

Bridging Causal Discovery and Large Language Models: A Comprehensive Survey of Integrative Approaches and Future Directions

Guangya Wan¹, Yuqi Wu², Mengxuan Hu¹, Zhixuan Chu³, Sheng Li¹

¹School of Data Science, University of Virginia

²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Alberta

³Ant Group

{wxr9et,qtq7su,shengli}@virginia.edu, yuqi14@ualberta.ca, chuzhixuan.czx@antgroup.com

Abstract

Causal discovery (CD) and Large Language Models (LLMs) represent two emerging fields of study with significant implications for artificial intelligence. Despite their distinct origins—CD focusing on uncovering cause-effect relationships from data, and LLMs on processing and generating human-like text—the convergence of these domains offers novel insights and methodologies for understanding complex systems. This paper presents a comprehensive survey of the integration of LLMs, such as GPT-4, into CD tasks. We systematically review and compare existing approaches that leverage LLMs for various CD tasks and highlight their innovative use of metadata and natural language to infer causal structures. Our analysis reveals the strengths and potential of LLMs in both enhancing traditional CD methods and as an imperfect expert, alongside the challenges and limitations inherent in current practices. Furthermore, we identify gaps in the literature and propose future research directions aimed at harnessing the full potential of LLMs in causality research. To our knowledge, this is the first survey to offer a unified and detailed examination of the synergy between LLMs and CD, setting the stage for future advancements in the field.

1 Introduction

Causal Discovery (CD) is crucial in both society and academia and offers insights for policy-making, scientific research, and technological advancements. In healthcare, for example, CD methods can identify potential causal relationships between lifestyle choices and health outcomes. In economics, understanding causality is essential for effective interventions and measuring the impact of policy changes.

The emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT marks a transformative phase in various sectors [Milano *et al.*, 2023; Yang *et al.*, 2023; Wang *et al.*, 2023b; Jin *et al.*, 2023a; Liu *et al.*, 2023c; Zhang *et al.*, 2023b], including AI-aided content generation and search, which propels us towards a new frontier in artificial general intelligence. Distinct from traditional CD algorithms which mostly rely on data itself, LLMs offer an innovative method

for CD. They deduce causal structures through the interpretation of metadata such as variable names. This approach holds the promise of reducing the extensive expertise and labor traditionally required [Long *et al.*, 2023].

The integration of LLMs into CD tasks capitalizes on their sophisticated understanding of language and rich knowledge base [Zhao *et al.*, 2023], derived from vast amounts of training data, to enhance knowledge-driven causal discovery. This synergy makes the CD process more efficient and also enriches analytical depth in observational studies. While existing research [Zečević *et al.*, 2023; Zhang *et al.*, 2023a], explores computational strategies in CD and the capabilities of LLMs, it often does not provide an exhaustive overview of the most recent advancements in integrating LLMs with CD. Many surveys concentrate on either LLMs [Zhao *et al.*, 2023] or CD [Author, 2019] independently, without bridging the gap between these two fields.

Compared to previously mentioned surveys and works, our survey is the first comprehensive review that investigates LLMs' capabilities with CD tasks. We first offer a detailed background, define the problem settings, analyze and synthesize the latest methodologies, and reflect on emerging challenges and prospective research paths. This work aims to provide a holistic understanding of the potential and complexities at the intersection of LLMs and CD. Our analysis highlights the underexplored potential of LLMs in enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of CD tasks, establishing a foundation for future explorations that could significantly impact both theoretical research and practical applications.

2 Background

This section provides a comprehensive overview of the foundational concepts and methodologies that underpin the research surveyed in this paper. It delves into the essential theoretical frameworks and tools that are instrumental in advancing our understanding of causal inference, CD, and the innovative applications of large language models (LLMs). By exploring these areas, we lay the groundwork for the subsequent discussions on how LLMs can be effectively integrated into causal analysis and the novel techniques that facilitate this integration. The section begins with basic notations and definitions, essential for comprehending the subsequent content on causal models, CD problems, and the emerging capabilities of LLMs.

2.1 Notation and Definitions

In our notation, capital letters represent mathematical objects, such as a random variable X , and capital boldface letters denote collections of objects, like a set \mathbf{X} . A graph $G = (V, E)$ consists of a finite set of vertices V and a finite set of edges $E \subseteq V \times V$. In a directed graph, an edge $X \rightarrow Y$ indicates a directed relationship, distinct from $Y \rightarrow X$.

A path in a graph is a sequence of connected vertices, and a cycle occurs when a path starts and ends at the same vertex. A Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) is a directed graph with no cycles, which plays and it's most often used to represent causal structures.

2.2 Causal Model

Causal modeling is pivotal in understanding the complexity of cause-effect relationships within various systems. These models are necessary in identifying how changes in one variable may influence other variables, forming the backbone for any subsequent causal analysis, including effect inference [Kuang *et al.*, 2020; Guo *et al.*, 2020; Yao *et al.*, 2021; Ma *et al.*, 2023; Li and Chu, 2023], prediction [Chu *et al.*, 2023b], or explanation [Wu *et al.*, 2023c].

Structural Causal Model (SCM). A Structural Causal Model (SCM) provides a formal framework for representing causal systems [Pearl, 2009]. It is defined by $M = (V, U, F, P)$, where \mathbf{V} represents the set of observable variables, \mathbf{U} being the set of unobservable variables, \mathbf{F} being the collection of functions that describes the causal mechanisms, and P being their probability distribution. SCM facilitates a structured model approach to the interplay between different system variables, delineating clear causal pathways and relationships [Pearl, 2009].

