

Counterfactual-Consistency Prompting for Relative Temporal Understanding in Large Language Models

Anonymous ACL submission

Abstract

Despite the advanced capabilities of large language models (LLMs), their temporal reasoning ability remains underdeveloped. Prior works have highlighted this limitation, particularly in maintaining temporal consistency when understanding events. For example, models often confuse mutually exclusive temporal relations like “before” and “after” between events and make inconsistent predictions. In this work, we tackle the issue of temporal inconsistency in LLMs by proposing a novel counterfactual prompting approach. Our method generates counterfactual questions and enforces collective constraints, enhancing the model’s consistency. We evaluate our method on multiple datasets, demonstrating significant improvements in event ordering for explicit and implicit events and temporal commonsense understanding by effectively addressing temporal inconsistencies.

1 Introduction

Despite the impressive capabilities of LLMs, a line of research (Jain et al., 2023; Chu et al., 2023) has highlighted that these models often lack temporal reasoning abilities. This is especially true for *relative* event understanding, where the goal is to infer temporal relationships between events or properties within an event in the passage, without depending on *absolute* time indicators (e.g., specific dates).

The primary challenge is that LLMs lack *temporal consistency* in their responses (Qiu et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). Temporal consistency is defined as the model’s ability to ensure that conflicting timelines do not co-exist. For instance in Figure 1-(a), if the model is temporally inconsistent, mutually exclusive temporal relations like “before” and “after” are sometimes confused when ordering events, leading to contradictory predictions—such as stating that Event A happens both before and after Event B in the same context.




Figure 1: Example of leveraging counterfactual questions to resolve temporal inconsistency in LLMs.

While events with time indicators are often addressed with mathematical reasoning (Zhu et al., 2023; Su et al., 2024), no existing work has successfully tackled the challenge of temporal inconsistency in the events’ relative understanding without requiring explicit time markers. Chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning (Wei et al., 2022), which primarily aids mathematical and symbolic reasoning (Sprague et al., 2024), is also reported to fail to solve such inconsistency (Qiu et al., 2024). Considering temporal consistency is fundamental in temporal reasoning, its absence in LLM can undermine key tasks like planning (Sakaguchi et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2024). These observations highlight the need for alternative reasoning skills to achieve temporal consistency.

This study answers the following research question: **Can we prompt LLMs to elicit the ability to mitigate temporal inconsistency?** Inspired by counterfactual augmentation, where models are exposed with lexically similar, but typically label-flipping pairs in training (Kaushik et al., 2020), we

extend it to LLMs to generate *temporally counterfactual questions*: We introduce lexically small interventions to the original input (e.g. before to after, years to centuries) that drastically affect its temporal semantics. By providing these questions and self-generated answers alongside the original input, the model would rely less on lexical similarities and better understand the semantics.

To this end, we propose a novel counterfactual-consistency prompting (CCP), designed to enhance the temporal consistency of LLMs, as described in Figure 1-(b). CCP first generates temporal counterfactual exemplars and then applies the insights gained to address the original temporal question. This method is particularly effective in relative event understanding because the counterfactual exemplars not only encourage the model to understand different temporal semantics but also directly impose temporal constraints. For instance, if the model states that “Event A happens after Event B” and also recognizes that “Event A happens before Event B”, the conflict forces the model to collectively re-weight the validity of these two statements.

We show performance gain of CCP across multiple relative event understanding tasks. Our effectiveness in mitigating temporal inconsistencies is further demonstrated by our inconsistency metric.

2 Method

Our idea is to make the model approximate the *temporal constraints* using counterfactuals. Because temporal reasoning imposes unique interdependencies, where one temporal aspect affects another (Han et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2024), counterfactuals enable us to capture these constraints. For example, if the model establishes from a counterfactual exemplar that “Event e_1 happens [r_2 : before] Event e_2 ”, it is constrained to predict the original question that “Event e_1 cannot happen [r_1 : after] Event e_2 ”:

$$r_2(e_1, e_2) \in \mathcal{V} \implies r_1(e_1, e_2) \notin \mathcal{V} \quad (1)$$

where $r(e_a, e_b)$ represents the temporal relation r between events e_a and e_b , and \mathcal{V} represents the set of coherent temporal relations with the context.

2.1 Generating Temporally Counterfactual Questions

Given a context C , our task is to provide an accurate answer to question Q while maintaining tem-

poral consistency. We start by creating *temporally counterfactual questions*, $Q^{c_1} \dots Q^{c_i}$.

Counterfactual augmentation conventionally aims to generate instances with lexically minimal edits while keeping others unchanged (Huang et al., 2019; Kaushik et al., 2020; Wang and Culotta, 2020). This strategy discourages models from relying too much on superficial similarity. However, previous works (Kaushik et al., 2020) require arbitrary label-flipping edits, which are unsuitable for LLM inference with unknown test labels.

In contrast, we focus on *temporally counterfactual questions* that specifically edit the temporal semantics of the original sentence. Our approach ensures that the model adheres to the “temporal constraints”, yet retains the effect of label-flipping that emphasizes temporal cues over superficial similarity.

Specifically, we set the types of counterfactual questions based on the temporal semantics each dataset aims to capture. The types of temporal counterfactuals are listed in Table 1. For sentences representing temporal relation between two events ($r_1(e_1, e_2)$), we substitute the relation r_1 to r_2 , or event e_2 to e_3 . For those representing an event’s temporal properties ($r_1(e_1)$) such as duration or stationarity, we substitute the property to r_2 or negate it to $\neg r_1$.

To generate counterfactual questions, we design our model to dynamically create them rather than rely on a predefined rule-based template. While rule-based approaches like Chen et al. (2024) in logical reasoning constrain answers using a predefined question set, they limit flexibility to cover the broad range of temporal expressions. By comparison, our dynamic generation of constraints provides a more adaptable solution. We specify various counterfactual types through in-context learning (ICL) to control the relevance of these generated questions. The full prompts are in Appendix G.1.

