

# How Good are LLMs at Relation Extraction under Low-Resource Scenario? Comprehensive Evaluation

Dawulie Jinensibieke<sup>1\*</sup>, Mieradilijiang Maimaiti<sup>1†</sup>, Wentao Xiao<sup>2\*</sup>,  
Yuanhang Zheng<sup>3</sup>, Xiaobo Wang<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>XinJiang Technical Institute of Physics and Chemistry Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>2</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology, Xinjiang University

<sup>3</sup>Dept. of Comp. Sci. & Tech., Institute for AI, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China  
dawuliejnensibieke22@mails.ucas.ac.cn; {miradel,wangxb}@ms.xjbu.ac.cn  
xiaowentao8@gmail.com; zheng-yh19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

## Abstract

Relation Extraction (RE) serves as a crucial technology for transforming unstructured text into structured information, especially within the framework of Knowledge Graph development. Its importance is emphasized by its essential role in various downstream tasks. Besides the conventional RE methods which are based on neural networks and pre-trained language models, large language models (LLMs) are also utilized in the research field of RE. However, on low-resource languages (LRLs), both conventional RE methods and LLM-based methods perform poorly on RE due to the data scarcity issues. To this end, this paper constructs low-resource relation extraction datasets in 10 LRLs in three regions (Central Asia, Southeast Asia and Middle East). The corpora are constructed by translating the original publicly available English RE datasets (NYT10, FewRel and CrossRE) using an effective multilingual machine translation. Then, we use the language perplexity (PPL) to filter out the low-quality data from the translated datasets. Finally, we conduct an empirical study and validate the performance of several open-source LLMs on these generated LRL RE datasets.<sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

Relation extraction (RE) aims to discern the semantic relationship between entities within a given context, which serves as a crucial technology for transforming unstructured text into structured information, especially within the framework of Knowledge Graph development (Ji and Grishman, 2011). RE also plays an important role in various NLP applications, including schema induction (Nimishakavi et al., 2016) and question answering (Yu et al., 2017). In previous studies, neu-

\*Equal Contribution.

† Corresponding authors: Mieradilijiang Maimaiti and Xiaobo Wang.

<sup>1</sup>The dataset is available at: [https://github.com/victor812-hub/entity\\_datasets](https://github.com/victor812-hub/entity_datasets)




Figure 1: The construction process of a low-resource language (LRL) relation extraction (RE) dataset based on a high-resource language (HRL) RE dataset.

ral networks and pre-trained language models are widely utilized in the research field of RE (Ma et al., 2019; Li, 2021; Li and Qian, 2022; Wei et al., 2019; Alt et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2020).

Recently, large language models (LLMs), including GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020), ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022) and GPT4 (OpenAI, 2023), have attracted widespread attention within the realm of natural language processing (NLP), since they have exhibited exceptional proficiency in numerous downstream tasks, including machine translation (Moslem et al., 2023), question answering (Kamalloo et al., 2023) and information extraction (Kartchner et al., 2023). In the research field of RE, LLMs have also achieved remarkable performance in various domains (Wadhwa et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023; Asada and Fukuda, 2024).

Although the previously proposed RE approaches achieve competitive performance on high-resource languages (HRLs), they suffer from extracting the relations between entities under low-resource conditions. On the one hand, the con-




Figure 2: The detailed process of dataset construction.

ventional RE methods rely on large-scale labeled data, which are difficult to obtain for low-resource languages (LRLs) (Taghizadeh and Faili, 2022). On the other hand, LLMs also perform poorly on LRLs since there are much fewer pre-training data on LRLs than on HRLs (Lin et al., 2022).

Therefore, in this work, we construct the RE datasets for 10 LRLs from three regions (Central Asia, Southeast Asia and Middle East) by taking advantage of the multilingual machine translation and evaluator model. As shown in Figure 1, we first prepare the openly available English RE corpora (NYT10, FewRel, and CrossRE). Then, we exploit a multi-lingual machine translation model NLLB (Costa-jussà et al., 2022) to generate the LRL RE data. Finally, We further filter out the low-quality data from the translated datasets by evaluating the language perplexity (PPL). Moreover, we conduct the empirical study and comprehensive evaluations among several open-source LLMs on our constructed corpora.

