
Quantifying Prediction Consistency Under Model Multiplicity in Tabular LLMs

Faisal Hamman¹ Pasan Dissanayake¹ Saumitra Mishra² Freddy Lecue² Sanghamitra Dutta¹
¹University of Maryland, College Park ²JPMorgan AI Research
{fhamman, pasand, sanghamd}@umd.edu
{saumitra.mishra, freddy.lecue}@jpmorgan.com

Abstract

Fine-tuning large language models (LLMs) on limited tabular data for classification tasks can lead to *fine-tuning multiplicity*, where equally well-performing models make conflicting predictions on the same inputs due to variations in the training process (i.e., seed, random weight initialization, retraining on additional or deleted samples). This raises critical concerns about the robustness and reliability of Tabular LLMs, particularly when deployed for high-stakes decision-making, such as finance, hiring, education, healthcare, etc. This work formalizes the challenge of fine-tuning multiplicity in Tabular LLMs and proposes a novel metric to quantify the robustness of individual predictions without expensive model retraining. Our metric quantifies a prediction’s stability by analyzing (sampling) the model’s local behavior around the input in the embedding space. Interestingly, we show that sampling in the local neighborhood can be leveraged to provide probabilistic robustness guarantees against a broad class of fine-tuned models. By leveraging Bernstein’s Inequality, we show that predictions with sufficiently high robustness (as defined by our measure) will remain consistent with high probability. We also provide empirical evaluation on real-world datasets to support our theoretical results. Our work highlights the importance of addressing fine-tuning instabilities to enable trustworthy deployment of LLMs in high-stakes and safety-critical applications.

1 Introduction

Large language models are generating significant interest in high-stakes applications, e.g., finance, healthcare, etc., particularly in few-shot classification scenarios on tabular datasets. Recent findings demonstrate that these models perform commendably in such scenarios, especially when very little training data is available, due to their transfer learning abilities [Hegselmann et al., 2023, Dinh et al., 2022, Yin et al., 2020, Yan et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2023]. However, models in these settings are often fine-tuned from large pretrained models with millions or billions of parameters on small proprietary datasets [Hu et al., 2021, Liu et al., 2022]. This paucity of training data, combined with large parameter spaces, risks instability across different fine-tuned variants of the pre-trained model.

We introduce the notion of *fine-tuning multiplicity* as to the phenomenon where multiple competing models, fine-tuned from the same pre-trained LLM but under slightly varying conditions (such as different random seeds or minor changes in the training data), exhibit comparable performance (e.g., in terms of accuracy) yet generate conflicting predictions for the same inputs. This concept is closely related to predictive multiplicity, often referred to as the Rashomon effect in the context of neural networks [Marx et al., 2020, Breiman, 2003, Hsu and Calmon, 2022]. This is particularly alarming for high-stakes applications, such as finance [Yin et al., 2023], healthcare [Wang et al., 2024, Chen et al., 2023, Kim et al., 2024], where arbitrary predictions can have significant consequences.

The fine-tuned models for high-stakes decisions might have to be updated due to various reasons, e.g., to retrain on additional data points to improve performance [Wu et al., 2024], or even removing datapoints for privacy. For instance, regulatory frameworks like the GDPR [Voigt, 2017] introduces the *right to be forgotten* which necessitates the removal of an individual’s data upon request, potentially leading to model updates. These updates could, in turn, impact the validity of previously issued predictions. The phenomenon of fine-tuning multiplicity not only raises concerns about model reliability but also paves the way for fairwashing and explanation bias [Black et al., 2022, Sokol et al., 2023] making quantifying robustness against fine-tuning multiplicity an important problem.

Since methods to measure multiplicity in classical ML are impractical for LLMs due to the computational challenge of retraining several fine-tuned models, we propose a novel metric to quantify the robustness of individual predictions without requiring expensive retraining of multiple models. Our metric, termed *consistency*, leverage the model’s local behavior around each input sample within the embedding space to estimate the prediction’s susceptibility to multiplicity. Interestingly, by analyzing this local neighborhood, we can derive probabilistic guarantees on the robustness of predictions with high consistency scores under a broad range of potential fine-tuned model updates.

Our contribution is summarized as follows:

- **Model multiplicity in fine-tuned tabular LLMs.** We show that model multiplicity is a critical issue in the context of fine-tuning large language models (LLMs) for tabular data tasks. Multiple fine-tuned models may perform equally well, yet assign conflicting predictions to the same input due to random training initialization, we term this *fine-tuning multiplicity*. To evaluate the extent of multiplicity, we finetune several models and evaluate the *Arbitrariness*, *Discrepancy*, *Pairwise Disagreement*, *Prediction Variance*, and *Prediction Range* (see Definitions 1,2,3,4, and 5 in Section 2). This multiplicity issue raises concerns about the robustness and reliability of fine-tuned LLMs, which are increasingly being deployed in high-stakes decision-making scenarios.
- **A measure to quantify prediction robustness amidst fine-tuning multiplicity.** We introduce a novel metric, termed *consistency* (see Definition 6), to quantify the robustness of model predictions in the face of fine-tuning multiplicity, without retraining several models. Given an input $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and model $f(\cdot) \in [0, 1]$, our robustness measure is given as: $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{x_i \in N_{x,k}} (f(x_i) - |f(x) - f(x_i)|)$, where $N_{x,k}$ is a set of k points sampled independently from a distribution over a hypersphere of radius σ centered at x . Consistency leverages the neighbors of a given sample (in the embedding space) to inform the reliability of its prediction. The first term essentially captures the mean value of the model output in a region around it. The second term captures the local average variability of the model output around it (lower variability is expected to be more reliable).
- **Probabilistic guarantees on consistency over a broad range of fine-tuned models.** Our main contribution is to provide a theoretical guarantee (see Theorem 1) that predictions with sufficiently high consistency (as defined by our measure) will remain consistent with high probability over a broad range of fine-tuned models. To achieve this guarantee, we characterize the behavior and statistical properties of a broad class of fine-tuned models (see Assumption 1; *Stochastic Fine-Tuned Model Class*). Our results leverage Bernstein’s Inequality (see Lemma 2) to establish rigorous concentration bounds on the Neighborhood Divergence (see Lemma 1), which are then used to prove our theoretical guarantee.
- **Empirical validation.** In our empirical analysis, we evaluate the extent of fine-tuning multiplicity and validate our proposed consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ on the Diabetes, German Credit, and Adult datasets [Kahn, Hofmann, 1994, Becker and Kohavi, 1996]. We employ the BigScience T0 encoder-decoder model [Sanh et al., 2021], fine-tuned via the T-Few recipe [Liu et al., 2022], and LORA [Hu et al., 2021]. We measure Arbitrariness, Discrepancy, Pairwise Disagreement, and Prediction Variance (see Section 2) to evaluate the extent of fine-tuning multiplicity. We study how effectively our consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$, (as measured only on model $f(\cdot)$) captures multiplicity of predictions over a broad range of fine-tuned models.