2.2 Counterfactual-Consistency Prompting

After generating the counterfactual questions, we prompt the model again to produce predictions for counterfactual Y^{c_1}, \dots, Y^{c_n} . However, there is a risk when LLMs may fail to answer the counterfactual questions correctly. In this case, their direct use propagates errors to the original question.

As a proxy for determining whether the generated prediction can be trusted, existing works aggregate multiple predictions of the same ques-

Dataset	Relation	Revision Type	Example
TempEvalBi-QA & TRACIE	$r_1(e_1, e_2)$	Original	They got married after they moved to Maine.
	$r_2(e_1, e_2)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	They got married before they moved to Maine.
MCTACO: Ordering	$r_1(e_1, e_2)$	Original	They went to the store after they were put in jail.
	$r_1(e_1, e_3)$	$e_2 \rightarrow e_3$	They repented after they were put in jail.
MCTACO: Duration, Frequency, Typical Time	$r_1(e_1)$	Original	It has existed for 1 year .
	$r_2(e_1)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	It has existed for centuries .
MCTACO: Stationarity	$r_1(e_1)$	Original	She is still in Ranchipur.
	$\neg r_1(e_1)$	$r_1 \rightarrow \neg r_2$	She is not in Ranchipur.

Table 1: Types of counterfactuals targeted for generation. The examples illustrate how counterfactual questions modify the semantics regarding temporal aspects (r_1, r_2) including relations and properties, for events (e_1, e_2, e_3).

tion (Wang et al., 2023; Du et al., 2024). Formally, the refined prediction Y is derived by re-weighting the probability distribution P of previous predictions Y_1, \dots, Y_n from the same question as: $P(Y) = f(P(Y_1), \dots, P(Y_n))$ where f is an aggregation function such as majority voting or LLM itself. Though, they can lead to errors as they solely rely on feedback from a single question.

Our distinction is to aggregate predictions from both the original and counterfactual questions. We design the model to re-weight the counterfactual answer distributions across the questions.

$$P(Y) = f(P(Q, Y), P(Q^{c_1}, Y^{c_1}), \dots, P(Q^{c_n}, Y^{c_n})) \quad (2)$$

For instance, even if the model wrongly predicts the relation as ‘after’ in a counterfactual, collectively considering the possibility of the relation ‘before’ can re-weight the effect of the constraint. The prompts are provided in Appendix G.2.

This re-evaluation approach improves robustness against potential errors in generated answers. The second analysis in Subsection 3.5 shows such self-correction outperforms a baseline directly leveraging counterfactuals without aggregation.

3 Experiments

3.1 Datasets

Among publicly available datasets, we selected three based on two criteria: (1) the task focuses on relative event understanding without absolute time indicators, and (2) the temporal inconsistency on the dataset can be evaluated.

TempEvalQA-Bi (Qiu et al., 2024) involves ordering two explicit events in time, assessing temporal consistency in mutually exclusive question pairs. **TRACIE** (Zhou et al., 2021) expands the event ordering to implicit events, testing if the hypothesis logically follows the story. We finally added **MCTACO** (Zhou et al., 2019) considering the diverse event-related temporal properties. The dataset covers broader aspects like event duration

or frequency. We modified the multiple-choice setting of MCTACO into a binary question-answering task for consistency evaluation, presenting each answer candidate separately to determine if it fits the context. Dataset statistics and examples are in Appendix A.

3.2 Metrics

Along with accuracy (ACC) and F1 scores to assess overall performance, we introduce the inconsistency metric (INC) as a main evaluation measure for temporal inconsistency. We define the INC as the percentage of inconsistent predictions. An inconsistency is counted when at least one incorrect answer is found within a group of minimally dissimilar questions with slight modifications in their temporal semantics, while all other aspects remain unchanged.

TempEvalQA-Bi directly provides this metric. For TRACIE, we manually group questions that are counterfactual to each other. We adapt INC in MCTACO by grouping original multiple-choice candidates by question.

3.3 Evaluation Settings and Baselines

For models, we used open-source LLM **Llama-3 8B** and **70B** (AI@Meta, 2024), and API-based LLM **GPT-4o-mini** and **GPT-4o** (OpenAI et al., 2024).

For baselines, we first compare CCP with standard prompting (**SP**) that directly answers the question without intermediate steps, and **CoT**, which incorporates step-by-step reasoning to derive the answer. Next, we consider methods that aggregate multiple predictions of the same question. **Self-Consistency** (Wang et al., 2023) predicts one question multiple times and performs majority voting. **Self-Reflect** methods (Madaan et al., 2024; Shinn et al., 2024) iteratively refine own predictions. Multi-agent **Debate** (Du et al., 2024) leverages both majority vote and reflection. We employ a 3-shot setting across all configurations. More

		TempevalQA-Bi			TRACIE			MCTACO		
		ACC	F1	INC (↓)	ACC	F1	INC (↓)	ACC	F1	INC (↓)
Llama -3-8B	SP	65.4	63	57.6	57.4	66.9	75.2	77.7	69.4	59.8
	CoT	69.6	70.6	50	63	64.9	56	77.6	69.8	63.4
	Consistency	70.8	71.2	49.6	64.9	67.3	57.8	77.5	69.0	61.1
	Reflection	63.6	63.9	44.6	62.5	55.7	55.5	77.4	69.7	76.4
	Debate	67.6	65.2	52.2	63.6	66	53.2	37.4	31.6	88.1
	CCP	75.9	75.2	32.7	68.8	70.4	39.8	78.7	81.7	57.7

Table 2: Performance comparison on the test set of relative event understanding tasks. Other models are in Table 5.

details on evaluation settings are in Appendix B.

