

# Benchmarking and Pushing the Multi-Bias Elimination Boundary of LLMs via Causal Effect Estimation-guided Debiasing

Zhouhao Sun<sup>1</sup>, Zhiyuan Kan<sup>1</sup>, Xiao Ding<sup>1\*</sup>, Li Du<sup>2</sup>, Yang Zhao<sup>1</sup>, Bing Qin<sup>1</sup>, Ting Liu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Center for Social Computing and Information Retrieval  
Harbin Institute of Technology, China

<sup>2</sup>Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence, Beijing, China  
{zhsun, xding, ypxu, yxma, yzhao, bqin, tliu}@ir.hit.edu.cn  
duli@baai.ac.cn

## Abstract

Despite significant progress, recent studies have indicated that current large language models (LLMs) may still utilize bias during inference, leading to the poor generalizability of LLMs. Some benchmarks are proposed to investigate the generalizability of LLMs, with each piece of data typically containing one type of controlled bias. However, a single piece of data may contain multiple types of biases in practical applications. To bridge this gap, we propose a multi-bias benchmark where each piece of data contains five types of biases. The evaluations conducted on this benchmark reveal that the performance of existing LLMs and debiasing methods is unsatisfying, highlighting the challenge of eliminating multiple types of biases simultaneously. To overcome this challenge, we propose a causal effect estimation-guided multi-bias elimination method (CMBE). This method first estimates the causal effect of multiple types of biases simultaneously. Subsequently, we eliminate the causal effect of biases from the total causal effect exerted by both the semantic information and biases during inference. Experimental results show that CMBE can effectively eliminate multiple types of bias simultaneously to enhance the generalizability of LLMs.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable performance across diverse domains (Achiam et al., 2023). However, previous works have shown that LLMs would also learn **bias** during the training process (Schick et al., 2021; Navigli et al., 2023; Klimashevskaya et al., 2024), leading to *poor generalizability* of LLMs (Du et al., 2023; Cheng and Amiri, 2024; Yang et al., 2025). Thus, it is crucial to assess LLMs’ generalizability with respect to biases and explore effective solutions for enhancement.

\*Corresponding Author




Figure 1: This figure presents an example that contains five different types of bias.

Recently, a series of benchmarks (Manerba et al., 2024; Bang et al., 2024) have been proposed to investigate the generalizability of LLMs with respect to biases. In most of these benchmarks, each piece of data typically contains only one type of controlled bias, with a small number of them containing two types. However, a single piece of data may simultaneously contain multiple types of biases in practical applications. As shown in Figure 1, this example contains five different types of biases that have been identified on the natural language inference (NLI) task (Gururangan et al., 2018; Dev et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2024b), and these types of biases have the same polarity ‘entailment’ (i.e., these types of biases will all cause an LLM to tend to predict the same answer ‘entailment’). However, the gender of Oliver is not mentioned in the premise. Therefore, the relationship between the premise and the hypothesis is neutral. This type of data poses a greater challenge to LLMs because each type of bias can cause LLMs to tend to make certain predictions. If a single piece of data contains multiple types of biases, and these biases have the same polarity, it becomes extremely difficult for LLMs to utilize useful semantic information during inference. It also poses new challenges to

the existing debiasing methods. This is because even if there is just one type of bias that has not been eliminated, it is likely to significantly affect the generalizability of LLMs. As a result, it is crucial to assess LLMs’ generalizability by utilizing data that contains multiple types of biases.

To address the limitations of existing evaluation, we propose a multi-bias benchmark, in which each piece of data contains five types of biases, and these biases have the same polarity. To construct such a benchmark, it is necessary to take into account multiple types of biases simultaneously and ensure that their polarities are the same. Therefore, we choose the NLI task, on which previous researchers have conducted extensive studies regarding bias (Rajae et al., 2022; Mckenna et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2024b), as the task format of this multi-bias benchmark. Subsequently, we explore and verify the polarity of the biases that have been discovered on the widely used LLM ChatGPT-4o-latest (Achiam et al., 2023) and select five biases with the same polarity. By manually controlling these biases within each piece of data, we are able to construct the multi-bias benchmark where each piece of data contains five types of biases. Then, to quantify the generalizability of LLMs, we thoroughly evaluate the mainstream LLMs and debiasing methods. Evaluation results demonstrate that even the most powerful LLMs and debiasing techniques are insufficient in handling multi-bias scenarios. Furthermore, our analysis indicates that relying on scaling up parameters to improve the generalizability on multi-bias scenarios is not advisable considering the consumption of massive resources.

To deal with the challenges of eliminating multiple types of biases simultaneously, we proposed a Causal effect estimation-guided Multi-Bias Elimination (CMBE) method. During the inference process of LLMs, both biases and semantic information are utilized to generate the answers (Zheng et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024b), i.e., they exert causal effect on the generation of the answers. Therefore, the output derived from LLMs on the original data can be regarded as the **Total Causal Effect** (Pearl, 2009) produced by both the biases and semantic information. Therefore, if we can eliminate the causal effect of biases from the total causal effect, we can enable the LLM to be free from the influence of biases during inference. However, it is impractical to estimate the causal effect of each bias combination due to the combinatorial explosion issue. Therefore, we assume that

ChatGPT-4o-latest	entailment	neutral	contradiction
hypothesis shorter	<b>43.7</b>	21.7	34.4
hypothesis longer	31.4	<b>40.1</b>	28.5
label distribution	33.3	33.3	33.3

Table 1: The distribution of predicted labels by ChatGPT-4o-latest and in the datasets in which each piece of data contains bias feature ‘hypothesis longer’ or ‘hypothesis shorter’.

the causal effect produced by the combination of different biases is a weighted linear combination of the causal effect of individual biases, thereby avoiding the combinatorial explosion issue.