1.1 Related Works

LLM in tabular predictions. The application of LLMs to tabular data is a growing area of research, demonstrating significant performance due to the transfer learning capabilities [Yin et al., 2020, Li et al., 2020, Narayan et al., 2022, Borisov et al., 2022, Bertsimas et al., 2022, Onishi et al., 2023, Zhang et al., 2023, Wang et al., 2023, Sui et al., 2024, Yan et al., 2024, Yang et al., 2024]. Yin et al.




Figure 1: (a) illustrates the process of fine-tuning LLMs for Tabular data using few labeled examples [Hegselmann et al., 2023, Dinh et al., 2022]. (b) demonstrates the concept of finetuning multiplicity. Models fine-tuned from the same pre-trained LLM under slightly varying conditions, such as different random seeds, can exhibit comparable performance metrics but may yield conflicting predictions for the same input. (c) introduces our proposed consistency measure designed to quantify the robustness of individual predictions without requiring the retraining of multiple models. By sampling points in a bounded neighborhood around a given input in the embedding space, the consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ informs a prediction’s susceptibility to multiplicity.

[2020], Jaitly et al. [2023] incorporated column data types into the serialized strings, adding a layer of descriptive context to the data. Dinh et al. [2022] proposes LIFT, a method for adapting LLMs to non-language classification and regression tasks without changing the model architecture or loss function. Hegselmann et al. [2023] investigates the use of LLMs for zero-shot and few-shot classification of tabular data and finds that this method outperforms previous deep-learning-based approaches and is competitive with traditional baselines like gradient-boosted trees. Wang et al. [2024] presents MediTab, a method that uses LLMs to combine different medical datasets, significantly improving predictions for patient and trial outcomes. Tabular LLMs have also been applied in other high-stakes domains [Chen et al., 2023, Kim et al., 2024, Li et al., 2023, Yin et al., 2023]. Yin et al. [2023] presents FinPT an LLM based approach to financial risk prediction. We refer to Fang et al. [2024] for a more detailed survey on LLMs on Tabular Data.

Model multiplicity in machine learning. Breiman [2003] introduced the idea that machine learning models can differ significantly while achieving similar average performance, known as the Rashomon effect. Marx et al. [2020] highlighted the prevalence of arbitrary decisions in simple classification problems, coining this phenomenon predictive multiplicity. [Creel and Hellman, 2022] discuss the harms of predictive multiplicity and arbitrary decisions. Efforts to leverage model multiplicity beneficially while addressing its implications have been explored by [Black et al., 2022, Fisher et al., 2019, Xin et al., 2022, Coston et al., 2021]. The effect of model multiplicity in fairness [Sokol et al., 2022] and explainability are examined by Hamman et al. [2023], Black et al. [2021], Dutta et al. [2022], Pawelczyk et al. [2020]. Watson-Daniels et al. [2023], Hsu and Calmon [2022] offered a framework for measuring predictive multiplicity in classical ML models, however this involves retraining several models. Model multiplicity has not been extensively studied in tabular LLMs. The closest work is by [Gomez et al., 2024], which investigates prediction arbitrariness for online content moderation. We leverage the rich embedding space of LLMs to quantify proneness to multiplicity without the need for expensive retraining, as fine-tuning LLMs is computationally expensive.

1.2 Preliminaries

We consider a classification task for a tabular dataset $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where each x_i is a d -dimensional feature vector (rows of a tabular input), and each label y_i is binary, $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$. We

study an n -shot classification problem by fine-tuning a pre-trained model on n examples from a training set. This fine-tuning process aims to adapt the pre-trained model to effectively predict new, unseen data points by learning from a limited number of training examples.

Serialization of Tabular Data for LLMs: To effectively apply LLMs to tabular data, it is crucial to transform the data into a natural text format. This process, known as serialization, involves converting the table rows into a text string that includes both the column names and their corresponding values [Yin et al., 2020, Jaitly et al., 2023, Hegselmann et al., 2023, Dinh et al., 2022]. The resultant serialized string is combined with a task-specific prompt to form the input for the LLM. There have been various proposed methods for serialization, and this is still a topic of active research Hegselmann et al. [2023], Jaitly et al. [2023]. Among the serializations we have examined are: list template (A list of column names and feature values), and text template (“*The <column name> is <value>.*”). LLMs can be adapted for classification tasks by training them on serialized tabular data. This training involves using the natural-language outputs of the LLM, mapped to valid classes in the target space, as part of a fine-tuning process (see Figure 1).

To clarify, table values are serialized into $\text{serialize}(x)$ and then transformed into a format understandable by the LLM, $\text{tokenize}(\text{serialize}(x))$, which is some embedding. Since these transformations are one-to-one mappings, we denote the embedded form of x as $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to represent x in the embedding space. This allows us to simplify the notation and directly use x to refer to the table values in the embedding space.

Goals. Our primary goal is to define a measure of predictive consistency to fine-tuning multiplicity that does not require retraining multiple models since this is computationally expensive for LLMs. We aim to theoretically motivate this measure and provide theoretical guarantees on its effectiveness in ensuring consistent predictions across a broad range of fine-tuned models (see Figure 1). Additionally, we intend to evaluate this measure against multiplicity metrics by fine-tuning several models to empirically validate its robustness and reliability.

2 Model Multiplicity in Fine-Tuned Tabular LLMs

Let $f(\cdot) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denote an LLM that performs binary classification, outputting the probability distribution over the classes. We let \mathcal{F} denote a broad class of fine-tuned models that are equally well-performing (i.e., a set of competing models as measured by the accuracy), i.e, $\mathcal{F}_\delta = \{f : \text{err}(f) \leq \text{err}(f_0) + \delta\}$ where $\text{err}(f_0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}[\hat{f}_0(x_i) \neq y_i]$ for a reference model f_0 (with satisfactory accuracy) a dataset with n examples. Here, $\hat{f}(x) = \mathbb{I}[f(x) \geq 0.5]$ denotes the predicted labels. This is a set of models that perform just as well as the baseline classifier where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is the error tolerance [Marx et al., 2020]. The appropriate choice of δ is application-dependent.

Fine-tuning multiplicity. We introduce the notion of fine-tuning multiplicity as to the phenomenon observed where multiple competing models, fine-tuned from the same pre-trained LLM but under slightly varying conditions (such as different random seeds or minor changes in the training data), exhibit comparable performance yet generate conflicting predictions for the same inputs (e.g., model in \mathcal{F}_δ). This concept is closely related to predictive multiplicity, often referred to as the Rashomon effect in the context of neural networks [Marx et al., 2020, Breiman, 2003, Hsu and Calmon, 2022]. However, this issue becomes more pronounced with LLMs because these models are typically fine-tuned on small datasets from large foundational models (to leverage their transfer learning ability), which possess millions or billions of parameters. This paucity of training data, combined with large parameter spaces, risks instability across different fine-tuned variants of the model (see Figure 1).

2.1 Evaluating Fine-tuning Multiplicity

To effectively evaluate the extent of fine-tuning multiplicity, we introduce specific empirical metrics that assess how predictions may vary across different versions of fine-tuned models. These can only be evaluated when we access to several fine-tuned models in the competing set.