3.4 Main results

Table 2 highlights the performance of our method compared to baseline methods on relative event understanding tasks. Compared to SP, the CoT baseline is not usually effective and often worsens performance. Advanced baselines, Consistency, Reflect, and Debate, also fail to consistently reduce inconsistencies or achieve competitive accuracy. In contrast, CCP steadily outperforms these baselines, significantly reducing temporal inconsistencies across all datasets and achieving notable improvements in ACC and F1 scores. The full results on other models are available in Table 5.

3.5 Analysis

Creating counterfactual questions by generation handles diverse temporal aspects. We compared our generative setting with the **Retrieved Questions (Ret.Q)** approach, where counterfactual questions were retrieved from other questions within the same question group. We evaluated the methods on MCTACO, which covers various aspects of event reasoning.

Figure 2 shows that generating counterfactual questions proved more effective for all temporal types. These results suggest that our method performs better in event understanding with diverse relations, where the dataset cannot often provide high-quality counterfactual questions. Notably, CCP outperforms the Ret.Q baseline even though our method may produce incorrect questions. Also, CCP is more practical since Ret.Q assumes the questions in the test set are observed.

CCP is robust against wrong counterfactual exemplars. We conducted a comparative analysis of two methods: **Direct Answering (Dir.A)**, which involves answering directly from counterfactual exemplars, versus CCP which leverages the aggregation step to re-evaluate them. We conducted experiments on TempEvalQA-Bi and TRACIE, where




Figure 2: Comparison between counterfactual example collection methods on MCTACO with Llama-3-8B.




Figure 3: Comparison between different counterfactual leveraging methods with the Llama-3-8B model.

before-after relations ensure that identifying a counterfactual answer is sufficient to determine the original. We excluded MCTACO since its counterfactual answers do not always determine the validity of the original answer. In the Dir.A implementation, the answer to the counterfactual question is flipped and directly used as the response to the original question. The results in Figure 3 demonstrate that CCP consistently outperforms Dir.A, supporting our robustness by the collective evaluation.

4 Conclusion

We targeted the temporal inconsistency in relative event understanding with LLMs by proposing a prompting approach using counterfactual questions. This encourages the model to focus more on the temporal aspects and collectively evaluate its answer with imposed constraints. Experiments with the INC metric show that our approach mitigates inconsistency and improves overall performance.

5 Limitation

Our method showed limited performance improvement when time indicators, such as specific years (e.g., 1980), are involved in temporal understanding. This is implied from our evaluations on event-time ordering and time-time ordering tasks, as shown in Appendix E.1. The findings suggest that arithmetic reasoning is essential for grounding timelines with absolute time indicators, as emphasized in prior studies (Su et al., 2024; Zhu et al., 2023).

Another limitation is that we focused on point-wise and pairwise event reasoning to highlight the model’s struggles with basic temporal reasoning due to consistency issues. We anticipate future work expanding our approach to more complex list-wise ordering like event schema prediction (Zhang et al., 2024).

Finally, the effectiveness of LLMs can be impacted by the specific wording of prompts (Jiang et al., 2020). For example, Appendix E.2 shows that, although our revised prompts generally yield better results than CoT, CCP experienced a slight decrease in performance.

References

AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).

Meiqi Chen, Yubo Ma, Kaitao Song, Yixin Cao, Yan Zhang, and Dongsheng Li. 2024. Improving large language models in event relation logical prediction. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9451–9478.

Wenhu Chen, Xinyi Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2021. A dataset for answering time-sensitive questions. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*.

Zheng Chu, Jingchang Chen, Qianglong Chen, Weijiang Yu, Haotian Wang, Ming Liu, and Bing Qin. 2023. Timebench: A comprehensive evaluation of temporal reasoning abilities in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17667*.

Yilun Du, Shuang Li, Antonio Torralba, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Igor Mordatch. 2024. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multi-agent debate. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*.

Yi Fang, Moxin Li, Wenjie Wang, Hui Lin, and Fuli Feng. 2024. [Counterfactual debating with preset stances for hallucination elimination of llms](#).

Rujun Han, I-Hung Hsu, Mu Yang, Aram Galstyan, Ralph Weischedel, and Nanyun Peng. 2019. Deep structured neural network for event temporal relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 666–106.

Po-Sen Huang, Huan Zhang, Ray Jiang, Robert Stanforth, Johannes Welbl, Jack Rae, Vishal Maini, Dani Yogatama, and Pushmeet Kohli. 2019. Reducing sentiment bias in language models via counterfactual evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.03064*.

Raghav Jain, Daivik Sojitra, Arkadeep Acharya, Sriparna Saha, Adam Jatowt, and Sandipan Dandapat. 2023. [Do language models have a common sense regarding time? revisiting temporal commonsense reasoning in the era of large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6750–6774, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Jun Araki, and Graham Neubig. 2020. How can we know what language models know? *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:423–438.

Divyansh Kaushik, Eduard Hovy, and Zachary Lipton. 2020. Learning the difference that makes a difference with counterfactually-augmented data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Jongho Kim, Dohyeon Lee, Minsoo Kim, and Seungwon Hwang. 2024. [Chaining event spans for temporal relation grounding](#). In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1689–1700, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.

Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2024. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button,