Experimental results show that CMBE can improve the performance of four LLMs on the multi-bias benchmark. This demonstrates that CMBE can effectively debias LLMs and enhance the generalizability of LLMs under the multi-bias scenarios.

## 2 Bias Polarity Study

Formally, each type of bias contains at least one kind of bias feature. For example, the bias type ‘lexical overlap’ have two bias features ‘high lexical overlap’ and ‘low lexical overlap’. To construct the multi-bias benchmark, we need to ensure that the polarities of these bias features are consistent. However, most of the previous researches (McCoy et al., 2019; Rajae et al., 2022; Anantaprayoon et al., 2024) on bias polarity are based on small discriminative models. The conclusions drawn from such scenarios may not necessarily be applicable to generative large language models. Therefore, we first design experiments for the biases that have already been discovered by predecessors to explore and verify their polarities. Subsequently, we select the bias features with the same polarity for the construction of the benchmark.

Take the bias type of sentence length for an example, Gururangan et al. (2018) discovered that the label neutral was associated with longer hypotheses, while the label entailment was associated with shorter hypotheses. Inspired by this finding, we take the relative length difference between the premise and hypothesis exceeding five words as the criterion for the sentence length bias and conduct explorations through experiments. For simplicity, we refer to the bias feature where the hypothesis is longer than the premise by more than five words as ‘hypothesis longer’, and the bias feature where the hypothesis is shorter than the premise by more than five words as ‘hypothesis shorter’. Specifically, for

Bias Type	Bias Feature	Bias Polarity
sentence length	hypothesis shorter: the hypothesis is shorter than the premise by more than five words	entailment
	hypothesis longer: the hypothesis is longer than the premise by more than five words	neutral
lexical overlap	high: the lexical overlap rate between the premise and hypothesis is higher than 0.8	entailment
	low: the lexical overlap rate between the premise and hypothesis is lower than 0.2	neutral
semantic similarity	high: the Bertscore between the premise and hypothesis is higher than 0.88	entailment
	low: the Bertscore between the premise and hypothesis is lower than 0.83	neutral
speculative word	speculative word exists: speculative word exists in the premise or the hypothesis	entailment
gender-occupation	male with male-biased occupations	entailment
	male with female-biased occupations	contradiction

Table 2: This table presents five types of biases with nine different bias features and their polarities. The bias of ‘male with male-biased occupations’ means that occupations statistically related to male appears in the premise, and male appears in the hypothesis (similar for male with female-biased occupations).

the bias features ‘hypothesis longer’ and ‘hypothesis shorter’, we randomly select 3,000 samples with balanced labels from existing datasets such as MNLI (Williams et al., 2018) for each feature respectively. Then, we statistically analyze the label distribution predicted by ChatGPT-4o-latest and compare it with the label distribution of the dataset. Experimental results are shown in Table 1.

From the table, we can find that ChatGPT-4o-latest tends to predict entailment and neutral for the bias features ‘hypothesis longer’ and ‘hypothesis shorter’, respectively. So the polarity of the bias feature ‘hypothesis longer’ is neutral (and entailment for the bias feature ‘hypothesis shorter’).

For other types of biases such as lexical overlap, we also conducted similar experiments to investigate their polarities. Eventually, the types of biases that still exist in ChatGPT-4o-latest, as well as their polarities, are shown in Table 2. To ensure the consistency of polarities for selected bias features, we choose the bias features ‘hypothesis shorter’, ‘high lexical overlap’, ‘high semantic similarity’, ‘speculative word exists’, and ‘male with male-biased occupations’ to construct our multi-bias benchmark. More details about the experiments for other biases can be seen in Appendix D.

### 3 Benchmark Construction and Evaluation

#### 3.1 Benchmark Construction

The challenge of constructing a multi-bias benchmark lies in how to control multiple types of biases simultaneously. To overcome this challenge, we design a data generation process that consists of three main steps, where each step introduces distinct bi-

ases to the data: (i) Template construction. (ii) vocabulary construction and template completion using the constructed vocabulary. (iii) verification of bias features on each generated data.

##### 3.1.1 Template Construction

We construct four pairs of templates for the label neutral and the other two labels, respectively. Each template is explicitly incorporated with the bias feature of ‘male with male-biased occupations’ and ‘speculative word exists’. Below is one pair of template, the first template is for the label neutral and the second is for the other two labels:

- (1) Premise:  $N_1$  is a  $P_1$ ,  $V_1$ . Hypothesis: He  $S_1$   $V_2$ .
- (2) Premise:  $N_1$  is a  $P_1$ . He  $V_1$ . Hypothesis: He  $S_1$   $V_2$ .

where  $N_1$  is a unisex name,  $P_1$  is a male-biased occupation (occupations statistically related to male) used to control the bias feature of ‘male with male-biased occupations’,  $S_1$  is a speculative word such as ‘might’,  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are two verb phrases used to control the bias types of lexical overlap and sentence length. Note that we also control that the gender information is not introduced in  $V_1$ , so that the label of the samples constructed using the first template will always be neutral. Full list of the templates can be seen in Appendix A.