Bayesian Network (BN). In parallel, a Bayesian Network (BN) B is conceptualized as a triple (G, \mathbf{X}, p) , where $G = (V, E)$ constitutes a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) [Pearl, 2009]. This graph comprises a set of nodes \mathbf{V} and a set of edges $E \subset \mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{V}$, structuring the causal relationships in a directed manner. The set $\mathbf{X} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ represents a collection of random variables, each corresponding to a node in \mathbf{V} . Within this framework, p symbolizes the joint distribution of these variables. A key assumption in Bayesian Networks, the faithfulness assumption, stipulates that the distribution p only embodies the independence conditions manifest in G . This assumption is also adopted in the context of this paper, ensuring that the BN accurately mirrors the underlying causal structure.

Conditional Independence Tests. Conditional independence tests are statistical procedures used to determine whether two random variables are independent of each other, given the value of one or more other variables. Formally, two variables X and Y are conditionally independent given a variable Z if and only if the conditional probability distribution of X given Z is the same as the conditional probability distribution of X given both Y and Z . This can be mathematically represented as follows:

$$P(X|Z) = P(X|Y, Z) \quad (1)$$

These tests are crucial in the field of causal inference and in the construction of graphical models, such as Bayesian

Networks, where understanding the conditional dependencies between variables is essential for modeling the underlying causal relationships.

2.3 Causal Discovery and Structure Learning

Causal Discovery and Structure Learning are fundamentally intertwined concepts that address the identification and refinement of causal relationships inherent within a given dataset. Essentially, both terms describe the task of learning the causal structure, represented as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG), from observational data. This involves a set of variables $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ and seeks to identify the correct causal graph G^* that best represents the underlying causal mechanisms.

The primary challenge in CD lies in the vastness of the DAG space and the Markov equivalence class problem, where multiple graphs may be consistent with the same data distribution, making it difficult to identify the true causal graph from observational data alone [Pearl, 2009; Author, 2019]. Additionally, issues of data sparsity and incomplete data further complicate the accurate identification of causal links.

Causal discovery methods, therefore, can be broadly categorized into two main approaches:

1. **Constraint-based methods**, such as the PC Algorithm, systematically perform conditional independence tests between variables to infer the presence or absence of causal relations. This approach relies on statistical tests to construct a graph that represents the causal structure, working under the assumptions of causal sufficiency and the faithfulness condition [Author, 2019].
2. **Score-based methods**, for example, the Bayesian Dirichlet Equivalent (BDeu) score, uses a scoring function to evaluate how well a proposed graph explains the observed data while penalizing model complexity. The BDeu score, favoured for its application in Bayesian network models, assesses the fit of a causal model by incorporating prior beliefs about model parameters and is particularly effective with discrete data and limited samples [Author, 2019].

The most common metric for CD tasks is structural hamming distance (SHD), which quantifies the difference between the learned graph and the true causal graph by counting the required edge additions, deletions, or reversals [Tsamardinos *et al.*, 2006]. Such metric provides a way to quantitatively assess the accuracy of CD methods in identifying the true causal structure and is also used in most current literature that studies the intersection of LLMs and CD.

2.4 Large Language Model

Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT-4 by OpenAI and LLaMA by Meta have recently made significant advances, thanks to the transformer architecture, to significantly improve natural language processing-related tasks [Devlin *et al.*, 2018; Wu *et al.*, 2023a; Tamkin *et al.*, 2021; Chu *et al.*, 2023a]. These advanced models effectively handle complicated tasks by leveraging large datasets and user feedback to improve their performance. They go beyond basic language tasks like recognizing names or translating lan-




Figure 1: General Workflow of Pair-wise Discovery Tasks, adapted from [Willig *et al.*, 2022].

guages and have achieved SOTA performance on many related tasks.

LLMs are good at learning from context, making complex deductions, and working with external tools and databases. For example, GPT-4 can understand instructions given in the text and adjust to new tasks without needing to be retrained [Zhao *et al.*, 2023]. They can also reason through problems step by step, offering deep insights or summaries that show a strong understanding of the material and its context. Furthermore, the Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) model [Zhao *et al.*, 2023] shows how these models combine their language abilities with searching for external information, greatly expanding the knowledge they can draw on beyond what they were initially trained with [Wang *et al.*, 2023b; Chu *et al.*, 2024].

This progress highlights how LLMs have moved beyond simply creating text to become powerful tools for various uses, including solving problems related to understanding causes and effects.

3 Problem Formulation

In this section, we will briefly introduce two directions the current researchers are exploring when applying LLMs to solve CD tasks.

3.1 Pair-wise Discovery

The task of identifying pairwise causal connections [Hoyer *et al.*, 2008] typically focuses on unveiling the causal relationships between two variables using collected data. In the setting of integrating LLMs with CD, it shifts from relying solely on data analysis to directly querying LLMs about the causality between variable pairs. Figure 1 illustrates the typical process of this task. Commonly, LLMs are engaged with straightforward inquiries, such as "Does A lead to changes in B?", where A and B represent the variables in question. This inquiry is posed for each variable pair in both possible directions (so both causal and anti-causal learning) to aggregate a comprehensive accuracy measure.