Definition 1 (Arbitrariness [Gomez et al., 2024]). *Arbitrariness over set \mathcal{F}_δ measures the extent of conflicting predictions across the model space for a given set of inputs $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. It is defined as:*

$$A_\delta = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}[\exists f, f' \in \mathcal{F}_\delta, : \hat{f}(x_i) \neq \hat{f}'(x_i)] \quad (1)$$

Arbitrariness generalizes the *Ambiguity* measure from Marx et al. [2020]. While *Ambiguity* computes the fraction of points where at least one model in \mathcal{F}_δ disagrees with a reference model, arbitrariness measures the percentage of points that receive conflicting predictions from any two models within the set \mathcal{F}_δ . Arbitrariness can be defined on an input, i.e., $A(x_i) = \mathbb{I}[\exists f, f' \in \mathcal{F}_\delta, : \hat{f}(x_i) \neq \hat{f}'(x_i)]$

Definition 2 (Discrepancy). *Discrepancy quantifies the maximum proportion of conflicting predictions between the reference model and any competing model in the set. It is defined as:*

$$D_\delta(f_0) := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\delta} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}[\hat{f}(x_i) \neq \hat{f}_0(x_i)] \right) \quad (2)$$

Discrepancy measures the maximum number of predictions that could change if a reference model is replaced with a competing model. This means that, in practice, altering multiple predictions requires that all conflicting predictions come from a single competing model.

Definition 3 (Pairwise Disagreement [Black et al., 2022]). *Pairwise Disagreement assesses the variability among models by measuring the proportion of instances where pairs of models within the competing set disagree:*

$$PD_\delta(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}_\delta|(|\mathcal{F}_\delta| - 1)} \sum_{f_i, f_j \in \mathcal{F}_\delta, f_i \neq f_j} \mathbb{I}[\hat{f}_i(x) \neq \hat{f}_j(x)] \quad (3)$$

Most existing measures of multiplicity focus on predicted labels. We propose more nuanced measures that leverages the predicted probabilities of model outputs:

Definition 4 (Prediction Variance). *Prediction Variance PD measures the variability of the model outputs for a given input x across different models within the set \mathcal{F}_δ . It is defined as:*

$$PV_\delta(x) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}_\delta|} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\delta} \left(f(x) - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{F}_\delta|} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\delta} f(x) \right)^2 \quad (4)$$

Prediction Variance captures the variability of predictions for a given input across the competing set of models (higher PV indicates more multiplicity). Unlike threshold-dependent measures, PV does not rely on accept/reject thresholds. This means low PV centered around the 0.5 threshold may indicate high multiplicity when using arbitrariness, discrepancy, or pairwise disagreement while these other measures may overlook high PV centered on one side of the decision boundary. We also introduce a similar measure that captures the maximum disparity in predictions:

Definition 5 (Prediction Range). *Prediction Range (PR) measures the range of model outputs for a given input x across different models in the set \mathcal{F}_δ . It is defined as:*

$$PR_\delta(x) := \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\delta} f(x) - \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\delta} f(x) \quad (5)$$

Remark 1. *Given the infeasibility of computing the exact size of $|\mathcal{F}_\delta|$ due to its potentially vast model space, we employ an expensive sampling approach, i.e., re-fine-tuning on various seeds. We select a finite number of models from \mathcal{F}_δ for practical evaluation, allowing us to evaluate the multiplicity metrics. It is very computationally expensive to fine-tune several models to evaluate multiplicity. This motivates the need for a measure to quantify consistency given one fine-tuned model.*

3 Quantifying Prediction Consistency amidst Fine-tuning Multiplicity

Our objective is to develop a measure denoted as $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$, for an input x and a given fine-tuned model f , that quantifies its robustness of predictions to a broad class of fine-tuned models. Ideally, we desire that the measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ should be high if the input x is consistent across this broad class of fine-tuned models (see Figure 1).

3.1 Proposed Consistency Measure

Prediction probabilities as a measure of consistency. Using the prediction probabilities of model $f(\cdot)$ as a measure of prediction certainty can offer insights into the model’s confidence in its predictions in choosing a certain class. While a high prediction probability $f(\cdot)$ might suggest a strong

confidence in a particular class, we show that relying solely on $f(x)$ for assessing the robustness of predictions against model multiplicity is insufficient (see Table 4, Figure 2, i.e., samples with high $f(x)$ or confidence can still be susceptible to multiplicity). Therefore, we propose leveraging the local neighborhood around the input x in the embedding space. This motivates us to derive a theoretical measure of consistency.

Definition 6 (Consistency). *The consistency of a given prediction $f(x) \in [0, 1]$ is defined as follows:*

$$S_{k,\sigma}(x, f) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{x_i \in N_{x,k}} (f(x_i) - |f(x) - f(x_i)|), \quad (6)$$

where $N_{x,k}$ is a set of k points sampled independently from a distribution over a hypersphere of radius σ centered at x , i.e., $N_{x,k} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\} \subset B(x, \sigma) = \{x' \in \mathcal{X} : \|x' - x\|_2 < \sigma\}$.

Remark 2. *Our consistency measure is fundamentally tied to the confidence in predicting a specific class. The concept can be seamlessly applied by considering the logits (or softmax outputs) for predicting any given class. This approach can also be extended to multi-class classification by providing logits for each class, thereby maintaining the measure’s applicability across various classification tasks.*

3.2 Theoretical Guarantees on Consistency

Here, we present theoretical insights that motivate and provide guarantees for our proposed robustness measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$, ensuring consistent predictions across a broad class of fine-tuned models. We represent the class of fine-tuned models by a stochastic (random) function F , such that $F \in \mathcal{F}$. We denote two random models, F and F' , both of which are independently and identically distributed within \mathcal{F} . For clarity, we use capital letters (e.g., F, F', X_i, Z) to denote random variables, while lowercase letters (e.g., x_i, f, ϵ) indicate specific realizations.

In our framework, we define a set of assumptions that delineates the behavior of a broad class of finetuned models and the statistical properties of their predictions.

Assumption 1 (Stochastic Fine-Tuned Model Class). *We define the stochastic divergence between predictions of two random models, F and F' as:*

$$Z_i := F'(X_i) - F(X_i) - |F(X_i) - F(x)| + |F'(X_i) - F'(x)|$$

with $Z = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i$ where X_i ’s are random points sampled independently from a distribution over a hypersphere $B(x, \sigma)$. We assume:

- $F(X)$ and $F'(X)$ are independent and identically distributed given an input $X = x$.
- $\text{Var}[Z_i | F' = f', F = f] \leq \beta$ for all $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}$.

Intuition: The variable Z captures the neighborhood stochastic divergence between predictions of two independently fine-tuned models F and F' . This captures both the difference in predictions and variability around a given point x . The first assumptions ensure that F and F' provide an unbiased estimate of the prediction for x . The assumption on the variance of Z_i indicates that the variance of the stochastic neighborhood divergence within a σ -Ball of a sample between any two models’ predictions is controlled. The parameter β essentially captures the similarity of the models within the local neighborhood of a sample. This concept is also somewhat analogous to the Lipschitz constant of a general function, which bounds how much the function’s output can change relative to changes in its input. However, in this context, the β -bound reflects an average behavior of the models’ predictions within the local neighborhood. It does not strictly enforce a uniform Lipschitz constant, especially considering that transformer models are not typically Lipschitz continuous [Kim et al., 2021].

