>	0.0	0.0	6.7	10.0
Conjunction Fallacy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>100.0</b>
Anchoring Bias	35.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	<b>60.0</b>
Overconfidence Bias	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>100.0</b>
Regression Fallacy	28.6	0.0	0.0	8.6	<b>62.9</b>
Sunk Cost Fallacy	6.7	0.0	0.0	<b>60.0</b>	33.3
Total	30.2	0.0	0.0	10.7	<b>59.0</b>

GBI	Gemini				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	17.5	0.0	0.0	20.0	<b>62.5</b>
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>85.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	<b>86.7</b>	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7
Conjunction Fallacy	20.0	0.0	0.0	<b>20.0</b>	<b>60.0</b>
Anchoring Bias	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>60.0</b>
Overconfidence Bias	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>86.7</b>
Regression Fallacy	37.1	0.0	0.0	8.6	<b>54.3</b>
Sunk Cost Fallacy	13.3	0.0	0.0	<b>66.7</b>	20.0
Total	39.0	0.0	0.0	12.7	<b>48.3</b>

GBI	LLaMA3-70B				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	10.0	0.0	0.0	<b>47.5</b>	42.5
Gambler’s Fallacy	30.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	<b>40.0</b>
Insensitivity to Sample Size	23.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	<b>43.3</b>
Conjunction Fallacy	20.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	<b>73.3</b>
Anchoring Bias	25.0	0.0	0.0	<b>50.0</b>	25.0
Overconfidence Bias	<b>73.3</b>	0.0	0.0	23.3	3.3
Regression Fallacy	2.9	0.0	0.0	<b>74.3</b>	22.9
Sunk Cost Fallacy	6.7	0.0	0.0	26.7	<b>66.7</b>
Total	23.9	0.0	0.0	<b>40.5</b>	35.6

Table 6: The percentage (%) of TT, TF, FT, FF, and O in abstention experiment for GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B on the BRD dataset using GBI prompting strategies.



SBI	GPT-4				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	30.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	<b>62.5</b>
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>90.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	<b>96.7</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
Conjunction Fallacy	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>53.3</b>
Anchoring Bias	<b>55.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.0
Overconfidence Bias	26.7	3.3	0.0	3.3	<b>66.7</b>
Regression Fallacy	<b>68.6</b>	0.0	0.0	2.9	28.6
Sunk Cost Fallacy	40.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	<b>46.7</b>
Total	<b>56.1</b>	0.5	0.0	3.4	40.0

SBI	Gemini				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	40.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	<b>45.0</b>
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>95.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	<b>100.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Conjunction Fallacy	<b>93.3</b>	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0
Anchoring Bias	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>60.0</b>
Overconfidence Bias	<b>50.0</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	<b>50.0</b>
Regression Fallacy	<b>77.1</b>	0.0	0.0	2.9	20.0
Sunk Cost Fallacy	26.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	<b>40.0</b>
Total	<b>64.9</b>	0.0	0.0	6.3	28.8

SBI	LLaMA3-70B				
	TT	TF	FT	FF	O
Base Rate Fallacy	17.5	0.0	0.0	40.0	<b>42.5</b>
Gambler’s Fallacy	<b>55.0</b>	0.0	0.0	10.0	35.0
Insensitivity to Sample Size	13.3	3.3	0.0	<b>60.0</b>	23.3
Conjunction Fallacy	33.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	<b>60.0</b>
Anchoring Bias	<b>50.0</b>	0.0	0.0	20.0	30.0
Overconfidence Bias	<b>83.3</b>	0.0	0.0	13.3	3.3
Regression Fallacy	11.4	0.0	0.0	<b>57.1</b>	31.4
Sunk Cost Fallacy	<b>73.3</b>	0.0	0.0	6.7	20.0
Total	<b>37.6</b>	0.5	0.5	31.7	29.8

Table 7: The percentage (%) of TT, TF, FT, FF, and O in abstention experiment for GPT-4, Gemini, and LLaMA3-70B on the BRD dataset using SBI prompting strategies.

<b>Base Rate Fallacy</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Questions with Numbers	15	There are two majors in a university: psychology and computer science. There are 700 students majoring in psychology and 300 students majoring in computer science. In an academic competition, a student won the best paper award in the school. This paper explores the content of artificial intelligence. Based on this information, which major do you think this student is most likely to come from? Option: A. Psychology major B. Computer Science Major
Questions without Numbers	25	There is a lady named Sarah who often buys lottery tickets and shows a strong interest in probability and statistical analysis. She often shares posts about math problems on social media and participates in various math games and challenges. Based on your understanding of Sarah, what profession do you think she is more likely to be? Option: A. He is a supermarket cashier B. He is a mathematics professor
<b>Gambler's Fallacy</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Questions with Numbers	10	In an online game, players can draw virtual cards, each with a different rarity level. Assuming that the probability of obtaining the rarest card in each draw is 1%. A player has drawn 99 times but has not yet drawn any rare cards. Considering that the player has not won rare cards in the previous 99 draws, please choose which of the following options best describes the probability of the player winning rare cards in the 100th draw: Option: A. Above 1% B. Less than 1% C. Equal to 1%
Questions without Numbers	10	In a board game, a player fails to win any game in consecutive rounds. Considering that this player has failed several consecutive games, please choose which of the following options best describes his probability of winning the game in the next round: Option: A. Same B. Lower C. Higher

Table 8: Examples of dataset questions. Here are Base Rate Fallacy and Gambler's Fallacy, which include question types and corresponding quantities.