407	Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany	Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng,	470
408	Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke	Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Fe-	471
409	Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully	lipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya,	472
410	Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben	Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang,	473
411	Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung,	Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei,	474
412	Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai,	CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Ji-	475
413	Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch,	ayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner,	476
414	Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve	Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong,	477
415	Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti,	Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael	478
416	Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix,	Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qim-	479
417	Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Ful-	ing Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong	480
418	ford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik	Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao	481
419	Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-	Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret	482
420	Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott	Zoph. 2024. Gpt-4 technical report .	483
421	Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane		
422	Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris,	Yifu Qiu, Zheng Zhao, Yftah Ziser, Anna Korhonen,	484
423	Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris	Edoardo Ponti, and Shay Cohen. 2024. Are large	485
424	Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele,	language model temporally grounded? In <i>Proceed-</i>	486
425	Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin	<i>ings of the 2024 Conference of the North American</i>	487
426	Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain,	<i>Chapter of the Association for Computational Lin-</i>	488
427	Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun	<i>guistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume</i>	489
428	Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Hee-	<i>1: Long Papers)</i> , pages 7064–7083, Mexico City,	490
429	woo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Ka-	Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.	491
430	mali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar,		
431	Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim,	Keisuke Sakaguchi, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan	492
432	Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirch-	Le Bras, Niket Tandon, Peter Clark, and Yejin Choi.	493
433	ner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo,	2021. proScript: Partially ordered scripts generation .	494
434	Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Kon-	In <i>Findings of the Association for Computational</i>	495
435	stantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal	<i>Linguistics: EMNLP 2021</i> , pages 2138–2149, Punta	496
436	Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan	Caná, Dominican Republic. Association for Compu-	497
437	Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li,	tational Linguistics.	498
438	Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz		
439	Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue,	Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath,	499
440	Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor	Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2024. Re-	500
441	Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie	flexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement	501
442	Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer	learning. <i>Advances in Neural Information Process-</i>	502
443	McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan,	<i>ing Systems</i> , 36.	503
444	Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob		
445	Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela	Zayne Sprague, Fangcong Yin, Juan Diego Rodriguez,	504
446	Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel	Dongwei Jiang, Manya Wadhwa, Prasann Singhal,	505
447	Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David	Xinyu Zhao, Xi Ye, Kyle Mahowald, and Greg Dur-	506
448	Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak,	rett. 2024. To cot or not to cot? chain-of-thought	507
449	Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh,	helps mainly on math and symbolic reasoning. <i>arXiv</i>	508
450	Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex	<i>preprint arXiv:2409.12183</i> .	509
451	Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambat-		
452	tista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex	Romain Storaï and Seung-won Hwang. 2024. Harp:	510
453	Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perel-	Hesitation-aware reframing in transformer inference	511
454	man, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov,	pass .	512
455	Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Poko-		
456	rny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Pow-	Zhaochen Su, Jun Zhang, Tong Zhu, Xiaoye Qu, Juntao	513
457	ell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl,	Li, Min Zhang, and Yu Cheng. 2024. Timo: Towards	514
458	Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh,	better temporal reasoning for language models. <i>arXiv</i>	515
459	Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach,	<i>preprint arXiv:2406.14192</i> .	516
460	Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ry-		
461	der, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar,	Shivin Thukral, Kunal Kukreja, and Christian Kavouras.	517
462	Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John	2021. Probing language models for understanding of	518
463	Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki	temporal expressions. In <i>Proceedings of the Fourth</i>	519
464	Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav	<i>BlackboxNLP Workshop on Analyzing and Interpret-</i>	520
465	Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens,	<i>ing Neural Networks for NLP</i> , pages 396–406.	521
466	Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin		
467	Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Fe-	Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le,	522
468	lipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever,	Ed H Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery,	523
469	Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson,	and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-consistency improves	524
		chain of thought reasoning in language models. In	525
		<i>The Eleventh International Conference on Learning</i>	526
		<i>Representations</i> .	527

Zhao Wang and Aron Culotta. 2020. Identifying spurious correlations for robust text classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 3431–3440.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.

Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. *Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing*. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Liang Yao. 2024. *Large language models are contrastive reasoners*.

Xinliang Frederick Zhang, Nicholas Beauchamp, and Lu Wang. 2024. *Narrative-of-thought: Improving temporal reasoning of large language models via re-counted narratives*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 16507–16530, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ben Zhou, Daniel Khashabi, Qiang Ning, and Dan Roth. 2019. “going on a vacation” takes longer than “going for a walk”: A study of temporal commonsense understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3363–3369.

Ben Zhou, Kyle Richardson, Qiang Ning, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Dan Roth. 2021. Temporal reasoning on implicit events from distant supervision. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1361–1371.

Xinyu Zhu, Cheng Yang, Bei Chen, Siheng Li, Jian-Guang Lou, and Yujiu Yang. 2023. Question answering as programming for solving time-sensitive questions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12775–12790.

Appendices

A Data Summary

Table 3 summarizes the dataset statistics used in this study. The numbers of official test samples are reported. Due to the budget, we evaluated Llama-3-8B on the full test set, GPT-4o-mini and Llama-3-70B on a random sample of up to 2,000 test set instances, and GPT-4o on 1,000 test set instances.

Additionally, the number of temporal relations considered in each dataset is included in Table 3. TempEvalQA-Bi and TRACIE focus mainly on the before-after relation. MCTACO includes diverse temporal relations, and the number of annotated candidates is reported. The questions in MCTACO are categorized into 5 question types, and examples for each type are provided in Figure 4.

	#Test	#Temporal relations
TempEvalQA-Bi	448	2
TRACIE	4248	2
MCTACO	9442	1-19

Table 3: Dataset Statistics. For TempEvalQA-Bi, the numbers represent the total number of questions. For TRACIE, the numbers refer to the number of story-hypothesis pairs. For MCTACO, the numbers reflect question-and-answer candidate pairs.

Table 4 demonstrates counterfactual types and examples addressed across the targeted temporal aspects in our datasets. Among the five temporal aspects in the MCTACO dataset, we generate counterfactuals for duration, frequency, and typical time in the same way by intervening in the temporal property, modifying $r_1(e1)$ to $r_2(e1)$.