3.2 Full Graph Discovery

Causal Structure Learning (CSL), or full graph discovery, involves a comprehensive approach to identifying how different factors influence each other within a system [De La Fuente *et al.*, 2004]. Unlike the simpler task of determining causal connections between pairs of variables, CSL aims to map out the entire network of causal relationships. This problem is crucial because if we rely on pairwise discovery alone, we might miss the broader context of how variables interact, which might lead to incomplete or misleading conclusions. In full graph discovery, the goal is to detail every direct causal link,

ensuring that the structure accurately reflects the underlying causal mechanisms among all studied variables. This requires not just identifying if there is a connection, but understanding the direction and nature of every causal relationship within the graph

Iterated Pair-wise Discovery. When presented with a collection of variables, a natural approach it to generate a catalog of every conceivable pair of variables and conducting the pair-wise analysis repeatedly to obtain the final graph. In scenarios involving simplistic graphs composed of 3 to 4 variables, [Long *et al.*, 2023] demonstrates that Large Language Models (LLMs) can achieve notable precision in deducing the connections between variables.

Remark: In the context of graph discovery, each pair of variables can relate in one of three ways: $A \rightarrow B$, $A \leftarrow B$, or no edge might exist between them. The challenge extends to differentiating between direct and indirect causations within the network. For instance, in a scenario where the true connection is $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$, indicating both $A \rightarrow B$ and $A \rightarrow C$ might be acceptable in a pairwise analysis. However, for graph discovery purposes, positing $A \rightarrow C$ directly would be erroneous. This determination also varies based on the variables included in the graph discovery task. If variable B is excluded from the input set, then the edge $A \rightarrow C$ becomes valid and should be acknowledged.

Although Large Language Models (LLMs) may accurately infer causal relationships between pairs of variables to formulate qualitative causal statements, they might not effectively identify direct causal links among variables. Moreover, the computational burden of comprehensive pairwise variable analysis represents another challenge that is often overlooked. For a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) with N variables, the total possible direct connections is $\binom{N}{2}$, and considering the directionality of these connections, the number of potential directed edges doubles. Therefore, simply extending pairwise analysis with LLMs may not adequately resolve the intricacies involved in the full graph discovery problem.

4 Current Methods

In this section, we outline methodologies for identifying causal statements through the use of LLMs, categorizing them into Knowledge Driven Causal Discovery and Data Driven Methods. The former leverages metadata like variable names to infer causal structures directly, while the latter integrates LLMs into conventional CD algorithms.

4.1 Knowledge Driven Discovery

Traditional CD algorithm heavily depend on pre-existing knowledge about the system’s potential causal mechanisms. Differing from traditional CD techniques that analyze statistical patterns on data, LLMs introduces the concept of knowledge-based CD, which could leverage both general and specific domain insights. These LLM-driven methods primarily employ metadata, including variable names, to infer causal connections between variables without the need for direct data analysis [Kıcıman *et al.*, 2023; Willig *et al.*, 2022]. This section will provide an overview of the recent developments in this knowledge-driven CD methodology.

Table 1: A practical example of prompts with respect to the three-stage LLM causal discovery framework.

Tasks	Prompt
Pairwise Discovery	”Which is more likely to be true: (A) lung cancer causes cigarette smoking, or (B) cigarette smoking causes lung cancer?”
Conditional Independence Set Test	As an expert in a specific field, you’re asked to assess the statistical independence between two variables, potentially conditioned on another variable set. Your response, based on theoretical knowledge, should be a binary guess (YES or NO) and the probability of its correctness, formatted as: [ANSWER (PROBABILITY%)]. For example, [YES (70%)] or [NO (30%)].
Full Graph Discovery	As a domain expert, analyze cause-and-effect relationships among variables with given abbreviations and values. Interpret each variable and present the causal relationships as a directed graph, using edges to denote direct causality, e.g., $x_{i1} \rightarrow x_{j1}, \dots, x_{im} \rightarrow x_{jm}$.

Here is the most common setting of the problem: Given a set of descriptive texts $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$ for a group of variables $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, LLMs can perform CD after thoroughly comprehending the concept of each variable. We denote the identified causal statements as $S = \{(x_i, x_j)\}$, where (x_i, x_j) indicates that x_i causes x_j . One key to fully elicit LLM’s reasoning abilities is to carefully design prompts [Wei *et al.*, 2022]. Prompting LLMs with direct queries about the causality between two variables leverages their zero-shot reasoning capabilities, and Table 1 demonstrates this approach [Antonucci *et al.*, 2023].

To give a comprehensive summary of knowledge-driven methods in the current literature, [Willig *et al.*, 2022] pioneered the application of Large Language Models (LLMs) for identifying pairwise causal relationships. Following this, [Kıcıman *et al.*, 2023] advanced the field by directly querying LLMs to determine causal directions between variable pairs. A groundbreaking approach proposed by [LYU *et al.*, 2022] involves reimagining task-specific input-output learning through the use of natural language prompts embedded with causal narratives. This method replaces traditional training methods with zero-shot prompting, where LLMs are asked to differentiate between cause and effect without prior specific training.

[Long *et al.*, 2023] explored the use of simpler LLMs to analyze small causal graphs, focusing on their ability to accurately map out causal structures from evaluations of variable pairs. In contrast, [Tu *et al.*, 2023] tested the capabilities of more advanced LLMs like GPT-4 within a medical context, revealing varied accuracy levels in CD. Further research by [Antonucci *et al.*, 2023] has experimented with generating causal graphs through iterative queries, assessing their approach against a benchmark of biomedical abstracts with verified causal graphs. This method acts as a refinement tool for enhancing standard CD algorithms with additional textual data.

To improve LLM performance, [Kojima *et al.*, 2022] demonstrated the efficacy of providing in-context examples within prompts. This strategy involves presenting LLMs with examples of causal relationships, alongside explanations, to encourage chain-of-thought reasoning [Wei *et al.*, 2022]. Such prompting techniques aim to guide LLMs towards more accurate causal inference by mimicking human analytical processes.

