

BMIKE-53: Investigating Cross-Lingual Knowledge Editing with In-Context Learning

Ercong Nie^{1,2}

Bo Shao³

Zifeng Ding^{1,2,4}

Mingyang Wang^{1,2,5}

Helmut Schmid¹

Hinrich Schütze^{1,2}

¹LMU Munich, Germany

²Munich Center for Machine Learning, Germany

³Technical University of Munich, Germany

⁴University of Oxford

⁵Bosch Center for Artificial Intelligence

nie@cis.lmu.de bo.shao@tum.de

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) possess extensive parametric knowledge, but this knowledge is difficult to update with new information because retraining is very expensive and infeasible for closed-source models. Knowledge editing (KE) has emerged as a viable solution for updating the knowledge of LLMs without compromising their overall performance. On-the-fly KE methods, inspired by in-context learning (ICL), have shown great promise and allow LLMs to be treated as black boxes. In the past, KE was primarily employed in English contexts, whereas the potential for cross-lingual KE in current English-centric LLMs has not been fully explored. To foster more research in this direction, we introduce the **BMIKE-53** benchmark for evaluating cross-lingual KE on 53 diverse languages across three KE task types. We also propose a gradient-free KE method called **Multilingual In-context Knowledge Editing (MIKE)** and evaluate it on BMIKE-53. Our evaluation focuses on cross-lingual knowledge transfer in terms of reliability, generality, locality, and portability, offering valuable insights and a framework for future research in cross-lingual KE. Our code and data are publicly accessible via the anonymous repository at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/MIKE>.

1 Introduction

Prior studies have shown that large language models (LLMs) acquire substantial knowledge in the pre-training stage and encode it in their parameters (Min et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023a; Zhang et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2024). However, this knowledge is static and needs to be updated regularly to remain relevant and accurate (Cao et al., 2021; Dhingra et al., 2022). Updating LLMs by fine-tuning them on texts with new knowledge becomes increasingly expensive as the model size is




Figure 1: Illustration of Cross-Lingual Knowledge Editing and MIKE. *th*: Thai, *en*:English.

scaled up (Dai et al., 2022), and cannot be done with closed-source models. In this context, knowledge editing (KE) has emerged as a promising technique for modifying the behaviour of LLMs in a targeted manner without compromising their overall performance (Zhang et al., 2024). Recent studies have drawn inspiration from the in-context learning (ICL) paradigm and explored gradient-free KE methods where LLMs learn from prompts and demonstrations without parameter updating. However, current gradient-free KE methods have primarily been explored in monolingual contexts.

In cross-lingual KE (Fig. 1), knowledge edited in a source language (e.g., English) is expected to generalize to queries in a target language (e.g., Thai) without interfering with other facts. Our work investigates the efficacy of gradient-free methods for cross-lingual KE. We introduce the BMIKE-53 benchmark, which evaluates cross-lingual KE across 53 diverse languages and three KE task types. We further propose MIKE, a Multilingual In-context Knowledge Editing method, and evaluate it on BMIKE-53 to show that this task can be

* The first four authors contributed equally to this work.

solved using gradient-free methods. A good KE method reliably feeds new knowledge to a LLM and enables it to correctly answer corresponding questions (*reliability*). The LLM is able to use the new knowledge also for answering semantically similar queries (*generality*), and to transfer the knowledge to related content (*portability*). Finally, a good KE method ensures that the response to unrelated queries remains unchanged (*locality*) (Yao et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b). Inspired by Zheng et al. (2023), we devise four types of cross-lingual in-context learning (ICL) demonstrations (Fig. 1), each aligned with one of the four goals, to enable MIKE to simultaneously achieve all objectives.

In summary, our contributions are: **i)** We develop BMIKE-53, a multilingual KE benchmark, by unifying the format of three tasks in English and automatically translating them into 52 languages. **ii)** We demonstrate the feasibility of gradient-free methods for cross-lingual KE by designing the MIKE method. **iii)** We investigate experimentally how factors such as demonstration formatting and linguistic feature similarity influence cross-lingual knowledge transfer performance.