##### 3.1.2 Vocabulary Construction and Template Completion

We drew our occupation vocabulary that includes 87 male-biased occupations from Anantaprayoon et al. (2024), and name vocabulary that contains 30 unisex names from the website<sup>1</sup>. For specula-

<sup>1</sup><https://www.behindthename.com/names/gender/unisex>

Premise	Hypothesis	label
Noah is a plumber. He builds furniture to decorate the home and save costs, using recycled wood.	He might build furniture to decorate the home and save costs.	Entailment
Emma is a officer. He plans an extensive and detailed project outline for the community event.	He could plan an extensive project outline for the community event.	Entailment
Emerson, a judge by trade, considers the various intricate details of the new art exhibit in the gallery.	He could consider the intricate details of the art exhibit.	Neutral
Morgan is a scholar, visiting the park regularly to enjoy nature and unwind, usually along a shaded path.	He might visit the park regularly to enjoy nature and unwind.	Neutral
Liam works as a trader. He declared that delivering 30 food boxes by December 10th would organize holiday meals, however, the warehouse received only 11 boxes by the deadline.	He would organize holiday meals after delivering 30 food boxes by December 10th.	Contradiction
Liam is a technician. He confirm that hosting 15 free coding workshops before December 15th would qualify for tech grants. however, there are only 6 workshops held by the deadline.	He may qualify for tech grants after hosting 15 free coding workshops before December 15th.	Contradiction

Table 3: This table presents six examples in our constructed benchmark.

tive vocabulary, we manually collect 6 speculative words (shown in Appendix B).

To control the answer of the generated data, we use ChatGPT-4o-latest to construct the vocabulary of verb phrase pairs (instead of verb phrases) and verify their validity. For each pair of them, the two verb phrases are used to fill in the premise and the hypothesis, respectively. To control the bias features of ‘high lexical overlap’ and ‘hypothesis shorter’, we utilize an automatic program to ensure that each verb phrase pair has a remarkably high degree of lexical overlap, and the verb phrase corresponding to the premise is more than three words longer than that corresponding to the hypothesis (since the other part of the premise is at least two words longer than that of the hypothesis in each template). Meanwhile, we manually verify whether each verb phrase pair always results in the premise entailing (or contradicting) the hypothesis after inserted into the templates. Three of us were involved in this verification process, and it was ensured that all three of us deemed that each verb phrase pair satisfied the requirements. Finally, we got a vocabulary containing 200 pairs of verb phrases (100 pairs corresponds to the label ‘entailment’ and 100 pairs corresponds to the label ‘contradiction’).

After collecting the vocabulary, we can complete the template by randomly extracting data from the vocabulary. Note that when constructing data with the ‘neutral’ label, we also use verb phrase pairs corresponding to the label ‘entailment’. Since the ‘neutral’ label is determined by templates, this does not affect the correctness of the data.

### 3.1.3 Verification of Bias Features

To ensure that the constructed data meets the requirements of the five bias features. Therefore, we employ an automatic program to select the data that satisfies the requirements of these bias features. Finally, we construct a multi-bias benchmark that contains 12000 samples with balanced labels. Some Dataset samples are provided in in Table 3.

## 3.2 Evaluation and Analysis

In this section, we explore three core research questions with the proposed benchmark. **RQ1:** Will the LLMs be more susceptible to multi-bias scenarios? **RQ2:** Are existing state-of-the-art (SOTA) debiasing methods still effective in multi-bias scenarios? **RQ3:** Can the challenges of multi-bias scenarios be solved by scaling the model parameters?

### 3.2.1 Evaluation Setup

**Models** In this work, we utilize ChatGPT-4o-latest (Achiam et al., 2023). Llama3.1-70B-chat (Dubey et al., 2024), Gemma3-27B-it (Team et al., 2025), and Qwen3-8B (Yang et al., 2024a) for experiments. We evaluate the LLMs in two ways: zero-shot, few-shots prompting. For few-shot experiments, we randomly select three examples with balanced labels from the MNLI train set. All experiments are done for three times and we report the average of the accuracy.

**Datasets** In addition to the constructed benchmark (called 5-bias below) that contains five types of biases within each data, we also select the crowd-sourced dataset MNLI (Williams et al., 2018), and the meticulously curated HANS (McCoy et al., 2019) dataset in which each instance contains one



	ChatGPT-4o-latest			Llama3.1-70B-chat			Gemma3-27B-it			Qwen3-8B		
Zero-shot	MNLI	HANS	5-bias	MNLI	HANS	5-bias	MNLI	HANS	5-bias	MNLI	HANS	5-bias
Vanilla	84.5	83.8	49.1	80.5	75.4	38.0	<u>82.6</u>	75.4	40.8	77.9	80.8	34.2
DC	84.6	<b>84.1</b>	<u>54.7</u>	80.6	<u>77.5</u>	45.7	82.4	77.8	45.9	78.0	81.5	39.6
BC	<b>84.7</b>	<u>84.0</u>	<b>57.8</b>	80.8	<b>78.6</b>	<u>47.6</u>	<u>82.6</u>	<b>78.6</b>	47.5	<b>78.2</b>	<b>81.6</b>	<b>40.3</b>
Unibias	—	—	—	80.5	77.3	44.8	82.5	77.7	44.2	<b>78.2</b>	81.2	38.6
CAL	—	—	—	<b>81.2</b>	76.6	<b>48.4</b>	<b>82.9</b>	<u>78.4</u>	<b>47.8</b>	77.4	80.4	36.6
Few-shot	MNLI	HANS	5-bias	MNLI	HANS	5-bias	MNLI	HANS	5-bias	MNLI	HANS	5-bias
Vanilla	85.4	84.8	51.2	83.9	89.0	42.1	<u>84.4</u>	80.5	43.9	<b>80.6</b>	76.8	43.3
DC	<b>85.6</b>	85.0	<u>57.7</u>	83.8	89.5	52.5	84.3	80.9	50.7	80.4	77.6	50.1
BC	<u>85.5</u>	<b>85.2</b>	<b>59.3</b>	<u>84.1</u>	<b>89.7</b>	<b>55.1</b>	<u>84.4</u>	80.7	<b>53.1</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>50.5</b>
Unibias	—	—	—	<b>84.2</b>	89.4	51.3	<b>84.6</b>	80.6	50.2	<u>80.5</u>	77.1	49.6
CAL	—	—	—	83.6	<u>89.6</u>	<u>53.4</u>	84.2	<b>81.4</b>	<u>52.6</u>	80.2	77.5	48.7