Remark: While Knowledge-Driven discovery methods




Figure 2: General Workflow of Applying LLM on Conditional Independence Tests to Solve Constraint-Based Discovery Tasks. Adapted from [Cohrs *et al.*, 2023].

show promise for pairwise causal analysis, they encounter limitations in comprehensive Causal Structure Learning (CSL) that requires a deeper level of causal investigation [Tu *et al.*, 2023; De La Fuente *et al.*, 2004]. As a result, there’s growing interest in Data-Driven discovery approaches augmented with LLMs, which capitalize on both LLMs’ domain expertise and the empirical strength of traditional methodologies. This hybrid strategy offers a promising path forward for nuanced CD, merging the best of both worlds.

4.2 Data Driven Method

Recent developments demonstrate the potential of using Large Language Models (LLMs) as both priors and heuristic experts in conditional independence testing. This innovative approach can enhance various CD algorithms, paving the way for LLM-supported, data-driven causal analysis. We delve into two primary methodologies: Constraint-based and Score-based discovery.

Constraint-based

The idea of the constraint-based causal discovery algorithm is to leverage conditional independence tests to eliminate unlikely causal pairs of variables, and therefore make it easier to find the final causal graph. Research by [Cohrs *et al.*, 2023] explores integrating LLMs with the PC algorithm and proposes the chatPC approach, which represents a novel methodology that combines both the good side of traditional causal discovery algorithms and LLMs. Here is a brief introduction on the workflow of chatPC:

- **Conditional Independence Queries as Prompts:** It first transforms conditional independence tests into natural language prompts so that LLMs can directly under-

stand them. Then it uses them as an oracle to guide the PC algorithm in constructing causal graphs.

- **Performance Evaluation:** This work also conducts a thorough assessment of LLMs’ efficiency in executing conditional independence tests across different problems
- **Statistical Aggregation:** A statistical-based mechanism is proposed to gather responses from multiple LLM queries to enhance its overall performance.
- **Graph Examination:** An analysis of causal graphs generated using the PC algorithm with LLM oracle support shows them to be reasonable, validating the approach.
- **Conservative Answer Tendency:** Observations indicate a general propensity of LLMs towards conservative responses when compared to human experts, alongside evidence of causal reasoning within the models’ outputs.
- **Potential Mitigation of Traditional Limitations:** The chatPC approach is posited as a promising solution to circumvent the constraints of conventional causal discovery methods, paving the way for more automated and nuanced causal graph construction.

Score-based

Score-based discovery methods seek to identify the Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG) that maximizes certain scoring criteria. Given that real-world data often provide an incomplete picture, the resulting Bayesian Networks (BNs) may not accurately reflect true causal relationships. Here, integrating prior knowledge is vital for constraining the BN structure, thereby enhancing causality recovery. Scoring functions consider both the data’s posterior probability and the DAG’s prior probability.

[Long *et al.*, 2023] introduces a nuanced, pair-based prompting technique with a voting mechanism to ascertain dependable prior knowledge. However, its application to larger datasets remains unproven, likely hindered by the approach’s complexity and computational demands.

Furthering this discourse, [Ban *et al.*, 2023b] presents hard constraint methods that prune BNs conflicting with established constraints, refining the score-based algorithm’s efficacy. They propose integrating LLM outputs with score-based methods, using ancestral constraints to guide BN refinement. Additionally, a soft constraint approach introduces a fault-tolerance mechanism, allowing for the dismissal of constraints that significantly conflict with data, thereby fine-tuning BNs based on specific structural criteria.

The latest advancement, the Iterative LLM Supervised CSL Framework (ILS-CSL) by [Ban *et al.*, 2023a], merges LLM insights with CSL processes more directly, concentrating on verifying data-suggested causal links. This method signifies a substantial leap forward in combining LLM capabilities with causal structure learning.

Remark: Both constraint-based and score-based methods have shown potential in surpassing traditional CD techniques and purely knowledge-driven approaches. As this research area continues to evolve, exploring additional forms of LLM-derived prior constraints could open new avenues for inquiry, particularly in enhancing the synergy between CD and LLMs.

5 Challenges and Visions

In this section, we discuss some important limitations and challenges existing in current solutions, as well as some promising directions in the future.

5.1 Limitations

Symbolic and Mathematical Understanding

In causal discovery, the ability to parse and understand symbols and mathematical relations is crucial because these tasks often involve identifying and modeling the mechanisms that underlie observable data. This requires a tool not only to grasp the language in which data relationships are described (whether natural or mathematical) but also to deduce the logical steps needed to unravel these relationships. LLMs currently are limited in advanced symbolic reasoning and researchers observe LLMs can make mistakes in understanding assumptions which are necessary to find the existing causal solutions [Jin *et al.*, 2023c]. This limitation originates from the foundational architecture of language models, which are primarily tailored for identifying patterns rather than conducting algorithmic or logical operations. Consequently, these models are prone to computational and logical errors that could compromise the integrity of the outcomes. Furthermore, the essence of solving mathematical problems frequently necessitates non-linear thought processes, requiring the solver to engage in extensive, iterative reasoning steps that are not inherently linear in nature. Predominantly trained on a next-word prediction basis, language models are restricted to sequential output generation without the capability for retrospective adjustment or refinement of their preceding responses, thereby enforcing a linear approach to argumentation [Bubeck *et al.*, 2023].