The main contributions are as follows:

- We first constructed the 10 low-resource datasets from three regions: Central Asia, Southeast Asia and Middle East for RE.
- We conduct the comprehensive evaluations between LLMs for relation extraction task on our created datasets.
- We introduce an efficient evaluation sub-model to increase the quality of generated data effectively.

## 2 Background

Relation Extraction (RE) can be conceptualized as a specialized instance of Information Extraction (Grishman, 2012). Its primary focus lies in discerning semantic relationships between entities within a given context. The central objective of a typical RE configuration involves extracting meaningful triples from textual data. In this context, a sequence of tokens  $T = [t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m]$  is considered, a relation set  $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k\}$  and alongside two identified entities represented by spans:  $S_A = \{t_i, \dots, t_j\}$  and  $S_B = \{t_u, \dots, t_v\}$ . The resulting RE triples conform to the structure  $\langle S_A, S_B, r \rangle$ , where  $r \in R$ , and  $R$  denotes a pre-defined set of relation labels. It’s noteworthy that due to the inherent directionality of these relations,  $\langle S_B, S_A, r \rangle$  denotes a distinct triple capturing a different aspect of the semantic connection.

## 3 Methodology

As shown in Figure 2, we first employ a machine translation model to translate the original English RE dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{en} = \{T_{en}^{(n)}, \langle S_A, S_B, r \rangle^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^N$  into low-resource language (LRLs) to obtain the LRL RE dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{LRL} = \{T_{LRL}^{(n)}, \langle S'_A, S'_B, r \rangle^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^N$ . Then, we filter the LRL RE dataset using an evaluator to obtain the final dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{final\_LRL}$ .

Specifically, for each sample of the original English RE dataset, we first translate the text  $T$  and the entities  $S_A$  and  $S_B$  into the LRLs, and then we identify the positions of the translated entities within the translated text.

LLMs	Central Asia						Southeast Asia		Middle East		Avg.		
	Ug	Kz	Ky	Tg	Tk	Uz	Ug-p2	Kz-p2	Fil	Id		He	Fa
LLaMA	3.0	<b>11.2</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>8.8</b>	7.0	<b>18.7</b>
Falcon	3.4	3.8	4.6	2.8	9.0	6.4	<b>46.2</b>	<b>78.6</b>	6.2	3.4	3.4	4.2	14.3
BLOOMZ	0.8	4.6	3.6	5.8	2.4	3.8	5.6	5.0	5.8	1.0	1.0	4.2	3.6
Qwen	<b>3.8</b>	7.6	12.4	7.0	9.8	7.8	4.2	6.2	7.4	7.8	7.8	<b>7.4</b>	7.4
OLMo	<b>3.8</b>	9.4	11.4	6.6	11.2	8.6	5.0	5.0	8.8	7.2	7.2	7.0	7.6

Table 1: F1 score of different LLMs on our constructed LRL RE datasets.

The construction of the LRL RE dataset is facilitated through two distinct pathways, Path1 and Path2. Path1 directly translate the original English RE dataset into LRLs using the machine translation model. Path2 incorporated an additional step of translating into an intermediary language (Chinese) before translating into LRLs, aiming to explore the impact of translation chaining on data quality.

Finally, we use an evaluator to filter the translated dataset to obtain the final LRL RE dataset. Specifically, the filtering process can be divided into two steps. The first step is to remove the samples which are too long or contain illegal characters. The second step is to remove the samples whose text has a high perplexity. Formally, for each sample in LRL RE dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LRL}}$ , we calculate the perplexity  $\text{PPL}(T_{\text{LRL}}^{(n)})$  of the text  $T_{\text{LRL}}^{(n)}$ . If the perplexity  $\text{PPL}(T_{\text{LRL}}^{(n)})$  is higher than a threshold  $\tau$ , we remove the sample from the dataset. The final dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{final\_LRL}}$  consists of all the remaining samples in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{LRL}}$ .