Theorem 1 (Probabilistic Guarantee on Consistency). *Given a data point x , a random model F' and consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, F')$. Then under Assumption 1, and $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i | F' = f', F = f]| \leq \epsilon'$, a prediction over a broad class of fine-tuned models satisfies:*

$$\Pr(F(x) \geq S_{k,\sigma}(x, F') - \epsilon) \geq 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-k\epsilon^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}\epsilon}\right), \quad (7)$$

for all $\epsilon > 2\epsilon'$, The probability is over the stochastic models F and F' , and the random perturbations X_i ’s are random points sampled independently from a distribution over a hypersphere $B(x, \sigma)$.

Consistency guarantee interpretation. Essentially, our consistency measure $S(x, F')$ provides a probabilistic guarantee that if a sample x has a sufficiently high consistency score with respect to a random model F' , then the prediction of another random model F from the same broad class of fine-tuned models will be at least $S(x, F') - \epsilon$ with high probability. For example, if $S(x, F') = 0.8$, we can be confident that $F(x)$ will be at least $0.8 - \epsilon$ with *high* probability (i.e., prediction will remain on the accepted side). This implies that high consistency scores are indicative of robust predictions across different fine-tuned models. Conversely, a low consistency score does not provide significant information about the prediction’s behavior, as it does not guarantee a lower bound on the prediction. For $F(x) \geq S(x, F') - \epsilon$ to hold with high probability, a large k is needed, ideally $k \gg \beta$. This implies that when β is large then more samples are needed. The complete proof of Theorem 1 is provided in Appendix B. Here, we include a proof sketch.

Proof Sketch: From Assumption 1, F and F' are identically distributed given X_i , hence $\mathbb{E}[F'(X_i)|X_i] = \mathbb{E}[F(X_i)|X_i]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|F'(X_i) - F'(x)||X_i] = \mathbb{E}[|F(X_i) - F(x)||X_i]$. The terms in $\mathbb{E}[Z]$ cancel each other out, resulting in $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$.

The next step of the proof leverages the Bernstein’s inequality (see Lemma 2) to provide a bound on the stochastic neighborhood divergence (see Lemma 1).

Lemma 1 (Neighborhood Divergence Bound). *Given the neighborhood discrepancy $Z = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F'(X_i) - F(X_i))$, under Assumption 1, for any $\tilde{\epsilon} > \epsilon' > 0$, we have:*

$$\Pr(Z \geq \epsilon' + \tilde{\epsilon}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-k(\tilde{\epsilon} + \epsilon')^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}(\tilde{\epsilon} + \epsilon')}\right). \quad (8)$$

Lemma 2 (Bernstein Inequality). *For a given random variable X_i such that $\Pr(|X_i| \leq c) = 1$, and $\beta = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Var}[X_i]$ then, for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k X_i - \mathbb{E}(X_i)\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-k\epsilon^2}{2\beta + \frac{2c\epsilon}{3}}\right), \quad (9)$$

See Sridharan [2002] for detailed proof of Bernstein’s Inequality. The final steps of the proof leverages the reverse triangle inequality so show: $F(x) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F(X_i) - |F(X_i) - F(x)|)$. Combining that along with Lemma 1 derives our consistency measure and guarantees. \square

Properties of consistency. While our measure was theoretically motivated, it also exhibits intuitive properties. Our consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ leverages the model’s predictions within a local neighborhood around an input in the embedding space. It considers two key factors: (i) the average prediction across k samples drawn from a σ -Ball around x , and (ii) the absolute variability of these predictions measured by $|f(x) - f(x_i)|$. A high $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ score indicates the model makes consistent predictions with low variability in x ’s local neighborhood, hence predictions are more robust to minor perturbations. Conversely, a low score implies the prediction is sensitive to local variations and hence less reliable under model updates. The idea is that sampling informs the behaviour of the model in a local neighborhood. By leveraging the average predictions and their variability, consistency is more comprehensive than solely using prediction probabilities, which may not capture local consistencies.

4 Empirical Validation

In this section, we experiment across different datasets to (i) quantify the prevalence of fine-tuning multiplicity in Tabular LLMs, and (ii) validate the effectiveness of our proposed measure in quantifying the consistency of predictions over a broad range of fine-tuned models.

Datasets and Serialization. Our experiments utilize the Diabetes [Kahn], German Credit [Hofmann, 1994], and Adult datasets [Becker and Kohavi, 1996], serialized using the “Text Template” method [Hegselmann et al., 2023, Dinh et al., 2022] where each tabular entry is converted into a natural language format by stating “The *<column name>* is *<value>*.” This approach helps align the inputs with the training distribution of LLMs, enhancing their performance in both zero-shot and few-shot scenarios.

Table 1: Evaluated Multiplicity for Different Datasets and Number of Shots. Evaluated on 40 fine-tuned models on T-Few recipe using different random seeds. Multiplicity observed in predictions across different fine-tuned model, even when models exhibit similar accuracy (in this setting $\delta = 0.02$). Fine-tuning using LORA achieves results in the same ballpark (see LORA Table 3 in Appendix C)

Dataset	No. Shots	Multiplicity Evaluation Metrics					
		Arbitrariness	Discrepancy	Avg. Pairwise Disagreement	Avg. Pred. Variance	Avg. Pred. Range	Avg. Model Accuracy
Adult	64	10%	9%	7%	0.01	0.10	83%
	128	10%	7%	8%	0.01	0.10	84%
	512	11%	8%	7%	0.01	0.12	85%
German	64	18%	10%	6%	0.01	0.20	71%
	128	17%	11%	6%	0.01	0.16	71%
	512	23%	12%	7%	0.02	0.23	72%
Diabetes	64	29%	18%	10%	0.04	0.31	71%
	128	13%	17%	11%	0.03	0.13	72%
	512	16%	16%	10%	0.02	0.18	78%

Models and Fine-tuning Methods. We utilize the BigScience T0 encoder-decoder model as our pretrained LLM for tabular tasks [Sanh et al., 2021]. This model was trained across a diverse array of task-specific prompts incorporating numerous datasets, making it well-suited for our experiments in the few-shot settings. For fine-tuning, we adopt the T-Few recipe [Liu et al., 2022], known for its performance in few-shot settings, and LORA [Hu et al., 2021], a parameter-efficient method that constrains weight matrix updates to be low-rank. Detailed setup can be found in Appendix C

Evaluating Extent of Fine-tuning Multiplicity. We measure the extent of fine-tuning multiplicity across the various datasets and fine-tuning methods, we use the following multiplicity evaluation metrics (introduced in Section 2): (1) Arbitrariness- extent of conflicting predictions across fine-tuned models (see Definition 1), (2) Discrepancy- the maximum proportion of conflicting predictions between the baseline classifier and any competing model (see Definition 2), (3) Average Pairwise Disagreement- the proportion of instances where pairs of models disagree (see Definition 3), (4) Average Prediction Variance- variability of model outputs over different fine-tuned models averaged over a set of inputs (see Definition 4), and (5) Average Prediction Range- range of model outputs over different fine-tuned models averaged over a set of test inputs (see Definition 5). To evaluate these multiplicity metrics across our datasets, we fine-tune 40 models on Tfew recipe and LORA using different random seeds and test on a sample set. Our results for Tfew are summarized in Table 1. See Table 3 in Appendix C for fine-tuning using LORA.