Hallucination

Hallucination in LLMs such as GPT-4 represents a pivotal challenge that significantly affects their reliability and practicality. This issue is particularly pronounced in tasks demanding extensive domain-specific knowledge, where the models’ propensity to generate content that either distorts real-world facts (factuality hallucination) or produces inconsistent responses not adherent to the input instructions (faithfulness hallucination) is notably problematic [Huang *et al.*, 2023]. The roots of these hallucinations can often be traced back to various aspects of the training process, including issues with the training data itself (flawed information) [Onoe *et al.*, 2022; Lin *et al.*, 2022], the alignment and preprocessing steps [Sharma *et al.*, 2023], and the inference mechanisms employed, which may lead to imperfect or defective decoding strategies [Stahlberg and Byrne, 2019; Miao *et al.*, 2021].

The implications of hallucination extend far beyond mere inaccuracies, posing serious concerns for misinformation spread, especially in contexts where accuracy is paramount. For instance, [Zhang *et al.*, 2023a] conducted a study on causal discovery tasks where LLMs were asked to choose between two companies based on specified requirements. However, the LLM misunderstood the task’s objective and selected both companies in its response. Furthermore, when the LLM was uncertain about the answer to a question, it failed




Figure 3: LLM causality graph prediction by two different queries.

to inform the user of its limitations. Instead, it provided explanations about the entities involved in the question without delivering the correct answer. These mistakes often confuse the audience and are unacceptable from a user trust perspective. In areas where the stakes are high, such as healthcare, legal advice, or financial services, the consequences of hallucinations can be particularly grave, underscoring the critical need for ongoing research and development to mitigate these issues and enhance the safe deployment of LLMs across various sectors. These sectors, however, are often the key areas of interest for causal inference study. [Zhang *et al.*, 2023c; Liu *et al.*, 2023b].

Therefore, addressing the hallucination and generating a trustworthy causal relationship still remains a challenge in the current LLM applications.

Robustness

Discussions from previous sections have indicated that while many studies affirm the ability of Large Language Models (LLMs) to acquire causal inference skills, the robustness of this learning is still a subject of debate. As highlighted in [Jin *et al.*, 2023c] robustness test, changes such as paraphrasing or variable refactoring in prompts can lead to inconsistent or even contradictory responses from LLMs, despite the underlying meaning of the prompts remaining the same. In the task of predicting causal graphs, simply altering the way we phrase the question can lead to significantly different generated causal graphs. As demonstrated in Figure 3, we observe a notable change in the predicted graph by changing a single query word (from "cause" to "causality") in a simple causality graph between diet control, exercise and weight loss. This variation can be explained by decoding strategies that might interpret these variations differently. In the latent space of Large Language Models (LLMs), the word embeddings for "cause" and "causality" may be significantly distant from each other, thereby resulting in the observed differences in responses [Willig *et al.*, 2022]. Furthermore, the effectiveness of LLMs in CD is greatly influenced by both the quality and the volume of their training data. A lack of diverse and unbiased examples of causal relationships in this data can severely limit the models' capacity to identify and understand causal links in new datasets. Additionally, there is a notable balance to be struck between general-purpose knowledge and domain-specific expertise. LLMs trained in specific fields may struggle to apply their knowledge to CD tasks in

different domains, given the substantial variations in causal mechanisms across various fields. This necessitates domain-specific modifications to the models or their training data. Consequently, it is suggested that the data generated for these tests, being out-of-distribution compared to the training data of current LLMs, is a reliable benchmark for assessing their performance. When evaluating fine-tuned models, it is crucial to pair the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) test set with adversarial attacks to ensure a comprehensive assessment.

Causality Understanding

Besides the general limitations inherent in Large Language Models (LLMs), research has indicated that these models demonstrate a lack of understanding of causality in certain tasks. Firstly, LLMs are not capable of rigorously solving causality problems following formal causal inference practices. Some researchers offer a potential explanation, suggesting that LLMs circumvent the causal hierarchy. They propose that LLMs primarily learn correlations of causal facts from their training data, instead of learning to reason about causality [Kırcıman *et al.*, 2023; Willig *et al.*, 2023]. However, it is crucial to note that in causal inference, correlations do not necessarily imply causality [DeMarie-Dreblow, 1991].

5.2 Future Direction

Specialized LLMs

In the current CD tasks enhanced by LLMs, the integration of LLMs primarily unfolds in two distinct approaches: firstly, utilizing LLMs as causal experts to directly generate causal inferences through natural language understanding; and secondly, positioning LLMs as central agents that collaborate with existing causality modules to execute the tasks.

In the approach where LLMs serve as domain experts, the models must possess an extensive and nuanced understanding of the relevant field. Current research predominantly employs general-purpose LLM models like ChatGPT, which, though trained on a vast array of corpora including Wikipedia, can access a wide breadth of knowledge. However, such generic models lack in-depth, domain-specific insights. To enhance the domain expertise of LLMs, three promising strategies emerge. Firstly, the easiest way to reduce the effect of hallucination is through prompt engineering [Liu *et al.*, 2023a]. By deliberately crafting prompts that include contextual cues, background knowledge, and collaboration with domain experts, it becomes possible to guide LLMs toward generating more reliable, accurate, and domain-specific responses [Wu *et al.*, 2023b; Jha *et al.*, 2023]. Secondly, the inherent adaptability of transformer-based LLMs obtained from transfer learning or fine-tuning on specific datasets stands out [Liu *et al.*, 2023a]. For example, fine-tuning a pre-trained language model on a medical dataset could significantly improve its performance in medical diagnostic tasks [Ji *et al.*, 2021; Wang *et al.*, 2023a]. Thirdly, Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) offers a dynamic method for domain adaptation [Lewis *et al.*, 2020]. RAG works by enabling the generative LLM to pull relevant information from an external database like knowledge graph and database each time it formulates responses so that LLMs are aware of the newly re-