Moreover, we conduct a thorough investigation of existing LLMs on our constructed LRL RE dataset, which aims to provide insights into the adaptability and efficacy of such models in handling LRL scenarios. In this case, we train the models using our constructed (LRL) RE dataset. The loss function during the training process is defined as:

$$L(\theta) = -\log P(r|T_{\text{LRL}}^{(n)}, S'_A, S'_B; \theta) \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta$  represents the model parameters.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Setup

**Dataset** Our original relation extraction datasets include NYT10<sup>2</sup> (Riedel et al., 2010),

<sup>2</sup><https://iesl.cs.umass.edu/riedel/ecml/>

FewRel<sup>3</sup> (Han et al., 2018) and CrossRE<sup>4</sup> (Bassig-nana and Plank, 2022). The datasets are translated into the following languages for respective regions: Uyghur (Ug), Kazakh (Kz), Kyrgyz (Ky), Tajik (Tg), Turkmen (Tk) and Uzbek (Uz) for the Central Asian region; for Central Asia; Filipino (Fil) and Indonesian (Id) for Southeast Asia; and Farsi (Fa) and Hebrew (He) for the Middle East region. For Uyghur and Kazakh, we use both Path1 and Path2 to construct the datasets. For other languages, we only use Path1 to build the datasets. We use “Ug-p2” and “Kz-p2” to represent the Uyghur and Kazakh datasets constructed using Path2, and “Ug” and “Kz” to represent the Uyghur and Kazakh datasets constructed using Path1.

In the dataset construction process, we employ the NLLB multilingual translation model (Costa-jussà et al., 2022) to translate both the text and entities of each data instance from the original dataset. Before the filtering process, the dataset contains approximately 705k samples per language. During the filtering process, we use the multilingual BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) to calculate the perplexity and set the threshold  $\tau$  to 20. After the filtering process, the dataset is reduced to approximately 317k samples per language, indicating a filtering out of around 55% of the data due to quality concerns. The detailed statistics of the datasets are shown in Appendix A.1.

**Baselines** We employ our constructed LRLs RE dataset to assess the efficacy of prominent open-source LLMs, gauging their performance in tasks associated with LRL RE. The evaluated models encompass LLaMA<sup>5</sup> (Touvron et al., 2023), Falcon<sup>6</sup> (Penedo et al., 2023), BLOOMZ<sup>7</sup> (Muen-

<sup>3</sup>[https://huggingface.co/datasets/thunlp/few\\_rel](https://huggingface.co/datasets/thunlp/few_rel)

<sup>4</sup>[https://huggingface.co/datasets/DFKI-SLT/cross\\_re](https://huggingface.co/datasets/DFKI-SLT/cross_re)

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/meta-llama>

<sup>6</sup><https://huggingface.co/tiiuae>

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/bigscience>




Figure 3: The perplexity (PPL) value of the Kazakh RE dataset constructed using two distinct pathways.

nighoff et al., 2023), Qwen<sup>8</sup> (Bai et al., 2023) and OLMo<sup>9</sup> (Groeneveld et al., 2024), each of which contains approximately 7 billion parameters.

## 4.2 Main Results

As shown in Table 1, we assess the performance of several large language models (LLMs), including LLaMA, Falcon, BLOOMZ, Qwen and OLMo, on our constructed LRL RE datasets. We evaluate the performance of the models using the F1 score metric. Experimental results show that LLaMA and Falcon showing notably superior performance, which can be attributed to their robust pre-training regimes and their capacity to adapt to the nuances of LRLs.

## 4.3 Comparison of Different Pathways

As shown in Figure 3, we investigate the effect of different pathways used to construct the datasets. Experimental results show that the dataset constructed using Path2 exhibits a lower PPL value than that of Path1, indicating higher fluency and quality of the dataset constructed using Path2.

## 4.4 Effect of Filtering

As shown in Table 2, we also investigate the effectiveness of the filtering mechanism by calculating the PPL value of the unfiltered and filtered datasets. Experimental results show that the filtering mechanism significantly reduces the PPL, which indicates that the evaluator played a crucial role in refining the datasets obtained from both Path1 and Path2 and there is a need for further refinement to ensure the quality and coherence of the translated texts.

