# **Probabilistic Soundness Guarantees** in LLM Reasoning Chains



Weiqiu You, Anton Xue, Shreya Havaldar, Delip Rao, Helen Jin, Chris Callison-Burch, Eric Wong University of Pennsylvania



### LLMs often make reasoning errors



### ARES excels on long synthetic reasoning



ARES maintains high Macro-F1 on ClaimTrees, even for long chains.

Existing methods struggle to detect ungrounded statements, propagated errors, and invalid derivations.

## **ARES:** Structured error detection with logic



The entailment model autoregressively checks each claim

#### **ClaimTrees: A synthetic reasoning benchmark**

Reasoning Chain			ARES	Entail- Prev	Entail- Base	LLM- Judge
Base 1:	Rule: H3 -> AZ		-	-	-	-
Base 2:	Fact: I have D8		-	-	-	-
			-	-	-	-
Base 9:	Rule: DG -> G8		-	-	-	-
Claim 1: I have D8, I use rule (D8 -> U8) to derive U8			0.96	1.00	1.00	1.00
Claim 6: I have H3, I use rule (H3 > AZ) to derive AZ			0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00
Claim 7: I have AZ, I use rule (AZ -> SG) to derive SG			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20
Claim 8: I have SG, Huse rule (SG -> C6) to derive C6			0.09	1.00	1.00	1.00

Only ARES detects the propagated error: The non-existent rule (AZ -> SG) cannot be used!

### **ARES** also wins on real benchmarks



### Statistical guarantees on reasoning



Entailment models are **probabilistic**: each step's soundness estimated by probabilistically including previous claims by their soundness rates.

**Theorem.** With  $N \ge \log(2m/\delta)/(2\varepsilon^2)$  samples, the soundness rate for *m* claims is estimated to  $\pm \epsilon$  error with 1 -  $\delta$  confidence.

Method	Robust	Causal	Sufficient
ARES (ours)	$\checkmark$	✓	
Entail-Prev	×		
Entail-Raw			×
LLM-Judge	×	×	

*Robust: Previous errors do not adversely affect current step. Causal: Downstream steps do not affect current step.* Sufficient: All relevant claims included as premise for detection.





# Why is ARES so effective?