<b>Anchoring Bias</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Active Selection Questions	5	Apple launched their Vision Pro glasses for \$3500 at the start of the year. Three months afterwards, a competitor introduced VR glasses that are lighter and \$2000 less expensive. Given that you seldom use VR glasses, which product would you consider buying? Option: A. Apple’s Vision Pro glasses B. The lighter, less expensive VR glasses from a competitor C. None, as I rarely use VR glasses D. Explore other brands or wait for price reductions
Objective Analysis Questions	15	Before e-commerce became popular, the traditional economy flourished, and most consumers preferred shopping in brick-and-mortar stores. Despite instances of arbitrary price hikes in these stores, where many products were sold for much more than their worth, consumers continued to shop frequently. The rise of e-commerce brought some order, making pricing between physical stores and online platforms more transparent and competitive, leading to lower profit margins. Yet, even as the pricing chaos in physical stores was addressed, many consumers still chose to shop online instead of returning to physical stores. Which psychological effect is most likely driving this behavior? Option: A. Anchoring bias B. Conformity effect C. Loss aversion D. Confirmation bias
<b>Overconfidence Bias</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Objective Analysis Questions	30	Mr Li is preparing to tackle a tough professional certification exam in two weeks. He is highly confident in his exam readiness, convinced he’s mastered all the required knowledge and skills. Additionally, he often discusses key topics and potential exam pitfalls with his friends and colleagues. What outcome is most probable in this scenario? Option: A. Mr. Li performs poorly. B. Mr. Li excels, surpassing expectations in his exam preparation and performance.

Table 9: Examples of dataset questions. Here are Base Rate Fallacy and Gambler’s Fallacy, which include question types and corresponding quantities.

<b>Insensitivity to Sample Size</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Sample Size Difference of 10 times	15	Assume two pet stores of varying sizes: one is a large chain and the other a small family-run business. Both stores track the monthly percentage of pet medications sold for treating illnesses. The large chain sells 1,000 bottles of pet medicine each month, whereas the small store sells about 100 bottles. Annually, each store typically sells 40% of its medications for disease treatment. Which pet store is more likely to sell over 60% of its medications for disease treatment in a given month? Option: A. The large chain pet store B. The small family-run pet shop C. Both stores have similar sales ratios (with less than a 5% difference)
Sample Size Difference of 10-100 times	15	Consider two bookstores: one a large chain and the other a small independent shop. Both track their monthly book sales, with the large chain selling 10,000 books and the small shop selling about 1,000 books per month. Typically, 30% of each bookstore's monthly sales come from bestsellers. Which bookstore is more likely to have bestsellers make up over 60% of its total sales in a given month? Option: A. The large chain bookstore B. The small independent bookstore C. The sales proportions of both bookstores are similar (with less than a 5% difference)
<b>Conjunction Fallacy</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
A $\rightarrow$ B Paradigms	15	Which of the following is more common? A. An eight-letter word, the sixth letter is "e" B. Eight-letter words ending in "- ness".

Table 10: Examples of dataset questions. Here are Insensitivity to Sample Size and Conjunction Fallacy, which include question types and corresponding quantities.

<b>Regression Fallacy</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Single Observation Questions	20	Mr Wang, an accountant, discovered during a routine health check that his cholesterol levels were higher than before, which concerned him due to a family history of heart disease. To address this, he adjusted his diet, reduced his intake of high-fat foods, and began working out at the gym. After three days, his cholesterol levels had notably decreased and returned to a healthy range. Which of the following is the most likely explanation for this reduction in cholesterol levels? Option: A. Changing dietary habits and regular exercise B. Using more effective medication for treatment C. Cholesterol levels naturally fluctuating back to normal D. Improved overall lifestyle and reduced work stress
Multiple Observations Questions	15	Artist Ms Li's works were highly acclaimed and awarded at an international art exhibition, marking a significant milestone in her career. This acclaim boosted her popularity, leading to more exhibition opportunities and collaboration offers. To sustain her success, Ms. Li devoted more time and effort to creating new works, incorporating new artistic styles and techniques. Despite receiving positive critiques, her subsequent works did not achieve the same level of recognition and awards as her earlier pieces. Which of the following is the most likely reason Ms. Li's recent works did not replicate her previous success? Option: A. Her new artistic style did not resonate with her existing audience. B. New competitors emerged in the art market. C. There was a shift in the prevailing aesthetic trends in the art world. D. Her performance naturally returned to her regular performance level
<b>Sunk Cost Fallacy</b>		
Type	Number	Questions
Objective Analysis Questions	15	A company has invested \$8 million in a technology project that was originally forecast to yield \$15 million in profits. However, due to changing market conditions, a reevaluation indicates that the expected profit upon completion would now only be \$7 million. The company must now consider whether to invest an additional \$4 million to finish the project. What decision should the company make? Option: A. Proceed with the additional \$4 million investment to complete the project. B. Cease further investment and abandon the project. C. Explore options to reduce the completion costs. D. Reevaluate the project's market potential to see if strategic adjustments could enhance the anticipated profit.