trieved domain-specific information. This approach, a subset of prompt engineering yet in a more autonomous way, effectively mitigates the issue of LLM hallucination by grounding the model’s responses in factual data [Shuster *et al.*, 2021]. In conclusion, the prompt engineering, the fine-tuning of models, and the application of RAG can markedly diminish the occurrence of hallucinations and inconsistency in LLM outputs, thereby furnishing LLMs with a deeper and more precise grasp of domain-specific knowledge. This enhancement is vital for CD tasks, especially those rooted in specialized fields such as medical causal inference, underscoring the necessity for LLMs to evolve beyond general-purpose applications towards more targeted, domain-specific functionalities. However, the trade-off between the degree of domain-specificity and general knowledge should be carefully considered since causal discovery tasks involve a broad spectrum of various specialized areas.

Causal LLM Agent

In considering the optimal approach for enhancing the functional competencies of LLMs, particularly in areas such as floating-point multiplication, causal reasoning, and symbolic reasoning tasks, a strategic question arises: Should we endeavour to directly train LLMs in these specific skills, or is it more prudent to integrate their capabilities with external Python functions or specialized modules? The latter approach, which aligns with the concept of LLM agents, appears to offer a more efficient solution. An LLM agent is a sophisticated artificial intelligence construct that leverages an LLM as its central control unit. This approach includes participating in interactive conversations, completing tasks, conducting analytical reasoning, and achieving a degree of independent functionality, as described in the study by [Xi *et al.*, 2023]. This strategy recognizes the fundamental nature of LLMs, which excel in identifying language patterns rather than engaging in logical or algorithmic reasoning, by treating the LLM as the central brain of a unified system, thus allowing the LLM to effectively coordinate specialized causal modules or APIs designed for particular activities. It then integrates the results from these different modules to produce a unified and insightful answer. This method leverages the LLM’s natural abilities in understanding and creating language while drawing on the accuracy and dependability of modules designed for specific tasks. As a result, this combined approach produces more robust and more precise answers by merging the LLM’s capability in language with the specialized knowledge of domain-specific modules.

New Benchmark Dataset

In addition to improving CD capabilities by enhancing LLMs, developing rigorous new benchmark datasets is crucial for driving progress in this area. For example, CLADDER [Jin *et al.*, 2023b] is a new benchmark dataset introduced for systematically evaluating the causal reasoning capabilities of LLMs. It contains over 10,000 in natural language questions algorithmically generated from formal causal graphs and queries covering all three rungs of the ladder of causation - association, intervention, and counterfactuals. Experiments reveal that CLADDER poses a difficult challenge for current state-of-the-art models like GPT-4, with the best performance

achieving only 70.4% accuracy and noticeable weaknesses in key aspects of formal causal inference. The fine-grained nature of the dataset enables a detailed diagnosis of exactly where models struggle in the reasoning process. CLADDER offers a principled methodology grounded in causal inference theory to assess whether language models can move beyond simply memorizing commonsense causal knowledge, toward algorithmic causal reasoning. This could bring us closer to passing a “mini-Turing test” for causality, albeit currently covering only a subset of possible queries and graphs. As models improve on this benchmark, it has the potential to greatly enhance reliability for real-world AI systems that need to handle causal claims and questions accurately across diverse domains like medicine, public policy, and economics.

Besides, the proposed benchmark dataset in [Zečević *et al.*, 2023] provides explicit ground truth causal graphs and associated natural language statements that directly expose LLMs to textual “correlations of causal facts”, the type of signal hypothesized to enable their causal paraphrasing capabilities. Then, they utilize the new benchmarks to investigate whether LLMs like GPT-3 have learned any actual understanding of causality or if their performance on causal reasoning tasks is solely based on exploiting correlations in their textual training data. They introduce a formalism called “meta structural causal models” that encode causal facts about other causal models in their variables. The central conjecture is that LLMs appear causal by leveraging correlations between causal queries and factual statements, making them causal “parrots”. Fine-tuning large models on this data could significantly improve their ability to correctly answer causal queries by better utilizing asymmetric vs symmetric question formulations. However, strong performance on this dataset alone would not confirm real causal understanding has emerged. True evaluation requires assessing inductive generalization beyond the training distribution, which remains an open challenge. Nonetheless, over time, larger-scale pre-training combined with causal fine-tuning may lead to substantially more reliable “causal parroting” behaviors, even if reasoning from raw data likely necessitates explicit architectural innovation.

6 Conclusion

Amid the challenges delineated, the fusion of Large Language Models (LLMs) with Causal Discovery (CD) tasks heralds a compelling frontier for progress in the field. Despite the present constraints inherent in either LLMs’ reasoning capabilities or integrating LLMs with traditional CD algorithm, the dynamic advancement of LLM technologies, allied with cutting-edge strategies in model refinement and evaluative benchmarks, portends a bright horizon. Embracing the combined strengths of LLMs and CD paves the way towards forging potent, precise, and efficient methodologies. Such innovations promise to demystify the complex causal networks that form the backbone of diverse domains, propelling us toward a deeper understanding and manipulation of the causal fabric that shapes our world.