Comparing Consistency Measure to Evaluated Multiplicity. We compare our measure of consistency $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ (measured on just one model) with the prediction probability $f(x)$ in informing the multiplicity (evaluated on several trained models). This comparison is made using the Spearman correlation coefficient (see Definition 7), a nonparametric measure that evaluates the rank correlation between two variables. Specifically, we calculate the Spearman correlation between the consistency $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ and the multiplicity, e.g., Prediction Variance ($PV(x)$) across all test samples. This analysis provides insights into consistency’s utility in indicating the presence of fine-tuning multiplicity. In Figure 2, we visually illustrate the evaluated multiplicity versus our consistency measure for the 128-shot setting on the Adult dataset (see Figure 3 and Figure 4 in Appendix C for Diabetes and German Credit datasets). In Table 4, we report the absolute Spearman correlation between the consistency measure and the various multiplicity evaluation metrics for 128 shots on the Adult, German Credit, and Diabetes datasets. See detailed Table with 64 and 512 shot cases in Appendix C.

Hyperparameter Selection. Based on our theoretical guarantees, choosing a larger k is advantageous as it ensures the guarantee holds with high probability k . However, this increases the computational cost of model inference (forward pass). In our experiments, we used $k = 30$, the maximum number that fits in one inference pass through the GPU, yielding good results. For σ , we sampled points from a truncated Gaussian distribution with a variance of 0.01. This choice performed well across all our experiments. To guide the choice of σ , one could consider the spread of training samples. The choice of δ in the competing set \mathcal{F}_δ is application-dependent. For our experiments, we use $\delta = 0.02$, which corresponds to a 2% margin of accuracy deviation. Evaluating multiplicity by refining several models is computationally expensive, which motivated this work. Ideally, sampling more models provides a better evaluation of multiplicity. However, due to computational constraints, we used 40 models.




Figure 2: Evaluated multiplicity (assessed on 40 retrained models) versus our consistency measure (evaluated on one model) for the 128-shot setting on the Adult dataset. The plots demonstrate that high consistency values correspond to low multiplicity across various multiplicity evaluation metrics. Also, observe that high predicted probability values (i.e., high prediction confidence) does not imply low multiplicity. Our consistency measure provides better insight into the multiplicity of predictions compared to the predicted probabilities alone. See Appendix C for visualizations on other Datasets.

Table 2: This table reports the absolute Spearman correlation between the consistency measure and various multiplicity evaluation metrics for 128 shots on the Adult, German Credit, and Diabetes datasets. In most cases, the consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ shows a higher correlation with these multiplicity measures compared to predicted probabilities, indicating that the consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ better informs about the multiplicity than predicted probabilities $f(x)$ do. See full Table with 64 and 512 shot cases in Appendix C.

Dataset	Number of Shots	Measure	Arbitrariness	Pairwise Disagreement	Prediction Variance	Prediction Range
Adult	128	Consistency	0.80	0.96	0.84	0.91
		Pred. Prob.	0.67	0.62	0.30	0.54
German	128	Consistency	0.54	0.54	0.87	0.87
		Pred. Prob.	0.57	0.57	0.86	0.86
Diabetes	128	Consistency	0.92	0.95	0.93	0.95
		Pred. Prob.	0.88	0.93	0.93	0.95

5 Discussions

Our multiplicity evaluation metrics, summarized in Table 1, reveal significant variability in model predictions across different fine-tuned variants, even when they exhibit similar accuracy. This multiplicity is not captured by merely examining predicted probabilities, as predictions with high confidence can still be susceptible to multiplicity (see Figure 2). Our consistency measure, $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$, was compared with prediction probabilities $f(x)$. The results, presented in Table 4, demonstrate that our consistency measure consistently shows mainly higher correlation with multiplicity metrics across the datasets compared to prediction probabilities. This indicates that $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ is more informative than the predictive probabilities at informing the multiplicity.

Marx et al. [2020] argue for the necessity of measuring and reporting multiplicity to better inform predictions. Traditional methods to measure multiplicity in classical ML are impractical for LLMs due to the computational challenge of retraining several fine-tuned models [Marx et al., 2020, Hsu and Calmon, 2022, Watson-Daniels et al., 2023]. Our proposed measure, which requires only the given model and leverages the embedding space to inform multiplicity, addresses this issue. This approach reduces the complexity from retraining and inference to just inference, making it more feasible to apply in practice. Although, from our theoretical guarantee, a large k (number of sampled points) might be needed for accurate consistency estimation (particularly when β is large), it remains computationally more efficient than retraining multiple models. Our work provides practitioners with meaningful information about the multiplicity of predictions, which may lead them to carefully evaluate which predictions to trust and which to treat with caution. Our research has significant implications in several high-stakes applications, e.g., hiring, finance, education, etc., where inconsistent predictions can lead to distrust. A limitation of our work is that while we inform about fine-tuning multiplicity for a given sample, we do not resolve it. Future work could focus on developing methods to mitigate fine-tuning multiplicity, ensuring more consistent model predictions.

Acknowledgements

This paper was prepared for informational purposes in part by the CDAO group of JPMorgan Chase & Co and its affiliates (“J.P. Morgan”) and is not a product of the Research Department of J.P. Morgan. J.P. Morgan makes no representation and warranty whatsoever and disclaims all liability, for the completeness, accuracy or reliability of the information contained herein. This document is not intended as investment research or investment advice, or a recommendation, offer or solicitation for the purchase or sale of any security, financial instrument, financial product or service, or to be used in any way for evaluating the merits of participating in any transaction, and shall not constitute a solicitation under any jurisdiction or to any person, if such solicitation under such jurisdiction or to such person would be unlawful.