B Details of Evaluation Settings

This section outlines the detailed evaluation settings, including hyperparameters, resources, efficiency, and parsing methods. We use greedy decoding for **SP**, **CoT**, and **CCP**. For **Consistency**, **Reflect**, and **Debate**, we adopt the approach from Wang et al. (2023), employing top-k sampling with $k = 40$ and a temperature of 0.5 for the LLaMA model. For GPT-based models, we set the temperature to 0.7. **Consistency** samples 40 outputs from the decoder. **Reflect** refines the output iteratively for two iterations, including the initial output. In **Debate**, three agents engage in a debate over two rounds (Du et al., 2024). The implementations of the latter two baselines (**Reflect**, **Debate**)

Dataset	Relation	Revision Type	Example
TempEvalBi-QA	$r_1(e_1, e_2)$	Original	Did they get married after they moved to Maine?
	$r_2(e_1, e_2)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	Did they get married before they moved to Maine?
TRACIE	$r_1(e_1, e_2)$	Original	Chad found the cap before he got off of the ride.
	$r_2(e_1, e_2)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	Chad found the cap after he got off of the ride.
MCTACO: Duration	$r_1(e_1)$	Original	It has existed for 1 year .
	$r_2(e_1)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	It has existed for centuries .
MCTACO: Frequency	$r_1(e_1)$	Original	It rained a couple of times in the summer.
	$r_2(e_1)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	It rained every month in the summer.
MCTACO: Stationarity	$r_1(e_1)$	Original	She is still in Ranchipur.
	$r_2(e_1)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	She is not in Ranchipur.
MCTACO: Ordering	$r_1(e_1, e_2)$	Original	They went to the store after they were put in jail.
	$r_1(e_1, e_3)$	$e_2 \rightarrow e_3$	They repented after they were put in jail.
MCTACO: Typical Time	$r_1(e_1)$	Original	Durer died 40 years later.
	$r_2(e_1)$	$r_1 \rightarrow r_2$	Durer died 360 years later.

Table 4: The full range of temporal aspects targeted by each dataset and types of counterfactuals addressed by our framework. The examples illustrate how counterfactual questions modify the semantics regarding temporal relations (r_1, r_2) for events (e_1, e_2, e_3).

are based on the GitHub repository¹ from Du et al. (2024). Single-run performances are reported.

We note that our method prompts 3 times: for counterfactual question generation, counterfactual answer generation, and original question’s answer generation, whose efficiency is compatible with or even more efficient than the three baselines. We also note that the Consistency baseline of Llama-3-70B cannot be reported due to its computation inefficiency.

For resources, we used the Transformers library (Wolf et al., 2020) and vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) with 4 RTX A6000 GPUs for Llama-3 models. We used Openai API² for GPT models. For output parsing, the models generate the final answer after the phrase “Final answer:”. Counterfactual exemplars are generated by modifying each dataset’s questions, hypotheses, and candidate answers.

C Details of Main Results

C.1 Full Main Results

Table 5 shows the performance of our method compared with baseline methods on relative event understanding tasks. The results show that our method outperforms the baselines across the board.

C.2 Task generalizability

To demonstrate that our solution extends beyond binary question answering to multiple-choice question answering (MCQA), we evaluated the performance of GPT models using the original MC-

TACO evaluation setting (Zhou et al., 2019). While our primary evaluation decomposed the multiple-choice format into binary questions to measure inconsistency, it can be reconstructed for multiple-choice evaluation. We additionally introduced a baseline for MCQA (MCQA-CoT) that provides the context, question, and all candidate answers, generating one or more correct answers step-by-step. The results in Table 6 indicate that our method (CCP) outperforms the MCQA-CoT baseline on multiple-choice tasks, demonstrating its effectiveness in the MCQA setting.

D Further Analysis

D.1 Generated vs Retrieved Questions

We tested whether our claim in Figure 2 can be generalized to other models. Figure 5 consistently confirms that creating counterfactual questions by generation handles diverse temporal relations better than retrieving questions across different models.

D.2 Number of In-context Learning Examples

Our approach inevitably introduces additional counterfactual examples during in-context learning (ICL), leading to a higher total number of shots compared to the baseline. To ensure a more competitive baseline, we increased the total number of shots in the baseline. In the MCTACO dataset and with the Llama model, we additionally experimented with the 12-shot CoT, which includes 12 passage (P)-question (Q)-candidate (C) pairs, and compared them with our 3-shot. We note that our 3-shot examples include 3 passage-question pairs and 11 candidates.

The results in Table 7 demonstrate that our

¹https://github.com/composable-models/llm_multiagent_debate

²platform.openai.com

		TempevalQA-Bi			TRACIE			MCTACO		
		ACC	F1	INC (\downarrow)	ACC	F1	INC (\downarrow)	ACC	F1	INC (\downarrow)
Llama -3-8B	SP	65.4	63	57.6	57.4	66.9	75.2	77.7	69.4	59.8
	CoT	69.6	70.6	50	63	64.9	56	77.6	69.8	63.4
	Consistency	70.8	71.2	49.6	64.9	67.3	57.8	77.5	69.0	61.1
	Reflection	63.6	63.9	44.6	62.5	55.7	55.5	77.4	69.7	76.4
	Debate	67.6	65.2	52.2	63.6	66	53.2	37.4	31.6	88.1
	CCP	75.9	75.2	32.7	68.8	70.4	39.8	78.7	81.7	57.7
Llama -3-70B	SP	76.6	78.6	39.7	79.9	79.7	29.6	85.2	81.8	43.5
	CoT	80.4	82	31.3	80.1	80	31.8	85.9	82.2	46.9
	Consistency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Reflection	77	77.9	35.3	80	78.3	30.3	80.6	73	56.5
	Debate	81	82.8	32.6	81.6	80.7	25.9	85.3	81.4	45.9
	CCP	87.3	87.9	19.2	86.5	86.1	12.0	89.4	87.6	37.0
GPT-4o -mini	SP	78.8	76.4	36.6	74.6	71.3	38.2	76.0	63.1	65.8
	CoT	81.3	79.9	29	73.2	68.5	42.7	80.9	73.7	58.9
	Consistency	85.5	85.5	21.9	73.6	68.8	42.8	78.9	69.4	60.6
	Reflection	86.8	86.9	22.8	74.4	70.9	39.1	74.8	60.2	68.5
	Debate	86.4	86.4	24.6	73	67.1	44.5	78.3	68.2	61.0
	CCP	88.8	88.7	19.6	82.5	81.2	20.2	87.8	85.8	42.1
GPT-4o	SP	86.4	85.8	20.1	80.1	78.6	27.0	79.7	70.9	60.5
	CoT	90.4	90	17.4	80.2	78.1	32.4	84.4	80	49.7
	Consistency	91.7	91.5	14.7	80.1	77.7	31.4	82.9	77.3	49.7
	Reflection	93.1	93	11.2	82.7	80.9	26.6	80.0	72.2	55.4
	Debate	90.8	90.6	11.2	80.6	77.9	32.8	81.4	74.6	52.2
	CCP	93.8	93.8	8.0	85.8	84.7	17.6	90.4	88.8	35.0

Table 5: The full performance comparison results on the relative event understanding tasks. Our prompting methods, which leverage self-generated exemplars as the temporal constraint, outperform baselines across the board.