Table 4: Evaluation results of different LLMs and different debiasing methods on MNLI, HANS and 5-bias datasets. Best in bold, second with an underline. — denotes that this method is inapplicable to ChatGPT-4o-latest due to the requirement for internal representations of the model.

type of controlled bias for experimental analysis. Since the gold labels for the MNLI test set are not publicly available, we follow previous work and report the results on the development-matched.

**Debiasing Methods** In this work, we conduct a comprehensive analysis of the existing debiasing methods for LLMs, including DC (Fei et al., 2023), BC (Zhou et al., 2024a), Unibias (Zhou et al., 2024b), and CAL (Sun et al., 2024b) methods. Additionally, we also report the results of vanilla in-context learning.

More details about the specific prompts used for evaluation can be seen in Appendix E.

### 3.2.2 Quantitative Analysis

Experimental results are shown in Table 4, from which we find that:

(1) Comparing the performance of four LLMs on the HANS and 5-bias datasets in which each instance contains one and five types of controlled bias features, it is evident that the performance on 5-bias dataset is much lower (more than 20%). This indicates that LLMs are more susceptible to multi-bias scenarios where each piece of data contains multiple types of biases.

(2) Compared to the vanilla zero-shot and few-shot method, current debiasing methods achieves better performance on HANS and 5-bias datasets in general (with BC method performs the best). This demonstrates the effectiveness of current debiasing methods. However, the performance of these methods on 5-bias dataset is still unsatisfying, which indicates that current debiasing methods is not effective enough in multi-bias scenarios. This also highlights the importance of devising debiasing methods that can deal with multi-bias scenarios.




Figure 2: Error rates of four LLMs for each label.

(3) Compared to smaller LLMs, the performance of larger LLMs on the 5-bias dataset is higher in general, which indicates that larger LLMs is more robust in multi-bias scenarios. However, scaling up model size requires massive resources and current LLMs’ performance is far from expectations even for ChatGPT-4o-latest, indicating that relying on scaling up parameters to improve the generalizability on multi-bias scenarios is not advisable.

### 3.2.3 Error Analysis

For a more in-depth analysis, we statistically analyzed the error rates of four LLMs for each label. Specifically, we conduct a statistical analysis on the zero-shot evaluation results for the 5-hard dataset. As shown in Figure 2, the error rate of data whose gold answer is ‘neutral’ and ‘contradiction’ are significantly higher than those with the gold answer ‘entailment’, which suggests that the bias contained in these data causes LLMs to exhibit a tendency to predict entailment. This aligns with the original intention of constructing the 5-bias dataset. As




Figure 3: Causal Effect Estimation-guided Multi-bias Elimination Method.

the five types of injected biases all cause LLMs to tend to predict ‘entailment’, these LLMs will predict ‘entailment’ most of the time, thereby exhibiting poor performance on other label categories. Furthermore, we find that Chatgpt-4o-latest is relatively less affected by bias among the four LLMs.

## 4 Method

From the evaluation of LLMs and debiasing methods on the multi-bias benchmark, we know that current LLMs and debiasing methods cannot deal with scenarios where data contains multiple types of biases. To deal with this problem, we propose a causal effect estimation-guided multi-bias elimination method.

### 4.1 Causal View of Bias

As shown in Figure 3, due to unknown confounders  $z$ , which are the common cause of semantic information  $S$  and bias  $B$ , bias is correlated to the semantic information, and hence  $B$  is also correlative to the target answer  $Y$  (since there exists a causal relationship between  $S$  and  $Y$ ). Therefore, bias produces a natural indirect effect (Pearl, 2009) on answer  $Y$ .

### 4.2 The Proposed Framework: CMBE

As shown in Figure 3, to conduct unbiased inference, we should eliminate the natural indirect effect (NIE) from the total causal effect (TCE) to get the total direct effect (TDE) which is only exerted by the semantic information:

$$TCE - NIE = TDE \quad (1)$$

While the TCE can be easily represented as the LLMs’ predicted probability of the candidate answers, the NIE cannot be directly derived since the semantic information and bias features cannot be easily decoupled at the instance level. Therefore, we estimate the average NIE (denoted as  $\overline{NIE}$ ) to

substitute for the natural indirect effect produced by bias features in each instance. However, due to the combinatorial explosion problem when considering multiple types of biases, it is challenging to estimate the  $\overline{NIE}$  for each combination of bias features. To deal with this problem, we devise a two-stage approach to estimate the  $\overline{NIE}$  for multiple types of bias.