Language	Unfiltered	Filtered	$\Delta_{PPL}$
<b>Kz</b>	15.37	7.27	8.10
<b>Ky</b>	7.29	7.10	0.19
<b>Tg</b>	9.09	8.02	1.08
<b>Uz</b>	23.99	19.50	4.49
<b>Id</b>	30.96	15.41	15.55
<b>He</b>	11.42	9.92	1.51
<b>Fa</b>	37.05	17.41	19.64
<b>Kz-p2</b>	10.12	7.11	3.02

Table 2: Perplexity (PPL) values on unfiltered and filtered datasets for various languages.

## 5 Related Work

Relation extraction (RE) aims to discern the relationship between two given entities within a contextual milieu. Early RE methods embrace pattern-based techniques (Barrière, 2016; Deepika and Geetha, 2021), alongside CNN/RNN-based approaches (Ma et al., 2019; Li, 2021) and graph-based methods (Li and Qian, 2022). With the advent of pre-trained language models (PLMs), a paradigm shift reflects in the widespread adoption of PLMs as the cornerstone for contemporary RE systems (Wei et al., 2019; Alt et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2020).

Although the aforementioned methods have achieved competitive performance under high-resource conditions, they show limited performance under low-resource conditions. Thus, previous studies have proposed various approaches to improve the models’ performance on RE under low-resource conditions. For example, some studies propose harnessing higher-resource data through methods such as Weakly Supervised Augmentation (Najafi and Fyshe, 2023), Multi-lingual Augmentation (Taghizadeh and Faili, 2022), and Auxiliary Knowledge Enhancement (Wen et al., 2023). Other studies exploit more robust models, employing techniques such as Meta Learning (Obamuyide and Johnston, 2022), Transfer Learning (Sun et al., 2021), and Prompt Learning (Hsu et al., 2023). Besides, Zhong and Chen (2021) propose a simple pipelined approach for entity and relation extraction on HRLs. Christopoulou et al. (2019) present an edge-oriented graph neural model for document-level relation extraction. Chen et al. (2023) propose an optimized method for relation extraction using distant supervision learning.

<sup>8</sup><https://huggingface.co/Qwen>

<sup>9</sup><https://huggingface.co/allenai>

## 6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a novel method to generate LRL RE datasets, which translates the original English RE datasets into LRLs and filter out the low-quality samples from the translated datasets. We also evaluate the performance of several open-source LLMs on our constructed LRL RE datasets.

## Limitations

In this work, we propose a novel method to generate LRL RE datasets. However, this method heavily relies on the machine translation model. If the machine translation model performs poorly when translating the English sentences into the LRLs, the entities in the text may not be correctly translated and thus the LRL RE dataset may not be correctly constructed.