Models	Methods	MCTACO	
		EM	F1
GPT-4o -mini	MCQA-CoT	51.7	67.7
	CCP	58.9	78.6
GPT-4o	MCQA-CoT	65.6	73.3
	CCP	66.2	80.2

Table 6: Performance comparison on MCTACO with multiple-choice question answering setting.

	MCTACO				
	#P-Q	#C	ACC	F1	INC
CoT	3	3	77.6	69.8	63.4
CoT	12	12	78.9	72.2	60.0
CCP	3	11	78.7	81.7	57.7
CCP	12	26	85.0	82.2	49.8

Table 7: Performance comparison of Llama-3-8B on MCTACO with the different number of ICL examples.

method significantly outperforms the CoT, even with the increased number of examples in the baseline (INC score: 60.0 for CoT vs. 57.7 for Ours). This indicates that the performance gains are not simply due to the inclusion of more examples but are primarily driven by leveraging temporal constraints through counterfactual questions to enhance reasoning.

Additionally, we tested whether our approach benefits from additional ICL examples. The results in the last row of Table 7 confirm this, showing an improvement in INC score from 57.7 to 49.8, further validating the potential performance gain of our method.

Event Duration
P. However, more recently, it has been suggested that it may date from earlier than Abdalonymus' death. Q. How long has it existed?
(A) 2,000 hours (B) 2,000 years (C) 1 year (D) thousands of years (E) centuries (F) months
Event Frequency
P. Most of us have seen steam rising off a wet road after a summer rainstorm. Q. How often does it rain in the summer?
(A) 333.33 times (B) every other minute (C) a couple times (D) every month (E) once a hour (F) once a year
Stationarity
P. She renews in Ranchipur an acquaintance with a former lover , Tom Ransome , now a dissolute alcoholic. Q. Is she still in Ranchipur?
(A) yes (B) no
Event Ordering
P. Some of the people who took advantage of her through a questionable loan program were sent to jail. Q. What happened after they were put in jail?
(A) they went to the store (B) they repented (C) even some people took these steps
Typical Time
P. Durer's father died in 1502, and his mother died in 1513. Q. When did Durer die?
(A) 40 years later (B) 360 years later (C) 4545 (D) 40 seconds later (E) April 6, 1528

Figure 4: Examples of MCTACO Question Types. MCTACO covers various temporal aspects including event duration, frequency, stationarity, ordering, and typical time.

D.3 Number of Counterfactual Questions

We analyze the impact of varying the number of counterfactual questions on performance by testing with 1, 3, 5, and 7 questions. As shown in Figure 6, performance is highest with a single counterfactual question, with degradation observed as the number increases. The result aligns with findings from prior studies, where incorporating excessive counterfactual or contrastive information in prompts often results in diminished performance (Yao, 2024; Fang et al., 2024; Storaí and Hwang, 2024). For instance, multiple information degrade the performance in arithmetic and symbolic reasoning (Yao, 2024), multi-hop and commonsense question answering (Fang et al., 2024), and speculative decoding (Storaí and Hwang, 2024). These results indicate that such a phenomenon is not specific to




Figure 5: Comparison between counterfactual example collection methods on MCTACO with different models.




Figure 6: Inconsistency changes with the different number of counterfactual questions. The Llama-3-8B model is used.

our method but highlights a broader limitation in LLMs' ability to process multiple counterfactual information effectively.

		TimeQA		TimexNLI	
		ACC	F1	ACC	F1
Llama 3-8B	3 shot	34.3	40.8	68.0	65.3
	CoT 3 shot	32.3	38.4	74.0	73.3
	CCP 3 shot	34	41.5	67.3	62.2
GPT-4o-mini	3 shot	40	52.36	86.4	85.3
	CoT 3 shot	43.3	56.75	90.4	90.3
	CCP 3 shot	41	53.59	90.3	90.0

Table 8: Performance comparison on TimeQA and TimexNLI.

E Details of Limitations

E.1 Tasks with temporal indicators

Table 8 shows the experimental results for the tasks requiring the understanding of temporal indicators. We evaluated our method on TimeQA (Chen et al., 2021), the event-time ordering task, and TimexNLI-T1 (Thukral et al., 2021), the time-time ordering task, where CCP showed limited performance gains.

E.2 Prompt Sensitivity

Our key decision in the prompt design was to separate the counterfactual question generation

Models	Prompts	TempEvalQA-Bi			TRACIE			MCTACO		
		ACC	F1	INC	ACC	F1	INC	ACC	F1	INC
Llama-3-8B	CoT	69.6	70.6	50.0	63.0	64.9	56.0	77.6	69.8	63.4
	CCP (e2e)	<u>75.4</u>	<u>73.6</u>	<u>33.9</u>	<u>66.8</u>	<u>65.4</u>	<u>46.7</u>	83.1	81.0	53.7
	CCP	75.9	75.2	32.7	68.8	70.4	39.8	<u>78.7</u>	<u>81.7</u>	<u>57.7</u>
GPT-4o-mini	CoT	<u>81.3</u>	79.9	29.0	73.2	68.5	42.7	80.9	73.7	58.9
	CCP (e2e)	80.8	<u>80.2</u>	<u>27.7</u>	<u>79.0</u>	<u>78.3</u>	<u>28.0</u>	<u>87.1</u>	<u>84.4</u>	<u>52.1</u>
	CCP	88.8	88.7	19.6	82.5	81.2	20.2	87.8	85.8	42.1

Table 9: Performance comparison with different prompts. The best and second-best performances are in boldface and underlined, respectively.

prompt (CCP), described in Appendix G.1, from the prompt that answers counterfactual and original questions, detailed in Appendix G.2. If we generate counterfactual questions and answers in an end-to-end manner using only the prompt in Appendix G.2 (CCP(e2e)), while it still outperforms CoT, the performance slightly decreases, as shown in Table 9.