**In the first stage**, we estimate the average NIE for each bias feature separately. Take ‘speculative word exists’ as an example of the target bias feature  $b$ , we first select  $n$  samples that are label-balanced and each contains speculative words<sup>2</sup> from the existing datasets. Subsequently, since the average of debiased probability distribution is expected to be uniform on the label-balanced datasets, we calculate the average predicted probabilities  $\overline{P}_b$  of the LLM for the selected samples, and then subtract the uniform probability distribution  $P_U$  of the labels from  $\overline{P}_b$  to obtain the  $\overline{NIE}_b$ :

$$\overline{NIE}_b = \overline{P}_b - P_U \quad (2)$$

**In the Second stage**, we aim at estimating the average NIE for different combinations of bias features. To deal with the combinatorial explosion problem, we assume that the NIE produced by the combination of different bias features is a weighted linear combination of the NIE of each bias feature. Specifically, for the combination of bias features  $S = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ , the  $\overline{NIE}$  of  $S$  can be represented as:

$$\overline{NIE}_S = \sum_{b_i \in S} \lambda_{t_i} \cdot \overline{NIE}_{b_i} \quad (3)$$

where  $t_i$  is the bias type of the bias feature  $b_i$  (e.g., sentence length is the bias type of ‘hypothesis shorter’), and  $\lambda_{t_i}$  is the parameters of weighted linear combination for estimating  $\overline{NIE}_S$ . Similarly,

<sup>2</sup>We ensure that there are no bias features of the other four types of bias in the selected data through automatic programs.

We first select  $m$  samples that are label-balanced and each contains at least two bias features from the existing datasets. Subsequently, we use the following equation to estimate these parameters:

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m (P_j - \sum_{b_i \in S_j} \lambda_{t_i} \cdot \overline{NIE}_{b_i}) = P_U \quad (4)$$

where  $j$  is an instance and  $S_j$  is the bias features contained by instance  $j$ .

At the inference stage, we firstly use automatic programs to derive the bias features  $S_k$  within each instance  $k$ , and then the TDE of the semantic information can be calculated as the debiased result:

$$TDE = P_k - \overline{NIE}_{S_k} \quad (5)$$

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Experimental Settings

Due to the diversity of biases, it is impossible to know all potential bias types existing in the data in practical applications. Therefore, in this experiment, we assume that we have prior knowledge of three or four types of biases in advance (called CMBE-3 and CMBE-4), and demonstrate that our method is still effective in such scenarios through experiments. Since it is challenging to automatically extract data from existing datasets for estimating the causal effects of gender-occupation bias, we select ‘lexical overlap’, ‘sentence length’, ‘semantic similarity’, ‘speculative word’ as known bias types for CMBE-4. For CMBE-3, we randomly choose three types of biases from them for two times as known bias types, and take the average result of these two selections as the result of CMBE-3.

For LLMs, we choose ChatGPT-4o-latest, Llama3.1-70B-chat, Gemma3-27B-it, and Qwen3-8B for our experiments. In addition, we also choose vanilla in-context learning, DC, BC, Unibias, and CAL method as our baselines. The hyperparameters  $m$  and  $n$  are set to 90 and 15 respectively, and the samples used for estimating the causal effect of biases are sampled from the MNLI train set. For zero-shot and few-shot experiments, we utilize the same prompts as the baseline. All experiments are done for three times and we report the average of the accuracy. For datasets, we choose the MNLI and 5-bias as in-domain (ID) and out-of-domain (OOD) datasets to evaluate the in-domain and out-of-domain performance under multi-bias scenarios. Due to the page limit, we

	GPT-4o		Llama3.1-70B		Gemma3-27B	
Zero-shot	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias
Vanilla	84.5	49.1	80.5	38.0	82.6	40.8
DC	84.6	54.7	80.6	45.7	82.4	45.9
BC	<u>84.7</u>	<u>57.8</u>	80.8	47.6	82.6	47.5
Unibias	—	—	80.5	44.8	82.5	44.2
CAL	—	—	<b>81.2</b>	48.4	<b>82.9</b>	47.8
CMBE-3	84.7	57.6	80.5	49.4	<u>82.7</u>	50.4
CMBE-4	<b>84.8</b>	<b>58.9</b>	80.6	<b>51.8</b>	<u>82.7</u>	<b>52.1</b>
Few-shot	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias
Vanilla	85.4	51.2	83.9	42.1	84.4	43.9
DC	<b>85.6</b>	57.7	83.8	52.5	84.3	50.7
BC	<u>85.5</u>	59.3	<u>84.1</u>	55.1	84.4	53.1
Unibias	—	—	<b>84.2</b>	51.3	<b>84.6</b>	50.2
CAL	—	—	83.6	53.4	84.2	52.6
CMBE-3	85.1	<u>59.5</u>	83.8	<u>56.3</u>	<u>84.5</u>	<u>56.6</u>
CMBE-4	85.2	<b>60.7</b>	84.0	<b>57.2</b>	<u>84.5</u>	<b>58.3</b>

Table 5: Comparison of CMBE with baselines across four LLMs. Best in bold, second with an underline. — denotes that this method is inapplicable to ChatGPT.

report the full experimental results that includes Qwen3-8B in Appendix C.

### 5.2 Experimental Results

Experimental results are shown in Table 5 (full results in Table 7), from which we find that:

(1) Comparing the performance of our method with vanilla zero-shot and few-shot prompting, our method performs better on the 5-bias dataset (even if we only know three types of biases ahead). This demonstrates that by estimating and eliminating the causal effect of biases, our method can effectively debias LLMs to improve the generalizability of LLMs in multi-bias scenarios.