References

- [Antonucci *et al.*, 2023] Alessandro Antonucci, Gregorio Piqué, and Marco Zaffalon. Zero-shot causal graph extrapolation from text via llms, 2023.
- [Author, 2019] Firstname M. Author. Review of causal discovery methods based on graphical models. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 10:524, 2019.
- [Ban *et al.*, 2023a] Taiyu Ban, Lyuzhou Chen, Derui Lyu, Xiangyu Wang, and Huanhuan Chen. Causal structure learning supervised by large language model, 2023.
- [Ban *et al.*, 2023b] Taiyu Ban, Lyvzhou Chen, Xiangyu Wang, and Huanhuan Chen. From query tools to causal architects: Harnessing large language models for advanced causal discovery from data, 2023.
- [Bubeck *et al.*, 2023] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Tulio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4, 2023.
- [Chu *et al.*, 2023a] Zhixuan Chu, Huaiyu Guo, Xinyuan Zhou, Yijia Wang, Fei Yu, Hong Chen, Wanqing Xu, Xin Lu, Qing Cui, Longfei Li, et al. Data-centric financial large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17784*, 2023.
- [Chu *et al.*, 2023b] Zhixuan Chu, Mengxuan Hu, Qing Cui, Longfei Li, and Sheng Li. Task-driven causal feature distillation: Towards trustworthy risk prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16113*, 2023.
- [Chu *et al.*, 2024] Zhixuan Chu, Yan Wang, Qing Cui, Longfei Li, Wenqing Chen, Sheng Li, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. Llm-guided multi-view hypergraph learning for human-centric explainable recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08217*, 2024.
- [Cohrs *et al.*, 2023] Kai-Hendrik Cohrs, Emiliano Diaz, Vasileios Sitokonstantinou, Gherardo Varando, and Gustau Camps-Valls. Large language models for constrained-based causal discovery. In *AAAI 2024 Workshop on "Are Large Language Models Simply Causal Parrots?"*, 2023.
- [De La Fuente *et al.*, 2004] A. De La Fuente, N. Bing, I. Hoeschele, and P. Mendes. Discovery of meaningful associations in genomic data using partial correlation coefficients. *Bioinformatics*, 20(18):3565–3574, 2004.
- [DeMarie-Dreblow, 1991] Darlene DeMarie-Dreblow. Relation between knowledge and memory: A reminder that correlation does not imply causality. *Child Development*, 62(3):484–498, 1991.
- [Devlin *et al.*, 2018] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [Guo *et al.*, 2020] Ruocheng Guo, Lu Cheng, Jundong Li, P Richard Hahn, and Huan Liu. A survey of learning causality with data: Problems and methods. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 53(4):1–37, 2020.
- [Hoyer *et al.*, 2008] Patrik O. Hoyer, Dominik Janzing, Joris M. Mooij, Jonas Peters, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Nonlinear causal discovery with additive noise models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 21, 2008.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2023] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*, 2023.
- [Jha *et al.*, 2023] Susmit Jha, Sumit Kumar Jha, Patrick Lincoln, Nathaniel D Bastian, Alvaro Velasquez, and Sandeep Neema. Dehallucinating large language models using formal methods guided iterative prompting. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Assured Autonomy (ICAA)*, pages 149–152. IEEE, 2023.
- [Ji *et al.*, 2021] Shaoxiong Ji, Tianlin Zhang, Luna Ansari, Jie Fu, Prayag Tiwari, and Erik Cambria. Mentalbert: Publicly available pretrained language models for mental healthcare. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.15621*, 2021.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2023a] Ming Jin, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, Zhixuan Chu, James Y Zhang, Xiaoming Shi, Pin-Yu Chen, Yuxuan Liang, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, et al. Time-llm: Time series forecasting by reprogramming large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01728*, 2023.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2023b] Zhijing Jin, Yuen Chen, Felix Leeb, Luigi Gresole, Ojasv Kamal, Zhiheng Lyu, Kevin Blin, Fernando Gonzalez, Max Kleiman-Weiner, Mrinmaya Sachan, and Bernhard Schölkopf. CLadder: Assessing causal reasoning in language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2023c] Zhijing Jin, Jiarui Liu, Zhiheng Lyu, Spencer Poff, Mrinmaya Sachan, Rada Mihalcea, Mona Diab, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Can large language models infer causation from correlation?, 2023.
- [Kojima *et al.*, 2022] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [Kuang *et al.*, 2020] Kun Kuang, Lian Li, Zhi Geng, Lei Xu, Kun Zhang, Beishui Liao, Huaxin Huang, Peng Ding, Wang Miao, and Zhichao Jiang. Causal inference. *Engineering*, 6(3):253–263, 2020.
- [Kıçıman *et al.*, 2023] Emre Kıçıman, Robert Ness, Amit Sharma, and Chenhao Tan. Causal reasoning and large language models: Opening a new frontier for causality, 2023.
- [Lewis *et al.*, 2020] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [Li and Chu, 2023] Sheng Li and Zhixuan Chu. *Machine Learning for Causal Inference*. Springer Nature, 2023.