References

- Barry Becker and Ronny Kohavi. Adult. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20>.
- Dimitris Bertsimas, Kimberly Villalobos Carballo, Yu Ma, Liangyuan Na, Léonard Boussioux, Cynthia Zeng, Luis R Soenksen, and Ignacio Fuentes. Tabtext: a systematic approach to aggregate knowledge across tabular data structures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10381*, 2022.
- Emily Black, Zifan Wang, Matt Fredrikson, and Anupam Datta. Consistent counterfactuals for deep models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03109*, 2021.
- Emily Black, Manish Raghavan, and Solon Barocas. Model multiplicity: Opportunities, concerns, and solutions. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 850–863, 2022.
- Vadim Borisov, Kathrin Seßler, Tobias Leemann, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Language models are realistic tabular data generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06280*, 2022.
- Leo Breiman. Statistical modeling: The two cultures. *Quality control and applied statistics*, 48(1): 81–82, 2003.
- Zekai Chen, Mariann Micsinai Balan, and Kevin Brown. Language models are few-shot learners for prognostic prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12692*, 2023.
- Amanda Coston, Ashesh Rambachan, and Alexandra Chouldechova. Characterizing fairness over the set of good models under selective labels. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2144–2155. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/coston21a.html>.
- Kathleen Creel and Deborah Hellman. The algorithmic leviathan: Arbitrariness, fairness, and opportunity in algorithmic decision-making systems. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 52(1): 26–43, 2022.
- Tuan Dinh, Yuchen Zeng, Ruisu Zhang, Ziqian Lin, Michael Gira, Shashank Rajput, Jy-yong Sohn, Dimitris Papailiopoulos, and Kangwook Lee. Lift: Language-interfaced fine-tuning for non-language machine learning tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 11763–11784, 2022.
- Sanghamitra Dutta, Jason Long, Saumitra Mishra, Cecilia Tilli, and Daniele Magazzeni. Robust counterfactual explanations for tree-based ensembles. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5742–5756. PMLR, 2022.
- Xi Fang, Weijie Xu, Fiona Anting Tan, Jiani Zhang, Ziqing Hu, Yanjun Qi, Scott Nickleach, Diego Socolinsky, Srinivasan Sengamedu, and Christos Faloutsos. Large language models (llms) on tabular data: Prediction, generation, and understanding—a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17944*, 2024.

- Aaron Fisher, Cynthia Rudin, and Francesca Dominici. All models are wrong, but many are useful: Learning a variable’s importance by studying an entire class of prediction models simultaneously. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(177):1–81, 2019.
- Juan Felipe Gomez, Caio Vieira Machado, Lucas Monteiro Paes, and Flavio P Calmon. Algorithmic arbitrariness in content moderation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16979*, 2024.
- Faisal Hamman, Erfan Noorani, Saumitra Mishra, Daniele Magazzeni, and Sanghamitra Dutta. Robust counterfactual explanations for neural networks with probabilistic guarantees. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12351–12367. PMLR, 2023.
- Stefan Hegselmann, Alejandro Buendia, Hunter Lang, Monica Agrawal, Xiaoyi Jiang, and David Sontag. Tablm: Few-shot classification of tabular data with large language models. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5549–5581. PMLR, 2023.
- Hans Hofmann. Statlog (German Credit Data). UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1994. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5NC77>.
- Hsiang Hsu and Flavio Calmon. Rashomon capacity: A metric for predictive multiplicity in classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:28988–29000, 2022.
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- Sukriti Jaitly, Tanay Shah, Ashish Shugani, and Razik Singh Grewal. Towards better serialization of tabular data for few-shot classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12464*, 2023.
- Michael Kahn. Diabetes. UCI Machine Learning Repository. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5T59G>.
- Hyunjik Kim, George Papamakarios, and Andriy Mnih. The lipschitz constant of self-attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5562–5571. PMLR, 2021.
- Yubin Kim, Xuhai Xu, Daniel McDuff, Cynthia Breazeal, and Hae Won Park. Health-llm: Large language models for health prediction via wearable sensor data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06866*, 2024.
- Xiangyang Li, Bo Chen, Lu Hou, and Ruiming Tang. Ctrl: Connect tabular and language model for ctr prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02841*, 2023.
- Yuliang Li, Jinfeng Li, Yoshihiko Suhara, AnHai Doan, and Wang-Chiew Tan. Deep entity matching with pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00584*, 2020.
- Haokun Liu, Derek Tam, Mohammed Muqeeth, Jay Mohta, Tenghao Huang, Mohit Bansal, and Colin A Raffel. Few-shot parameter-efficient fine-tuning is better and cheaper than in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:1950–1965, 2022.
- Charles Marx, Flavio Calmon, and Berk Ustun. Predictive multiplicity in classification. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6765–6774. PMLR, 2020.
- Avanika Narayan, Ines Chami, Laurel Orr, Simran Arora, and Christopher Ré. Can foundation models wrangle your data? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.09911*, 2022.
- Soma Onishi, Kenta Oono, and Kohei Hayashi. Tabret: Pre-training transformer-based tabular models for unseen columns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15747*, 2023.
- Martin Pawelczyk, Klaus Broelemann, and Gjergji Kasneci. On counterfactual explanations under predictive multiplicity. In *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 809–818. PMLR, 2020.
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*, 2021.

- Kacper Sokol, Meelis Kull, Jeffrey Chan, and Flora Dilys Salim. Fairness and ethics under model multiplicity in machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07139*, 2022.
- Kacper Sokol, Meelis Kull, Jeffrey Chan, and Flora Dilys Salim. Cross-model fairness: Empirical study of fairness and ethics under model multiplicity, 2023.
- Karthik Sridharan. A gentle introduction to concentration inequalities. *Dept. Comput. Sci., Cornell Univ., Tech. Rep*, 2002.
- Yuan Sui, Mengyu Zhou, Mingjie Zhou, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. Table meets llm: Can large language models understand structured table data? a benchmark and empirical study. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 645–654, 2024.
- Voigt. The eu general data protection regulation (gdpr). *A Practical Guide, 1st Ed., Cham: Springer International Publishing*, 10(3152676):10–5555, 2017.
- Ruiyu Wang, Zifeng Wang, and Jimeng Sun. Unipredict: Large language models are universal tabular predictors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03266*, 2023.
- Zifeng Wang, Chufan Gao, Cao Xiao, and Jimeng Sun. Meditab: Scaling medical tabular data predictors via data consolidation, enrichment, and refinement, 2024.
- Jamelle Watson-Daniels, David C. Parkes, and Berk Ustun. Predictive multiplicity in probabilistic classification, 2023.
- Tongtong Wu, Linhao Luo, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, Thuy-Trang Vu, and Gholamreza Haffari. Continual learning for large language models: A survey, 2024.
- Rui Xin, Chudi Zhong, Zhi Chen, Takuya Takagi, Margo Seltzer, and Cynthia Rudin. Exploring the whole rashomon set of sparse decision trees. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:14071–14084, 2022.
- Jiahuan Yan, Bo Zheng, Hongxia Xu, Yiheng Zhu, Danny Chen, Jimeng Sun, Jian Wu, and Jintai Chen. Making pre-trained language models great on tabular prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01841*, 2024.
- Yazheng Yang, Yuqi Wang, Sankalok Sen, Lei Li, and Qi Liu. Unleashing the potential of large language models for predictive tabular tasks in data science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20208*, 2024.
- Pengcheng Yin, Graham Neubig, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian Riedel. Tabert: Pretraining for joint understanding of textual and tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08314*, 2020.
- Yuwei Yin, Yazheng Yang, Jian Yang, and Qi Liu. Finpt: Financial risk prediction with profile tuning on pretrained foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00065*, 2023.
- Han Zhang, Xumeng Wen, Shun Zheng, Wei Xu, and Jiang Bian. Towards foundation models for learning on tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07338*, 2023.