(2) Compared to previous debiasing methods, our method generally performs better on 5-bias dataset while maintaining performance on MNLI dataset. This indicates that by considering and eliminating the causal effect of **multiple** types of biases simultaneously, we can mitigate the impact of biases on LLMs more effectively. As a result, our method can effectively debias LLMs by eliminating the causal effect of biases to improve the generalizability of LLMs in multi-bias scenarios.

(3) Comparing the performance of CMBE-4 with CMBE-3, the performance of CMBE-4 is better on 5-bias dataset consistently. This indicates that our method can enhance the generalization performance in multi-bias scenarios (OOD) by considering and eliminating more types of biases.




Figure 4: Influence of different numbers of data for estimating the average causal effects of different bias features combinations.

### 5.3 Sensitivity Analysis

To estimate the average causal effects of different combinations of bias features, we select 90 samples that are label-balanced and each contains at least two known bias features. In this experiment, we investigate the sensitivity of model performance upon different hyperparameters by setting different numbers of data for estimation. Experiments are conducted on 5-bias using Gemma3-27B and the results are shown in Figure 4. We observe that: Empirically, the performance of CMBE-4 remains relatively stable with different numbers of data for estimation. Moreover, our approach outperforms the best performance of previous debiasing methods on the 5-bias dataset, which demonstrates the effectiveness of our approach to debias LLMs in multi-bias scenarios.

## 6 Related Work

**Bias Evaluation Benchmarks** Some recent studies (Zhou et al., 2024c; Sun et al., 2024a) have revealed that LLMs still utilize biases during the inference stage, and found that this phenomenon may lead to poor performance when generalizing to out-of-distribution scenarios. Zhou et al. (2024d) found that LLMs utilizes lexical and style biases in sentiment analysis tasks and propose a benchmark for verification. Anantaprayoon et al. (2024) proposed a benchmark to examine the gender bias within LLMs. Their research indicates that LLMs exhibits gender bias even in the NLI task. Steen and Markert (2024) focused on the news summarization task and proposed a dataset to explore the biases exploited by LLMs. They found that LLMs exhibit entity hallucination bias on this dataset, thus decreasing the performance of LLMs. Though there

are many benchmarks proposed to investigate the generalizability of LLMs, each piece of data contains only one type of controlled bias in most of these benchmarks (few of them contains two types). However, a single piece of data may simultaneously contain multiple types of biases in practical applications. To mitigate this gap, we propose a multi-bias benchmark, where each piece of data contains five types of biases.

**Debiasing Methods for LLMs** There are also some works aiming at mitigating biases of LLMs. Domain-context calibration method (Fei et al., 2023) uses random words sampled from the unlabeled evaluation dataset as the content-free text, and then calibrates the outputs based on the content-free text to mitigate label bias. Batch calibration (Zhou et al., 2024a) method models the bias from the prompt context by marginalizing the LLM scores in the batched input. Causal-guided active learning method (Sun et al., 2024b) first automatically identifies biased instances and induces explainable biases. Subsequently, this method utilizes these biased instances and explainable biases to debias LLMs. UniBias (Zhou et al., 2024b) identifies and eliminates biased FFN vectors and attention heads within LLMs.

Though there are some method proposed to debias LLMs, they cannot deal with multi-bias scenarios as shown in our experiments. In this work, we propose a causal effect estimation-guided multi-bias elimination method, which can mitigate this gap by estimating and eliminating the causal effect of multiple types of biases.

## 7 Conclusions

In this paper, we focus on exploring and improving the validity of LLMs and debiasing methods in multi-bias scenarios. Concretely, we propose 5-bias, the first multi-bias benchmark where each piece of data contains 5 types of biases, for probing into the performance boundary of LLMs and debiasing methods in multi-bias scenarios. Then, an evaluation of current LLMs and debiasing methods on 5-bias is conducted. Evaluation results show that current LLMs and debiasing methods exhibit unsatisfied on this benchmark, highlighting the challenge of eliminating multiple types of biases simultaneously. To overcome this challenge, we present a causal effect estimation-guided multi-bias elimination method, which estimates and eliminates the causal effect of multiple types



of biases simultaneously during the inference process of LLMs. Experimental results show that our approach can effectively debias LLMs to enhance their generalizability in multi-bias scenarios.

## Limitations

Although benchmarking and improving the multi-bias elimination ability of LLMs, our debiasing method relies on adjusting the probability of the output, which may be inaccessible in some proprietary models. As a result, our method cannot be applied to some closed-source models.