## References

- Christoph Alt, Marc Hübner, and Leonhard Hennig. 2019. Improving relation extraction by pre-trained language representations. In *1st Conference on Automated Knowledge Base Construction*.
- Masaki Asada and Ken Fukuda. 2024. Enhancing relation extraction from biomedical texts by large language models. In *Artificial Intelligence in HCI - 5th International Conference*, volume 14736, pages 3–14.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. 2023. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*.
- Caroline Barrière. 2016. Pattern-based relation extraction. *Natural Language Understanding in a Semantic Web Context*, pages 205–229.
- Elisa Bassignana and Barbara Plank. 2022. CrossRE: A cross-domain dataset for relation extraction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 3592–3604.
- Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020*.
- Zhouwei Chen, Yujia Tian, Lianxi Wang, and Shengyi Jiang. 2023. A distantly-supervised relation extraction method based on selective gate and noise correction. In *Chinese Computational Linguistics - 22nd China National Conference*, volume 14232, pages 159–174.
- Fenia Christopoulou, Makoto Miwa, and Sophia Ananiadou. 2019. Connecting the dots: Document-level neural relation extraction with edge-oriented graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 4924–4935.
- Marta R. Costa-jussà, James Cross, Onur Çelebi, Maha Elbayad, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Heffernan, Elahe Kalbassi, Janice Lam, Daniel Licht, Jean Maillard, Anna Y. Sun, Skyler Wang, Guillaume Wenzek, Al Youngblood, Bapi Akula, Loïc Barraud, Gabriel Mejia Gonzalez, Prangthip Hansanti, John Hoffman, Semarley Jarrett, Kaushik Ram Sadagopan, Dirk Rowe, Shannon Spruit, Chau Tran, Pierre Andrews, Necip Fazil Ayan, Shruti Bhosale, Sergey Edunov, Angela Fan, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Francisco Guzmán, Philipp Koehn, Alexandre Mourachko, Christophe Ropers, Safiyyah Saleem, Holger Schwenk, and Jeff Wang. 2022. No language left behind: Scaling human-centered machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- S. S. Deepika and T. V. Geetha. 2021. Pattern-based bootstrapping framework for biomedical relation extraction. *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell.*, 99:104130.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4171–4186.
- Ralph Grishman. 2012. Information extraction: Capabilities and challenges. *Notes prepared for the*.
- Dirk Groeneveld, Iz Beltagy, Pete Walsh, Akshita Bhagia, Rodney Kinney, Oyvind Tafjord, Ananya Harsh Jha, Hamish Ivison, Ian Magnusson, Yizhong Wang, Shane Arora, David Atkinson, Russell Authur, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Arman Cohan, Jennifer Dumas, Yanai Elazar, Yuling Gu, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, William Merrill, Jacob Morrison, Niklas Muenighoff, Aakanksha Naik, Crystal Nam, Matthew E.

- Peters, Valentina Pyatkin, Abhilasha Ravichander, Dustin Schwenk, Saurabh Shah, Will Smith, Emma Strubell, Nishant Subramani, Mitchell Wortsman, Pradeep Dasigi, Nathan Lambert, Kyle Richardson, Luke Zettlemoyer, Jesse Dodge, Kyle Lo, Luca Soldaini, Noah A. Smith, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. OLMo: Accelerating the science of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00838*.
- Xu Han, Hao Zhu, Pengfei Yu, Ziyun Wang, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2018. FewRel: A large-scale supervised few-shot relation classification dataset with state-of-the-art evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4803–4809.
- Chiaming Hsu, Changtong Zan, Liang Ding, Longyue Wang, Xiaoting Wang, Weifeng Liu, Fu Lin, and Wenbin Hu. 2023. Prompt-learning for cross-lingual relation extraction. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pages 1–9.
- Heng Ji and Ralph Grishman. 2011. Knowledge base population: Successful approaches and challenges. In *The 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1148–1158.
- Ehsan Kamaloo, Nouha Dziri, Charles Clarke, and Davood Rafiei. 2023. Evaluating open-domain question answering in the era of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5591–5606.
- David Kartchner, Selvi Ramalingam, Irfan Al-Hussaini, Olivia Kronick, and Cassie Mitchell. 2023. Zero-shot information extraction for clinical meta-analysis using large language models. In *The 22nd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing and BioNLP Shared Tasks*, pages 396–405.
- Wanli Li and Tiejun Qian. 2022. Graph-based model generation for few-shot relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 62–71.
- Yunzhou Li. 2021. The combination of CNN, RNN, and DNN for relation extraction. In *2021 2nd International Conference on Computing and Data Science*, pages 585–590.
- Chen Lin, Timothy Miller, Dmitriy Dligach, Steven Bethard, and Guergana Savova. 2019. A BERT-based universal model for both within-and cross-sentence clinical temporal relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 65–71.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Mikel Artetxe, Tianlu Wang, Shuohui Chen, Daniel Simig, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Shruti Bhosale, Jingfei Du, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Sam Shleifer, Punit Singh Koura, Vishrav Chaudhary, Brian O’Horo, Jeff Wang, Luke Zettlemoyer, Zornitsa Kozareva, Mona T. Diab, Veselin Stoyanov, and Xian Li. 2022. Few-shot learning with multilingual generative language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9019–9052.
- Meng Ma, Weiyu Hao, and Pengfei Li. 2019. Combining position-aware CNN and RNN for relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 2nd International Conference on Algorithms, Computing and Artificial Intelligence*, pages 427–432.
- Yasmin Moslem, Rejwanul Haque, John D. Kelleher, and Andy Way. 2023. Adaptive machine translation with large language models. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation*, pages 227–237.
- Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, Lintang Sutawika, Adam Roberts, Stella Biderman, Teven Le Scao, M. Saiful Bari, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Hailey Schoelkopf, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Alham Fikri Aji, Khalid Almubarak, Samuel Albanie, Zaid Alyafeai, Albert Webson, Edward Raff, and Colin Raffel. 2023. Crosslingual generalization through multitask finetuning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 15991–16111.
- Saeed Najafi and Alona Fyshe. 2023. Weakly-supervised questions for zero-shot relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3075–3087.
- Madhav Nimishakavi, Uday Singh Saini, and Partha P. Talukdar. 2016. Relation schema induction using tensor factorization with side information. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 414–423.
- Abiola Obamuyide and Blair Johnston. 2022. Meta-learning adaptive knowledge distillation for efficient biomedical natural language processing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2022*, pages 131–137.
- OpenAI. 2022. [Introducing ChatGPT](#).
- OpenAI. 2023. [GPT-4](#).
- Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. 2023. The RefinedWeb dataset for Falcon LLM: outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*.
- Sebastian Riedel, Limin Yao, and Andrew McCallum. 2010. Modeling relations and their mentions without labeled text. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases, European Conference*, volume 6323, pages 148–163.
- Xia Sun, Chengcheng Fu, Suoqi Liu, Wenjie Chen, Ran Zhong, Tingting He, and Xingpeng Jiang. 2021. Multi-type microbial relation extraction by transfer

- learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine*, pages 266–269.
- Nasrin Taghizadeh and Heshaam Faili. 2022. Cross-lingual transfer learning for relation extraction using universal dependencies. *Comput. Speech Lang.*, 71:101265.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. LLaMA: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Somin Wadhwa, Silvio Amir, and Byron C. Wallace. 2023. Revisiting relation extraction in the era of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 15566–15589.
- Qiang Wei, Zongcheng Ji, Yuqi Si, Jingcheng Du, Jingqi Wang, Firat Tiryaki, Stephen Wu, Cui Tao, Kirk Roberts, and Hua Xu. 2019. Relation extraction from clinical narratives using pre-trained language models. In *AMIA 2019, American Medical Informatics Association Annual Symposium*.
- Chaojie Wen, Xudong Jia, and Tao Chen. 2023. Improving extraction of chinese open relations using pre-trained language model and knowledge enhancement. *Data Intell.*, 5(4):962–989.
- Haitao Yu, Yi Cao, Gang Cheng, Ping Xie, Yang Yang, and Peng Yu. 2020. Relation extraction with BERT-based pre-trained model. In *16th International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing Conference*, pages 1382–1387.
- Mo Yu, Wenpeng Yin, Kazi Saidul Hasan, Cícero Nogueira dos Santos, Bing Xiang, and Bowen Zhou. 2017. Improved neural relation detection for knowledge base question answering. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 571–581.
- Wei Zhao, Qinghui Chen, and Junling You. 2023. Llmre: A zero-shot entity relation extraction method based on the large language model. In *Proceedings of the 2023 7th International Conference on Electronic Information Technology and Computer Engineering*, pages 475–480.
- Zexuan Zhong and Danqi Chen. 2021. A frustratingly easy approach for entity and relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 50–61.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Statistics of the Datasets

The statistics of the original English RE datasets are shown in Table 3. The statistics of our constructed LRL RE datasets are shown in Tables 4, 5 and 6.

### A.2 Computational Cost for Constructing LRL RE Datasets

The translation process is conducted on a single NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU. For NYT10 (Riedel et al., 2010), constructing a RE dataset for a single LRL requires about 5-6 hours. For FewRel (Han et al., 2018) and CrossRE (Bassignana and Plank, 2022), constructing a RE dataset for a single LRL requires about 1-2 hours.