A Relevant Definition

Definition 7 (Spearman’s Correlation). *Spearman’s correlation, $\text{Spearman}(X, Y)$, measures the strength and direction of the monotonic relationship between two ranked variables. It is calculated as the Pearson correlation coefficient between the ranked variables.*

For n pairs of observations (X_i, Y_i) , Spearman’s rank correlation is given by:

$$\text{Spearman}(X, Y) = 1 - \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^n d_i^2}{n(n^2 - 1)},$$

where d_i is the difference between the ranks of X_i and Y_i . Alternatively, in terms of covariance:

$$\text{Spearman}(X, Y) = \frac{\text{cov}(\text{rank}(X), \text{rank}(Y))}{\sigma_{\text{rank}(X)} \sigma_{\text{rank}(Y)}},$$

where σ denotes standard deviation. $\text{Spearman}(X, Y)$ ranges from -1 (perfect negative monotonic relationship) to 1 (perfect positive monotonic relationship), with 0 indicating no monotonic relationship.

B Proof of Theoretical Guarantee

Theorem 1 (Probabilistic Guarantee on Consistency). *Given a data point x , a random model F' and consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, F')$. Then under Assumption 1, and $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i | F' = f', F = f]| \leq \epsilon'$, a prediction over a broad class of fine-tuned models satisfies:*

$$\Pr(F(x) \geq S_{k,\sigma}(x, F') - \epsilon) \geq 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-k\epsilon^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}\epsilon}\right), \quad (7)$$

for all $\epsilon > 2\epsilon'$. The probability is over the stochastic models F and F' , and the random perturbations X_i ’s are random points sampled independently from a distribution over a hypersphere $B(x, \sigma)$.

Proof. To prove Theorem 1, we begin with Lemma 1.

Assume the fine-tuned models F belong to a discrete class of random variables. A specific model realization is represented as f_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{F}_\delta|$, with the complete set denoted by $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{|\mathcal{F}|}\}$. Each model f_i is selected with probability p_i , where $\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{F}_\delta|} p_i = 1$.

Lemma 1 (Neighborhood Divergence Bound). *Given the neighborhood discrepancy $Z = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F'(X_i) - F(X_i))$, under Assumption 1, for any $\tilde{\epsilon} > \epsilon' > 0$, we have:*

$$\Pr(Z \geq \epsilon' + \tilde{\epsilon}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-k(\tilde{\epsilon} + \epsilon')^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}(\tilde{\epsilon} + \epsilon')}\right). \quad (8)$$

We show that $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{X_i} \left[\mathbb{E}_{F|X_i} \left[\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F'(X_i) - F(X_i) - |F(X_i) - F(x)| + |F'(X_i) - F'(x)|) \right] \right] \quad (10)$$

$$\stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{X_i} [\mathbb{E}_{F|X_i} [(F'(X_i) - F(X_i) - |F(X_i) - F(x)| + |F'(X_i) - F'(x)|)]] \quad (11)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{X_i} [\mathbb{E}[F'(X_i)|X_i] - \mathbb{E}[F(X_i)|X_i] - \mathbb{E}[|F(X_i) - F(x)||X_i]] \quad (12)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}[|F'(X_i) - F'(x)||X_i]] \quad (13)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{=} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{E}_{X_i} [\mathbb{E}[F(X_i)|X_i] - \mathbb{E}[F(X_i)|X_i] - \mathbb{E}[|F(X_i) - F(x)||X_i]] \quad (14)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}[|F(X_i) - F(x)||X_i]] = 0 \quad (15)$$

Here (a) holds from applying the law of total expectation. (b) Distributing the expectation over the summation. (c) Applying the linearity of expectations inside the inner expectation. (d) From Assumption 1, F and F' are identically distributed given X_i , hence $\mathbb{E}[F'(X_i)|X_i] = \mathbb{E}[F(X_i)|X_i]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|F'(X_i) - F'(x)||X_i] = \mathbb{E}[|F(X_i) - F(x)||X_i]$. The terms cancel each other out, resulting in $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$. The rest of the proof leverages Bernstein's Inequality:

Lemma 2 (Bernstein Inequality). *For a given random variable X_i such that $\Pr(|X_i| \leq c) = 1$, and $\beta = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Var}[X_i]$ then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\Pr\left(\left|\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k X_i - \mathbb{E}(X_i)\right| > \varepsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{-k\varepsilon^2}{2\beta + \frac{2c\varepsilon}{3}}\right), \quad (9)$$

Observe that $|Z_i| = |F'(X_i) - F(X_i) - |F(X_i) - F(x)| + |F'(X_i) - F'(x)|| \leq 2$. Hence, we have:

$$\Pr(|Z - \mathbb{E}[Z|F' = f', F = f]| \geq \tilde{\varepsilon} | F' = f', F = f) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{k\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{2\beta + \frac{4}{3}\tilde{\varepsilon}}\right)$$

where $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Var}[Z_i|F' = f', F = f] \leq \beta$ from Assumption 1.

Given $|\mathbb{E}[Z|F' = f', F = f] - \mathbb{E}[Z]| < \epsilon'$ and $\mathbb{E}[Z] = 0$,

we have $-\epsilon' < \mathbb{E}[Z|F' = f', F = f] < \epsilon' \forall f, f'$. Now observe that:

$$\Pr(Z \geq \epsilon' + \tilde{\varepsilon} | F' = f', F = f) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Pr(Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z|F' = f', F = f] + \tilde{\varepsilon} | F' = f', F = f) \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(\frac{-k\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{2\beta + \frac{4}{3}\tilde{\varepsilon}}\right). \quad (17)$$

Here, (a) holds since $\mathbb{E}[Z|F' = f', F = f] < \epsilon'$. The event on the left is a subset of that on the right. Therefore, the probability of the event $\{Z \geq \epsilon' + \tilde{\varepsilon}\}$ occurring cannot be more than the probability of the event $\{Z \geq \mathbb{E}[Z|F' = f', F = f] + \tilde{\varepsilon}\}$ occurring.

$$\Pr(Z \geq \epsilon' + \tilde{\varepsilon}) \stackrel{(b)}{=} \sum_{i,j} \Pr(Z \geq \epsilon' + \tilde{\varepsilon} | F' = f_i, F = f_j) \Pr(F' = f_i, F = f_j) \quad (18)$$

$$\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \exp\left(\frac{-k\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{2\beta + \frac{4}{3}\tilde{\varepsilon}}\right) \sum_{i,j} \Pr(F' = f_i, F = f_j) \quad (19)$$

$$= \exp\left(\frac{-k\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{2\beta + \frac{4}{3}\tilde{\varepsilon}}\right) \quad (20)$$

$$\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \exp\left(\frac{-k(\tilde{\varepsilon} + \epsilon')^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}(\tilde{\varepsilon} + \epsilon')}\right) \quad (21)$$

Here, (b) holds from the law of total probability. Next, (c) follows from Equation (17). Finally, (d) holds from using the inequality $4\tilde{\varepsilon}^2 > (\tilde{\varepsilon} + \epsilon')^2$ which holds for $\tilde{\varepsilon} > \epsilon' > 0$ at the numerator and $\tilde{\varepsilon} \leq \tilde{\varepsilon} + \epsilon'$ at the denominator. Setting $\epsilon = \tilde{\varepsilon} + \epsilon'$.