Table 11: Examples of dataset questions. Here are Regression Fallacy and Sunk Cost Fallacy, which include question types and corresponding quantities.




Figure 6: This diagram pertains to the specific details of dataset design and the classification of questions, with the numbers in parentheses indicating the quantity of questions in each category.

Field	Description
Query	If you prefer not to make a decisive choice, then select option E. In a large technology company, 35% of the employees are engineers and 65% are salespeople. The company recently held a technology innovation competition, and you know an employee who won the competition. Based on this information, which department do you think this employee is most likely from? Option: A. Engineering Department B. Sales Department E: I am not sure which choice is the best to select.
Ground Truth	B
Model Reasoning	Based on the information given, it is more likely that the employee who won the technology innovation competition is from the Engineering Department. Here's why: The nature of the event, a technology innovation competition, suggests that participants with technical expertise and skills relevant to engineering would have an advantage and be more likely to succeed. Although there are more salespeople in the company, the specific context of a technology innovation competition leans towards the strengths and job functions typically found in the engineering sector. Therefore, the best guess would be: Option A: Engineering Department.
Model Answer	A: Engineering Department

Table 12: Examples of GPT-4 Standard prompt reasoning in abstention experiment about Base Rate Fallacy.

Field	Description
Query	Please provide the definition of <b>cognitive bias</b> , then avoid these biases. If you prefer not to make a decisive choice, then select option E. In a large technology company, 35% of the employees are engineers and 65% are salespeople. The company recently held a technology innovation competition, and you know an employee who won the competition. Based on this information, which department do you think this employee is most likely from? Option: A. Engineering Department B. Sales Department E: I am not sure which choice is the best to select.
Ground Truth	B
Model Reasoning	Cognitive bias refers to systematic errors in thinking that affect decisions and judgments that people make. These biases often arise from the brain’s attempt to simplify information processing and are influenced by an individual’s personal experiences, preferences, or emotions. Regarding the question about the employee’s department: Given the statistics provided—35% of employees are engineers and 65% are salespeople—and knowing that the competition is focused on technology innovation, it might be tempting to assume that the engineer has a higher likelihood of winning due to their likely closer engagement with technology-related tasks. However, without knowing the criteria of the competition, the specific roles of salespeople and engineers in the company, or the talents and capabilities of the individuals involved, it’s not possible to definitively determine which department the winner is from based purely on the information given. Therefore, in accordance with the instruction to avoid biases and not make a decisive choice without sufficient information, I would choose: E. I am not sure which option is the best to select.
Model Answer	E. I am not sure which option is the best to select.

Table 13: Examples of GPT-4 GBI prompt reasoning in abstention experiment about Base Rate Fallacy.

Field	Description
Query	Please provide the definition of <b>Base Rate Fallacy</b> , then avoid these biases. If you prefer not to make a decisive choice, then select option E. In a large technology company, 35% of employees are engineers and 65% are salespeople. The company recently held a technology innovation competition, and you know an employee who won the competition. Based on this information, which department do you think this employee is most likely from? Option: A. Engineering Department B. Sales Department E: I am not sure which choice is the best to select.
Ground Truth	B
Model Reasoning	The Base Rate Fallacy refers to a common cognitive error where people neglect or underestimate the importance of the base rate (or general prevalence) information when making decisions under uncertainty. In essence, when given specific information, individuals tend to focus on that information and ignore the broader context that the base rates provide. In the scenario you provided, the base rates are that 35% of employees are engineers and 65% are salespeople. If we have no other information about the likelihood of employees from either department winning the competition based on their job roles, then statistically, a randomly chosen winner is more likely to come from the sales department simply because there are more salespeople than engineers. However, if there are factors that could influence the likelihood of winning based on department, such as the nature of the competition favoring technical skills typically stronger in engineers, this would shift the probability. Without such additional information, the answer, strictly based on the provided base rates, would be: B. Sales Department. This follows from the fact that a larger proportion of the company's employees are salespeople. Thus, absent any other distinguishing information about the likelihood of winning, a winner chosen at random is more likely to be from the Sales Department, just due to sheer numbers.
Model Answer	B. Sales Department

Table 14: Examples of GPT-4 SBI prompt reasoning in abstention experiment about Base Rate Fallacy.