### A.3 Licenses of Models and Datasets

The license of the NLLB (Costa-jussà et al., 2022) model is CC-BY-NC-4.0. The license of the LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023) model is available at <https://huggingface.co/huggyllama/llama-7b/blob/main/LICENSE>. The license of the Falcon (Penedo et al., 2023) and OLMo (Groeneveld et al., 2024) models is Apache-2.0. The license of the BLOOMZ (Muennighoff et al., 2023) model is available at <https://huggingface.co/spaces/bigscience/license>. The license of the Qwen (Bai et al., 2023) model is available at <https://github.com/QwenLM/Qwen/blob/main/Tongyi%20Qianwen%20LICENSE%20AGREEMENT>. The license of the FewRel (Han et al., 2018) dataset is MIT. The license of the NYT10 (Riedel et al., 2010) and CrossRE (Bassignana and Plank, 2022) datasets is not available.

### A.4 Case Study

To illustrate the practical implications of our dataset construction methodologies, we present a case study involving sample outputs from both Path1 and Path2 in Table 7. The following table shows samples of the datasets along with the extracted entities and relations. These examples demonstrate the effectiveness of our dataset construction process in maintaining the integrity and context of the relations despite the complexities involved in translating to LRLs.



<b>Dataset</b>	<b>Train</b>	<b>Dev</b>	<b>Test</b>	<b>Total</b>
NYT10	522,611	N/A	172,448	695,059
FewRel	3,200	1,521	N/A	4,721
CrossRE	668	2,151	2,446	5,265

Table 3: Statistics of the original English RE datasets (NYT10, FewRel and CrossRE).

<b>Language</b>	<b>Train</b>	<b>Test</b>	<b>Total</b>
Ug	109,686	38,573	148,259
Kz	248,290	73,578	321,868
Ky	241,724	74,238	315,962
Tg	241,752	74,976	316,728
Tk	137,627	43,799	181,426
Uz	192,851	64,646	257,497
Fil	270,085	81,218	351,303
Id	416,770	136,163	552,933
He	225,249	73,964	299,213
Fa	203,060	61,230	264,290
Ug-p2	34,251	14,924	49,175
Kz-p2	79,201	28,813	108,014

Table 4: Statistics of the LRL RE datasets derived from the NYT10 dataset.

<b>Language</b>	<b>Unsup</b>	<b>Wiki</b>	<b>NYT</b>	<b>Pubmed</b>
Ug	145	85	8	6
Kz	310	130	8	15
Ky	349	134	7	12
Tg	296	55	14	13
Tk	338	60	12	8
Uz	355	67	17	12
Fil	611	32	26	7
Id	876	193	46	24
He	277	173	15	8
Fa	482	177	5	15
Ug-p2	37	11	0	0
Kz-p2	2	4	0	0

Table 5: Statistics of the LRL RE datasets derived from the FewRel dataset.

<b>Language</b>	<b>AI</b>	<b>Literature</b>	<b>Music</b>	<b>News</b>	<b>Politics</b>	<b>Science</b>
Ug	57	17	6	411	10	31
Kz	60	41	20	442	26	94
Ky	72	37	16	463	25	83
Tg	79	38	11	472	25	78
Tk	65	22	5	460	11	57
Uz	96	42	12	491	33	57
Fil	105	36	41	531	38	98
Id	210	136	63	608	151	223
He	70	60	11	494	21	56
Fa	141	63	21	469	58	93
Ug-p2	41	14	7	370	9	18
Kz-p2	72	33	19	423	21	69

Table 6: Statistics of the LRL RE datasets derived from the CrossRE dataset.

Path	Text Example	Extracted Entities	Relation
Path1	Ассоциация өкілдері Ксавье Ниельдің 2002 жылы құрған Free компаниясы туралы айтты; бұл Франциядағы "Orange" дан кейінгі екінші ірі интернет-ұйым.	{"Франция", "Париж"}	"location"
Path2	Технологиялық жетістіктер жайында әңгіме болды; мысалы, 2002 жылы Парижде Xavier Niel Free компаниясын құрып, Франциядағы екінші ірі интернет-қызметін бастады.	{"Франция", "Париж"}	"location"

Table 7: Sample Outputs from Path1 and Path2.