## References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, and 1 others. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Panatchakorn Anantaprayoon, Masahiro Kaneko, and Naoaki Okazaki. 2024. Evaluating gender bias of pre-trained language models in natural language inference by considering all labels. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 6395–6408.
- Yejin Bang, Delong Chen, Nayeon Lee, and Pascale Fung. 2024. Measuring political bias in large language models: What is said and how it is said. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11142–11159.
- Jiali Cheng and Hadi Amiri. 2024. Fairflow: Mitigating dataset biases through undecided learning for natural language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 21960–21975.
- Sunipa Dev, Tao Li, Jeff M Phillips, and Vivek Srikrumar. 2020. On measuring and mitigating biased inferences of word embeddings. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 7659–7666.
- Li Du, Xiao Ding, Zhouhao Sun, Ting Liu, Bing Qin, and Jingshuo Liu. 2023. Towards stable natural language understanding via information entropy guided debiasing. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2868–2882.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Yu Fei, Yifan Hou, Zeming Chen, and Antoine Bosselut. 2023. Mitigating label biases for in-context learning. In *Proceedings Of The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics (Acl 2023): Long Papers, Vol 1*, pages 14014–14031. Assoc Computational Linguistics-Acl.
- Suchin Gururangan, Swabha Swayamdipta, Omer Levy, Roy Schwartz, Samuel Bowman, and Noah A Smith. 2018. Annotation artifacts in natural language inference data. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 107–112.
- Anastasiia Klimashevskaya, Dietmar Jannach, Mehdi Elahi, and Christoph Trattner. 2024. A survey on popularity bias in recommender systems. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction*, 34(5):1777–1834.
- Marta Marchiori Manerba, Karolina Stanczak, Riccardo Guidotti, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2024. Social bias probing: Fairness benchmarking for language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14653–14671.
- Tom McCoy, Ellie Pavlick, and Tal Linzen. 2019. Right for the wrong reasons: Diagnosing syntactic heuristics in natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3428–3448.
- Nick Mckenna, Tianyi Li, Liang Cheng, Mohammad Hosseini, Mark Johnson, and Mark Steedman. 2023. Sources of hallucination by large language models on inference tasks. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2758–2774.
- Roberto Navigli, Simone Conia, and Björn Ross. 2023. Biases in large language models: Origins, inventory and discussion. *ACM Journal of Data and Information Quality*.
- Judea Pearl. 2009. *Causality*. Cambridge university press.
- Sara Rajaei, Yadollah Yaghoobzadeh, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar. 2022. Looking at the overlooked: An analysis on the word-overlap bias in natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10605–10616.
- Timo Schick, Sahana Udupa, and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. Self-diagnosis and self-debiasing: A proposal for reducing corpus-based bias in nlp. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:1408–1424.
- Julius Steen and Katja Markert. 2024. Bias in news summarization: Measures, pitfalls and corpora. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 5962–5983.

Zechen Sun, Yisheng Xiao, Juntao Li, Yixin Ji, Wenliang Chen, and Min Zhang. 2024a. Exploring and mitigating shortcut learning for generative large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 joint international conference on computational linguistics, language resources and evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 6883–6893.

Zhouhao Sun, Li Du, Xiao Ding, Yixuan Ma, Yang Zhao, Kaitao Qiu, Ting Liu, and Bing Qin. 2024b. Causal-guided active learning for debiasing large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14455–14469.

Gemma Team, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Rivière, and 1 others. 2025. Gemma 3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19786*.

Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R Bowman. 2018. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. In *NAACL-HLT*.

An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, and 1 others. 2024a. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.

Nakyeong Yang, Taegwan Kang, Stanley Jungkyu Choi, Honglak Lee, and Kyomin Jung. 2024b. Mitigating biases for instruction-following language models via bias neurons elimination. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9061–9073.

Shuo Yang, Bardh Prenkaj, and Gjergji Kasneci. 2025. Razor: Sharpening knowledge by cutting bias with unsupervised text rewriting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhonghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2023. *Judging LLM-as-a-judge with MT-bench and chatbot arena*. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.

Han Zhou, Xingchen Wan, Lev Proleev, Diana Mincu, Jilin Chen, Katherine Heller, and Subhrajit Roy. 2024a. Batch calibration: Rethinking calibration for in-context learning and prompt engineering. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Hanzhang Zhou, Zijian Feng, Zixiao Zhu, Junlang Qian, and Kezhi Mao. 2024b. Unibias: Unveiling and mitigating llm bias through internal attention and fn manipulation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pages 102173–102196. Curran Associates, Inc.

Yuhang Zhou, Paiheng Xu, Xiaoyu Liu, Bang An, Wei Ai, and Furong Huang. 2024c. Explore spurious correlations at the concept level in language models for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 478–492.

Yuqing Zhou, Ruixiang Tang, Ziyu Yao, and Ziwei Zhu. 2024d. Navigating the shortcut maze: A comprehensive analysis of shortcut learning in text classification by language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 2586–2614.

Premise	Hypothesis
$N_1$ is a $P_1$ , $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ is a $P_1$ . He $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ , a $P_1$ by trade, $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ , a $P_1$ by trade. he $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ works as a $P_1$ , $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ works as a $P_1$ . He $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ , recognized as a $P_1$ , $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .
$N_1$ is recognized as a $P_1$ . He $V_1$ .	He $S_1$ $V_2$ .

Table 6: This table presents six examples in our constructed benchmark.

## A Templates

We provide the templates that are used for constructing out benchmark in Table 6.

## B Speculative Vocabulary

Here we provide the full list of the speculative vocabulary that are used for constructing our benchmark, including “could”, “might”, “probably”, “presumably”, “must”, “may”.

## C More Experimental Results

We provide the full experiments that includes Qwen3-8B in Table 7.

## D More Experiments about Bias Polarity Study

We provide the experimental results for exploring the bias polarity which is shown in Table 8. For the bias type of gender-occupation, we follow (Anantaprayoon et al., 2024) to devise datasets for experiments due to the difficulty in automatically extracting data containing this type of bias from existing datasets. For the other types of biases, we construct the dataset for experiments by adopting the same methodology as illustrated in Sec. 2.

## **E Prompts**

We provide the specific prompts used for zero-shot and few-shot experiments in Figure 5.