Task	#Training	#Test	Q-Len.	A-Len.	#Lang.
zsRE	10,000	743	9.02	2.02	
CounterFact	10,000	1,031	5.97	1.00	53*
WFD	4,360	784	4.71	2.55	

Table 1: Statistics of BMIKE-53. Q/A-Len.: Average Text Length of Query/Answer. *: Refer to App. A.1 for more details regarding the language coverage.

2 BMIKE-53

2.1 Data Sources

BMIKE-53 is constructed from three monolingual KE datasets: **zsRE** (Levy et al., 2017), a Question Answering (QA) dataset extended and adapted by De Cao et al. (2021) and (Mitchell et al., 2021) for KE evaluation; **CounterFact** (Meng et al., 2022), which updates the knowledge items with *false* facts; and **WikiFactDiff (WFD)** (Khodja et al., 2024), which comprises real-world changes to a knowledge base. Both Counterfact and WFD are derived from WikiData (Vrandečić and Krötzsch, 2014), with each entry originating from a knowledge triple. BMIKE-53 covers a diverse range of knowledge, spanning from artificial to realistic. Altogether, BMIKE-53 covers 53 languages across three tasks (see Tab. 1). Fig. 4 in App. A.2 shows examples from the three datasets.

2.2 Benchmark Construction

The benchmark construction involves two steps.

Unifying Data Formats First, we unify the format of the three datasets to ensure consistency and compatibility. Each unified entry includes an edited knowledge item and four test queries. These queries evaluate reliability, generality, locality, and portability, respectively. The portability evaluation datasets for zsRE and CounterFact were created by Yao et al. (2023). For WDF, we extract a knowledge graph from the original WFD dataset, and perform one-hop knowledge reasoning in this graph to formulate portability queries.

Expansion to Multilingual Datasets We use the English base data from the first step to generate a multilingual benchmark by structurally translating each data entry into its multilingual counterparts. Following previous work (Nie et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023c; Beniwal et al., 2024), we use the Google Translate API¹ for the multilingual expansion. To maintain comparability with similar multilingual knowledge datasets like MLAMA (Kassner et al., 2021) and BMLAMA (Qi et al., 2023), we opt for the same language set.

3 MIKE

Our proposed method MIKE uses in-context learning for knowledge editing. The prompt sentence to the LLM includes a new fact and several demonstrations that illustrate how to correctly use new facts. The MIKE method is designed to address the following task.

3.1 Task Formulation

We are given a source language model \mathcal{M} , a query-answer pair $f = (x_s^*, y_s^*)$ representing a new fact, and a set of demonstrations $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ for the fact f (see Section 3.2). Also given is a set \mathcal{X}_s^* which contains x_s^* as well as other source language queries with identical semantics, and their translations $\mathcal{X}_t^* = \{I_t(x_s) : x_s \in \mathcal{X}_s^*\}$ into the target language using a translator $I^t(\cdot)$.

Now we consider a target language query x_t . $P_{\mathcal{M}}(y|x_t, f, C)$ is the probability which \mathcal{M} assigns to answer y given the target query x_t , the fact f , and the demonstrations C . $P_{\mathcal{M}}(y|x_t)$ is the probability assigned to y given the target query x_t only. The original answer of \mathcal{M} to query x_t is $y_t = \arg \max_y P_{\mathcal{M}}(y|x_t)$.

¹<https://cloud.google.com/translate>

Goal: The most likely answer of \mathcal{M} to the query x_t given f and C should be the translation of the fact answer y_s^* if the query x_t has the same semantics as the fact query x_s^* and, otherwise, the answer y_t obtained without knowledge editing. Mathematically:

$$\arg \max_y \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(y|x_t, f, C) = \begin{cases} I^t(y_s^*) & \text{if } x_t \in \mathcal{X}_t^* \\ y_t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

\mathcal{M} needs to understand the relationship between the target language query x_t and the source language query x_s^* to predict the correct answer.

3.2 MIKE Demonstrations

Demonstration Type Each demonstration c consists of a new fact $f' = (x'_s, y'_s)$ in the source language, a query x'_t in the target language and the correct answer y'_t in the target language. With in-context learning, the model can learn the proper relationship types from corresponding demonstrations, as shown in Fig. 1. We provide four types of demonstrations covering reliability, generality, locality, and portability.