We have:

$$\Pr\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k F(X_i) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F'(X_i) - |F'(X_i) - F'(x)| + |F(X_i) - F(x)|) - \epsilon\right) \geq 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-k\epsilon^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}\epsilon}\right). \quad (22)$$

Observe that $F(x) \geq F(x_i) - |F(x_i) - F(x)|$. This is applied directly from the reverse triangle inequality, i.e., for any real numbers a and b , we have: $|a| \geq |b| - |a - b|$.




Figure 3: Evaluated multiplicity (assessed on 40 retrained models) versus our consistency measure (evaluated on one model) for the **512-shot** setting on the **Diabetes dataset**. The plots demonstrate that high consistency values correspond to low multiplicity across various multiplicity evaluation metrics. Predictive probabilities not providing any providing any useful insight about multiplicity.




Figure 4: Evaluated multiplicity (assessed on 40 retrained models) versus our consistency measure (evaluated on one model) for the **512-shot** setting on the **German Credit dataset**. The plots demonstrate that high consistency values correspond to low multiplicity across various multiplicity evaluation metrics. In this setting Prediction probability is performing competitively. But generally consistency measure provides better insight into the multiplicity of predictions compared to the predicted probabilities.

Hence,

$$F(x) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F(X_i) - |F(X_i) - F(x)|) \quad (23)$$

Therefore, plugging (23) into (22), we have:

$$\Pr \left(F(x) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F'(X_i) - |F'(X_i) - F'(x)| + |F(X_i) - F(x)| - |F(X_i) - F(x)| - \epsilon) \right) \quad (24)$$

$$= \Pr \left(F(x) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F'(X_i) - |F'(X_i) - F'(x)|) - \epsilon \right) \geq 1 - \exp \left(\frac{-k\epsilon^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}\epsilon} \right). \quad (25)$$

Given $S_{k,\sigma}(x, F') = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k (F(X_i) - |F'(x) - F'(X_i)|)$, we have:

$$\Pr \left(F(x) \geq S_{k,\sigma}(x, F') - \epsilon \right) \geq 1 - \exp \left(\frac{-k\epsilon^2}{8\beta + \frac{16}{3}\epsilon} \right). \quad (26)$$

□

C Appendix to Experiment Section

C.1 Dataset Details

Adult Dataset The Adult dataset [Becker and Kohavi, 1996], also known as the "Census Income" dataset, is used for predicting whether an individual earns more than \$50,000 annually based on

Table 3: Multiplicity Evaluation Metrics for Different Datasets and Number of Shots. Evaluated on 40 fine-tuned models on LORA using different random seeds. Multiplicity observed in predictions across different fine-tuned model, even when models exhibit similar accuracy (in this setting $\delta = 0.02$).

Dataset	No. Shots	Multiplicity Evaluation Metrics					
		Arbitrariness	Discrepancy	Avg. Pairwise Disagreement	Avg. Pred. Variance	Avg. Pred. Range	Avg. Model Accuracy
Adult	64	11%	6%	9%	0.01	0.11	83%
	128	10%	9%	6%	0.01	0.10	84%
	512	11%	3%	10%	0.01	0.12	85%
German	64	19%	10%	6%	0.04	0.40	70%
	128	17%	11%	6%	0.01	0.16	71%
	512	21%	14%	8%	0.03	0.26	72%
Diabetes	64	20%	13%	11%	0.04	0.21	70%
	128	16%	14%	11%	0.08	0.14	73%
	512	19%	13%	11%	0.04	0.17	76%

various demographic attributes. It consists of 48,842 instances with 14 attributes, including age, work class, education, marital status, occupation, relationship, race, sex, capital gain, capital loss, hours per week, and native country. The dataset is commonly used in classification tasks.

German Credit Dataset The German Credit dataset [Hofmann, 1994] is used for credit risk evaluation. It consists of 1,000 instances with 20 attributes, which include personal information, credit history, and loan attributes. The target variable indicates whether the credit is good or bad. This dataset is often used for binary classification problems and helps in understanding the factors affecting creditworthiness. The dataset is commonly used in classification tasks.

Diabetes Dataset The Diabetes dataset Kahn is used for predicting the onset of diabetes based on diagnostic measurements. It contains 768 instances with 8 attributes, including the number of pregnancies, glucose concentration, blood pressure, skin thickness, insulin level, body mass index (BMI), diabetes pedigree function, and age. The target variable indicates whether the individual has diabetes. The dataset is commonly used in classification tasks.

C.2 Experimental Setup

Our experiments were conducted using the BigScience T0 model fine-tuned on three datasets: German Credit, Diabetes, and Adult Income. We explored the performance and robustness of the fine-tuned models in few-shot scenarios. The number of shots was set to 64, 128, and 512 for each dataset. To evaluate model multiplicity and consistency, we fine-tuned 40 models with different random seeds for each dataset and recorded their predictions. The training process involved setting the batch size to 2. The learning rate was set to 0.003. For each dataset, we determined the number of training steps adaptively based on the number of shots, ensuring sufficient iterations for model convergence. Specifically, for the number of shots-shot setting, the training steps were calculated as $20 \times (\text{number of shots}/\text{batch size})$. All experiments were performed on 2 NVIDIA RTX A4500 GPU, utilizing CUDA for efficient computation. The evaluation of model performance and consistency was conducted at regular intervals, with an evaluation epoch interval set to 30. To ensure reproducibility and robustness of the results, different random seeds were used for each fine-tuning iteration. For fine-tuning with LORA we use a rank of 4.

Table 4: This table reports the Spearman correlation between the consistency measure and various multiplicity evaluation metrics for different numbers of shots on the Adult, German Credit, and Diabetes datasets. In most cases, the consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ shows a higher correlation with these multiplicity measures compared to predicted probabilities, indicating that the consistency measure $S_{k,\sigma}(x, f)$ better informs about the multiplicity than predicted probabilities $f(x)$ do.

Dataset	Number of Shots	Measure	Arbitrariness	Pairwise Disagreement	Prediction Variance	Prediction Range
Adult	64	Consistency	0.95	0.90	0.91	0.89
		Pred. Prob.	0.67	0.66	0.50	0.62
	128	Consistency	0.80	0.96	0.84	0.91
		Pred. Prob.	0.67	0.62	0.30	0.54
	512	Consistency	0.90	0.86	0.93	0.92
		Pred. Prob.	0.70	0.69	0.56	0.72
German Credit	64	Consistency	0.95	0.95	0.98	0.84
		Pred. Prob.	0.99	0.99	0.80	0.79
	128	Consistency	0.54	0.54	0.87	0.87
		Pred. Prob.	0.57	0.57	0.86	0.86
	512	Consistency	0.59	0.60	0.87	0.86
		Pred. Prob.	0.54	0.56	0.83	0.82
Diabetes	64	Consistency	0.45	0.51	0.31	0.23
		Pred. Prob.	0.03	0.38	0.04	0.08
	128	Consistency	0.92	0.95	0.93	0.95
		Pred. Prob.	0.88	0.93	0.93	0.95
	512	Consistency	0.80	0.89	0.74	0.68
		Pred. Prob.	0.21	0.23	0.24	0.30