	GPT-4o		Llama3.1-70B		Gemma3-27B		Qwen3-8B	
Zero-shot	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias
Vanilla	84.5	49.1	80.5	38.0	82.6	40.8	77.9	34.2
DC	84.6	54.7	80.6	45.7	82.4	45.9	78.0	39.6
BC	<u>84.7</u>	<u>57.8</u>	80.8	47.6	82.6	47.5	<b>78.2</b>	40.3
Unibias	—	—	80.5	44.8	82.5	44.2	<b>78.2</b>	38.6
CAL	—	—	<b>81.2</b>	48.4	<b>82.9</b>	47.8	77.4	36.6
CMBE-3	<u>84.7</u>	57.6	80.5	<u>49.4</u>	<u>82.7</u>	<u>50.4</u>	<u>78.0</u>	<u>46.7</u>
CMBE-4	<b>84.8</b>	<b>58.9</b>	80.6	<b>51.8</b>	<u>82.7</u>	<b>52.1</b>	77.9	<b>54.8</b>
Few-shot	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias	MNLI	5-bias
Vanilla	85.4	51.2	83.9	42.1	84.4	43.9	80.6	43.3
DC	<b>85.6</b>	57.7	83.8	52.5	84.3	50.7	80.4	50.1
BC	<u>85.5</u>	59.3	<u>84.1</u>	55.1	84.4	53.1	80.6	50.5
Unibias	—	—	<b>84.2</b>	51.3	<b>84.6</b>	50.2	80.5	49.6
CAL	—	—	83.6	53.4	84.2	52.6	80.2	48.7
CMBE-3	85.1	<u>59.5</u>	83.8	<u>56.3</u>	<u>84.5</u>	<u>56.6</u>	<u>80.7</u>	<u>52.1</u>
CMBE-4	85.2	<b>60.7</b>	84.0	<b>57.2</b>	<u>84.5</u>	<b>58.3</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>53.7</b>

Table 7: Comparison of CMBE with baselines across four LLMs. Best in bold, second with an underline. — denotes that this method is inapplicable to ChatGPT-4o-latest due to the requirement for internal representations of the model.

ChatGPT-4o-latest	entailment	neutral	contradiction
low lexical overlap	30.3	<b>37.5</b>	32.2
high lexical overlap	<b>40.9</b>	24.6	34.5
label distribution	33.3	33.3	33.3
ChatGPT-4o-latest	entailment	neutral	contradiction
speculative word exists	<b>40.1</b>	27.7	32.2
speculative word absents	32.8	34.8	32.4
label distribution	33.3	33.3	33.3
ChatGPT-4o-latest	entailment	neutral	contradiction
high semantic similarity	<b>40.3</b>	27.2	32.5
low semantic similarity	30.6	<b>37.6</b>	31.8
label distribution	33.3	33.3	33.3
ChatGPT-4o-latest	entailment	neutral	contradiction
male with male-biased occupations	<b>53.8</b>	11.5	34.7
male with female-biased occupations	33.7	16.1	<b>51.2</b>
label distribution	33.3	33.3	33.3

Table 8: This table presents the distribution of the predicted labels by ChatGPT-4o-latest and in the dataset.



<p><b>Zero-shot:</b> Examine the pair of sentences and determine if they exhibit entailment, neutral, or contradiction. Answer with either 'entailment', 'neutral', or 'contradiction':</p>
<p><b>Few-shot 1:</b> Examine the pair of sentences and determine if they exhibit entailment, neutral, or contradiction. Answer with either 'entailment', 'neutral', or 'contradiction': Premise: I am asserting my membership in the club of Old Geezers. Hypothesis: I am proclaiming that I am now a member of the club of Old Geezers. Answer: 'entailment'</p> <p>Premise: Jon's feeling of age and weariness must have shown. Hypothesis: Jon had traveled longer than his body could handle. Answer: 'neutral'</p> <p>Premise: oh really it wouldn't matter if we plant them when it was starting to get warmer. Hypothesis: It is better to plant when it is colder. Answer: 'contradiction'</p>
<p><b>Few-shot 2:</b> Examine the pair of sentences and determine if they exhibit entailment, neutral, or contradiction. Answer with either 'entailment', 'neutral', or 'contradiction': Premise: uh i don't know i i have mixed emotions about him uh sometimes i like him but at the same times i love to see somebody beat him. Hypothesis: I like him for the most part, but would still enjoy seeing someone beat him. Answer: 'entailment'</p> <p>Premise: The new rights are nice enough. Hypothesis: Everyone really likes the newest benefits. Answer: 'neutral'</p> <p>Premise: This site includes a list of all award winners and a searchable database of Government Executive articles. Hypothesis: The Government Executive articles housed on the website are not able to be searched. Answer: 'contradiction'</p>
<p><b>Few-shot 3:</b> Examine the pair of sentences and determine if they exhibit entailment, neutral, or contradiction. Answer with either 'entailment', 'neutral', or 'contradiction': Premise: New York Times columnist Bob Herbert asserts that managed care has bought Republican votes and that patients will die as a result. Hypothesis: Managed care bought Republican votes and patients will end up dead because of this. Answer: 'entailment'</p> <p>Premise: Dirt mounds surrounded the pit so that the spectators stood five or six people deep around the edge of the pit. Hypothesis: The hole is seven feet deep. Answer: 'neutral'</p> <p>Premise: There are many homes built into the hillsides; some have been converted into art galleries and shops selling collectibles. Hypothesis: All of the homes in the hillside have been converted into art galleries and shops selling collectibles. Answer: 'contradiction'</p>

Figure 5: Error rates of three LLMs for each label.