- [Lin *et al.*, 2022] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023a] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9):1–35, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023b] Yang Liu, Yuanshun Yao, Jean-Francois Ton, Xiaoying Zhang, Ruocheng Guo, Hao Cheng, Yegor Klochkov, Muhammad Faaiz Taufiq, and Hang Li. Trustworthy llms: a survey and guideline for evaluating large language models’ alignment, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023c] Zhengliang Liu, Zihao Wu, Mengxuan Hu, Bokai Zhao, Lin Zhao, Tianyi Zhang, Haixing Dai, Xianyan Chen, Ye Shen, Sheng Li, et al. Pharmacygpt: The ai pharmacist. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10432*, 2023.
- [Long *et al.*, 2023] Stephanie Long, Alexandre Piché, Valentina Zantedeschi, Tibor Schuster, and Alexandre Drouin. Causal discovery with language models as imperfect experts. In *ICML 2023 Workshop on Structured Probabilistic Inference & Generative Modeling*, 2023.
- [LYU *et al.*, 2022] Zhiheng LYU, Zhijing Jin, Rada Mihalcea, Mrinmaya Sachan, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Can large language models distinguish cause from effect? In *UAI 2022 Workshop on Causal Representation Learning*, 2022.
- [Ma *et al.*, 2023] Jing Ma, Ruocheng Guo, and Jundong Li. Causal inference on graphs. In *Machine Learning for Causal Inference*, pages 53–78. Springer, 2023.
- [Miao *et al.*, 2021] Mengqi Miao, Fandong Meng, Yijun Liu, Xiao-Hua Zhou, and Jie Zhou. Prevent the language model from being overconfident in neural machine translation. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli, editors, *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3456–3468, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Milano *et al.*, 2023] Silvia Milano, Joshua A McGrane, and Sabina Leonelli. Large language models challenge the future of higher education. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(4):333–334, 2023.
- [Onoe *et al.*, 2022] Yasumasa Onoe, Michael Zhang, Eunsol Choi, and Greg Durrett. Entity cloze by date: What LMs know about unseen entities. In Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 693–702, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Pearl, 2009] J. Pearl. *Causality*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [Sharma *et al.*, 2023] Mrinank Sharma, Meg Tong, Tomasz Korbak, David Duvenaud, Amanda Askeell, Samuel R Bowman, Newton Cheng, Esin Durmus, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Scott R Johnston, et al. Towards understanding sycophancy in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13548*, 2023.
- [Shuster *et al.*, 2021] Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07567*, 2021.
- [Stahlberg and Byrne, 2019] Felix Stahlberg and Bill Byrne. On NMT search errors and model errors: Cat got your tongue? In Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan, editors, *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 3356–3362, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [Tamkin *et al.*, 2021] Alex Tamkin, Miles Brundage, Jack Clark, and Deep Ganguli. Understanding the capabilities, limitations, and societal impact of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.02503*, 2021.
- [Tsamardinos *et al.*, 2006] Ioannis Tsamardinos, Laura E. Brown, and Constantin F. Aliferis. The max-min hill-climbing bayesian network structure learning algorithm. *Machine Learning*, 65:31–78, 2006.
- [Tu *et al.*, 2023] Ruibo Tu, Chao Ma, and Cheng Zhang. Causal-discovery performance of chatgpt in the context of neuropathic pain diagnosis, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023a] Guangyu Wang, Xiaohong Liu, Zhen Ying, Guoxing Yang, Zhiwei Chen, Zhiwen Liu, Min Zhang, Hongmei Yan, Yuxing Lu, Yuanxu Gao, et al. Optimized glycemic control of type 2 diabetes with reinforcement learning: a proof-of-concept trial. *Nature Medicine*, 29(10):2633–2642, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023b] Yan Wang, Zhixuan Chu, Xin Ouyang, Simeng Wang, Hongyan Hao, Yue Shen, Jinjie Gu, Siqiao Xue, James Y Zhang, Qing Cui, et al. Enhancing recommender systems with large language model reasoning graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10835*, 2023.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2022] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [Willig *et al.*, 2022] Moritz Willig, Matej Zečević, Devendra Singh Dhami, and Kristian Kersting. Can foundation models talk causality?, 2022.

- [Willig *et al.*, 2023] Moritz Willig, Matej Zecevic, Devendra Singh Dhami, and Kristian Kersting. Causal parrots: Large language models may talk causality but are not causal. *preprint*, 8, 2023.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023a] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhajan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023b] Yuqi Wu, Jie Chen, Kaining Mao, and Yanbo Zhang. Automatic post-traumatic stress disorder diagnosis via clinical transcripts: A novel text augmentation with large language models. In *2023 IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference (BioCAS)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023c] Zhengxuan Wu, Karel D’Oosterlinck, Atticus Geiger, Amir Zur, and Christopher Potts. Causal proxy models for concept-based model explanations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 37313–37334. PMLR, 2023.
- [Xi *et al.*, 2023] Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864*, 2023.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2023] Jingfeng Yang, Hongye Jin, Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Qizhang Feng, Haoming Jiang, Bing Yin, and Xia Hu. Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13712*, 2023.
- [Yao *et al.*, 2021] Liuyi Yao, Zhixuan Chu, Sheng Li, Yaliang Li, Jing Gao, and Aidong Zhang. A survey on causal inference. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 15(5):1–46, 2021.
- [Zečević *et al.*, 2023] Matej Zečević, Moritz Willig, Devendra Singh Dhami, and Kristian Kersting. Causal parrots: Large language models may talk causality but are not causal. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023a] Cheng Zhang, Stefan Bauer, Paul Bennett, Jiangfeng Gao, Wenbo Gong, Agrin Hilmkil, Joel Jennings, Chao Ma, Tom Minka, Nick Pawlowski, and James Vaughan. Understanding causality with large language models: Feasibility and opportunities, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023b] Jielu Zhang, Zhongliang Zhou, Gengchen Mai, Lan Mu, Mengxuan Hu, and Sheng Li. Text2seg: Remote sensing image semantic segmentation via text-guided visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10597*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023c] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming Shi. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models, 2023.
- [Zhao *et al.*, 2023] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey of large language models, 2023.