F Usage of AI Assistants

ChatGPT was employed to generate answers in the prompt examples.

G Prompt Templates

We list the prompts that we used.

G.1 Prompt Templates for Generating Counterfactual Questions

To generate the counterfactual questions, we use the prompts provided below. We control question aspects by tailoring ICL examples and prompting the model to follow few-shot examples with the prompt: (“following previous examples”).

TempEvalQA-Bi

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. Generate one related question to help determine the correctness of the original question, following the previous examples.

[User]

Question: Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz before McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

[Assistant]

Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz after McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

[User]

Question: Is McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger after Farkas was made a brigadier general?

[Assistant]

Is McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger before Farkas was made a brigadier general?

[User]

Question: Is Farkas was appointed military attache at the Hungarian embassy before he was made a brigadier?

[Assistant]

Is Farkas was appointed military attache at the Hungarian embassy after he was made a brigadier?

TRACIE

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. Generate one related hypothesis to help determine the plausibility of the original hypothesis, following previous examples.

[User]

Hypothesis: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts after he got off the ride.

[Assistant]

Chad looked for his baseball cap starts before he got off the ride.

[User]

Hypothesis: Tom's friend says he is not gay starts before One day he noticed someone else asking

[Assistant]

Tom's friend says he is not gay starts after One day he noticed someone else asking

[User]

Hypothesis: Liza read a book on economics in the library starts before she got to the library

[Assistant]

Liza read a book on economics in the library starts after she got to the library

MCTACO

[System]

You are an expert in temporal commonsense knowledge. Generate related candidate answers that are either plausible or implausible that help determine the correctness of the original candidate answer following the previous examples.

[User]

Passage: The majority religion during the centuries of Ottoman rule, though a significant Christian minority remained. Question: What happened before Islam was the majority religion? Candidate answer: christianity

was the majority religion.

[Assistant]

The Ottoman Empire had just begun / The spread of Byzantine influence in the region / The emergence of Islam as a minor religion

[User]

Passage: It's hail crackled across the comm, and Tara spun to retake her seat at the helm.

Question: How long was the storm? Candidate answer: 6 years.

[Assistant]

an hour / a week / a month

[User]

Passage: About 30% of Ratners's profit already is derived from the U.S. Question: Is Ratners's profit derived from the U.S. today? Candidate answer: yes.

[Assistant]

no

G.2 Prompt Templates for CCP and Baselines

We only show the SP, CoT, and CCP since Consistency is the method that leverages CoT multiple times, and the Reflect and Debate follow the implementation of Du et al. (2024) after CoT.

Given the system and user message, the model generates an assistant's message. In our approach, the model is prompted twice: first to create an assistant's answer to the counterfactual question, and then to generate an assistant's answer to the original question. Though we use 3-shot examples, we provide 1 example for simplicity.

Prompt templates used to generate answers for the TempevalQA-Bi dataset are provided below.

TempevalQA-Bi: SP

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. Answer the question according to the article. Answer the question yes or no (Format: final answer: yes/no)

[User]

Article: Farkas, an air force captain, was sent into space on board the Soyuz 36 on May 26, 1980. He spent six days aboard the Salyut 6 spacecraft with three Soviet astronauts, Valery Kubasov, Leonid Popov and Valery Riumin. McBride, 54, of Lewisburg, West Virginia, was part of a seven-member crew aboard the Orbiter Challenger [...]

Question: Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz before McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

[Assistant]

Final answer: yes

TempevalQA-Bi: CoT

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. Answer the question according to the article. Let's think step by step to answer the question. The answer should be "yes" or "no" followed by "Final answer: ".

[User]

Article: [...]

Question: Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz before McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

[Assistant]

Let's think step by step. Farkas was sent into space on May 26, 1980 and McBride was on board the Orbiter Challenger in October 1984. May 26, 1980 is before October 1984. So the answer is: yes.

Final answer: yes

TempevalQA-Bi: CCP

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. Answer the question according to the article. To improve understanding, follow these steps: Answer the related question to better understand the timeline (Format: answer: [yes/no]) Using the answers to the related questions as the additional information, answer the original question yes or no (Format: final answer: [yes/no]).

[User]

Article: [...]

Original question: Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz before McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

Related question: Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz after McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

Answer the related question

[Assistant] # *Prediction for the counterfactual question*

Farkas was sent into space on board the

Soyuz 36 on May 26, 1980. McBride was part of the crew on board the Orbiter Challenger in October 1984. Since 1980 is before 1984, no, Farkas was not sent into space after McBride.

answer: no

[User]

Now, answer the original question. Question: Is Farkas sent into space on board the Soyuz before McBride on board the Orbiter Challenger?

[Assistant] # *Prediction for the original question*

Farkas was sent into space on May 26, 1980 and McBride was on board the Orbiter Challenger in October 1984. May 26, 1980 is before October 1984. So the answer is: yes.

Final answer: yes

Prompt templates used to generate answers for the TRACIE dataset are provided below.

TRACIE: SP

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. You can understand the implicit temporal relationships between events to make judgments. Your task is to determine the relationship between the story and hypothesis. A 'positive' label means the hypothesis can be inferred from the story or logically sound. A 'negative' label means the hypothesis cannot be inferred from the story. You must answer only with the labels 'positive' or 'negative'. (Format: final answer: positive/negative)

[User]

Story: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts after he got off the ride story: Chad had gone to an amusement park. He was riding on the roller coaster.

Hypothesis: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts after he got off the ride.

[Assistant]

Final answer: positive

TRACIE: CoT

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge.

You can understand the implicit temporal relationships between events to make judgments. Your task is to determine the relationship between the story and hypothesis. A ‘positive’ label means the hypothesis can be inferred from the story or logically sound. A ‘negative’ label means the hypothesis cannot be inferred from the story. You must give final answer only with the labels ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ after the “Final answer:” prompt. Let’s think step by step to evaluate the relationship.

[User]

Story: [...]

Hypothesis: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts after he got off the ride.

[Assistant]

Let’s think step by step:

The story states that Chad’s baseball cap fell off during the roller coaster ride.

It also mentions that Chad found the cap after he got off the ride. To find something, one typically needs to look for it first. Since Chad found the cap after getting off the ride, he must have started looking for it after getting off the ride. The hypothesis directly aligns with this sequence of events.

Final answer: positive

TRACIE: CCP

[System]

You are an expert in temporal knowledge. You can understand the implicit temporal relationships between events to make judgments. Your task is to determine the relationship between the story and hypothesis. A ‘positive’ label means the hypothesis can be inferred from the story or logically sound. A ‘negative’ label means the hypothesis cannot be inferred from the story. You must give final answer only with the labels ‘positive’ or ‘negative’. To improve understanding, follow these steps: Evaluate the related hypothesis to help clarify the story’s timeline (Format: answer: [positive/negative]). Using answers to the related hypothesis as the additional information, evaluate the original hypothesis (Format: final answer: [positive/negative]).

[User]

Story: [...]

Hypothesis: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts after he got off the ride.

Related hypothesis: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts before he got off the ride.

Answer the related hypothesis

[Assistant] # *Prediction for the counterfactual question*

The hypothesis conflicts with the story, as Chad finds the cap after the ride.

Answer: negative

[User]

Now, evaluate the original hypothesis: Chad looked for his baseball cap starts after he got off the ride.

[Assistant] # *Prediction for the original question*

Chad rides the roller coaster while wearing a baseball cap, which falls off during the ride. After getting off the ride, Chad finds the cap. The hypothesis suggests that Chad started looking for the cap after getting off the ride, which aligns with the story’s sequence of events.

Final answer: positive

Prompt templates used to generate answers for the MCTACO dataset are provided below.

MCTACO: SP

[System]

You are expert in temporal commonsense knowledge. Your goal is to determine if the candidate answer to a given question is plausible based on the information in the passage. Answer the related candidate answers then answer the candidate answer. Provide a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response to indicate whether the original candidate answer is correct. (Format: final answer: yes/no) If the passage does not provide explicit details, provide an educated guess based on what is common or plausible in similar situations

[User]

Passage: the majority religion during the centuries of Ottoman rule, though a significant Christian minority remained.

Question: What happened before Islam was the majority religion?

Candidate answer: the end of white-

minority rule.

[Assistant]

Final answer: no

MCTACO: CoT

[System]

You are an expert in temporal commonsense knowledge. Your goal is to determine if the candidate answer to a given question is plausible based on the information in the passage. Let's think step by step and provide a final 'yes' or 'no' response to indicate whether the original candidate answer is correct. If the passage does not provide explicit details, provide an educated guess based on what is common or plausible in similar situations. The final answer should be in the format: "Final answer: yes" or "Final answer: no".

[User]

Passage: the majority religion during the centuries of Ottoman rule, though a significant Christian minority remained.

Question: What happened before Islam was the majority religion?

Candidate answer: christianity was the majority religion

[Assistant]

Let's think step by step.

Step 1: Analyze the passage. The passage states that during the centuries of Ottoman rule, Islam was the majority religion, while a significant Christian minority remained. This implies that before the Ottoman Empire (which was Islamic), there could have been a different majority religion.

Step 2: Historical context. Before the rise of the Ottoman Empire, large parts of the Middle East, North Africa, and parts of Europe were under the rule of the Byzantine Empire, which was a Christian empire. Additionally, many regions that later came under Ottoman rule were predominantly Christian.

Step 3: Plausibility of the candidate answer. Given that Christianity was the dominant religion in many regions before the Ottoman Empire and its Islamic rule, it is plausible that Christianity was the majority religion before Islam in those areas.

Final answer: yes

MCTACO: CCP

[System]

You are an expert in temporal commonsense knowledge. Your goal is to determine if the candidate answer to a given question is plausible based on the information in the passage. To improve understanding, follow these steps: generate related candidate answers that are either plausible or implausible (Format: answer: yes/no) to help in determining the correctness of the original candidate answer. Provide a 'yes' or 'no' response to indicate whether the original candidate answer is correct (Format: final answer: yes/no). If the passage does not provide explicit details, provide an educated guess based on what is common or plausible in similar situations

[User]

Passage: the majority religion during the centuries of Ottoman rule, though a significant Christian minority remained.

Question: What happened before Islam was the majority religion?

original candidate answer: christianity was the majority religion

Related candidate: the end of white-minority rule

Can the candidate answer the given question? yes or no

[Assistant] # *Prediction for the counterfactual question*

This is incorrect because the passage discusses events during Ottoman rule, not before it.

answer: no

[User]

Now, can the candidate answer the given question? candidate answer: christianity was the majority religion

[Assistant] # *Prediction for the original question*

This is plausible because Islam would have started to emerge before becoming the majority.

Final answer: yes

H Scientific Artifacts

We used existing scientific artifacts for research purposes, and the use of existing artifacts was consistent with their intended applications.

TempEvalQA-Bi: [MIT license](#)

TRACIE: [Apache-2.0 license](#)

Llama-3: [custom commercial license](#)

OpenAI API: [Apache-2.0 license](#)