Demonstration Selection We explore two demonstration selection strategies. The first randomly selects a fixed set of examples from the training set (**random**). The second retrieves the most similar knowledge facts from the training corpus to construct the demonstrations (**search**). Specifically, we use the pre-trained sentence encoder² (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) to encode the new fact f and the records in the training corpus. Based on the cosine similarity, we retrieve the top k semantically most similar facts from the training set and rank them based on the similarity.

3.3 Experimental Setting

We work with the instruction-tuned LLaMA3-8B model. Over 5% of the pre-training dataset of this English-centric LLM consist of high-quality non-English data. We use a zero-shot cross-lingual prompt without demonstrations as our baseline (prompt). We set the number of few-shot demonstrations to 8 for both, MIKE-*random* and MIKE-*search*. See App. B for implementation details.

Evaluation Metrics We use two sets of metrics to measure the cross-lingual KE performance: If the dataset provides both, the original answer

Task	Baseline	Reliability		Generality		Locality		Portability	
		F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM
zsRE	Prompt	45.2	11.41	44.99	11.21	22.15	1.31	30.75	0.36
	MIKE-random	54.57	23.92	54.53	23.84	24.62	1.81	36.61	2.65
	MIKE-search	51.1	15.65	51.04	15.62	25.48	2.24	36.27	1.7
CounterFact	Prompt	89.24	29.82	82.55	20.53	34.67	-7.02	27.18	0.02
	MIKE-random	92.51	38.47	89.04	30.55	21.76	-18.23	29.97	0.03
	MIKE-search	84.75	32.4	80.48	26.12	36.75	-8.95	41.66	7.81
WFD	Prompt	85.01	28.71	83.59	24.67	26.25	0.78	20.48	0.02
	MIKE-random	88.28	35.12	87.83	31.5	26.81	0.74	19.6	0.03
	MIKE-search	83.7	31.91	82.97	29.83	30.88	0.83	24.25	0.1

Table 2: Cross-lingual KE performance averaging on 52 non-English languages. **Eight** demonstrations are used in the main experiment. Metric details are in §3.3. Best results of each task are **bold**.

y_t^o to the test input and the updated answer y_t^* which takes the new fact into account, we follow Yao et al. (2023) and Zheng et al. (2023) and calculate the Perplexity Score (**S**) defined as $\mathbb{E}([P_{\mathcal{M}}(y_t^*) > P_{\mathcal{M}}(y_t^o)])$ and the Magnitude (**M**) defined as $\mathbb{E}(P_{\mathcal{M}}(y_t^*) - P_{\mathcal{M}}(y_t^o))$, where $[.]$ is Iverson’s bracket operator. If a dataset does not provide the original answer, we compare the predicted answers with the correct answers using the **F1** score and Exact Match (**EM**) metrics, consistent with prior work (Wang et al., 2023b,c).

4 Experiments

By evaluating the MIKE method on our BMIKE-53 benchmark, we investigate three questions in our experiments. **(i)** Is it feasible to apply gradient-free ICL methods such as MIKE for cross-lingual KE? **(ii)** How do various ICL demonstration settings influence the efficacy of cross-lingual KE? **(iii)** Does the cross-lingual knowledge transfer performance vary across languages?

4.1 Main Results

Tab. 2 presents the average cross-lingual KE results across 52 target languages on three datasets. By comparing two MIKE settings (*random* vs. *search*) with the Prompt baseline, we find that incorporating semantically similar demonstrations enhances the locality performance (e.g. 25.48 vs. 22.15 and 30.88 vs. 26.25), while in terms of reliability and generality, the random selection yields superior KE performance. These results align with results obtained in monolingual in-context KE scenarios (Zheng et al., 2023). Regarding portability, MIKE-*search* is either on par with or superior to *random*. The lower performance wrt. reliability and generality observed for search-based demonstrations could be attributed to the LLM’s tendency

²<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2>




Figure 2: Cross-lingual KE performance of a subset of languages with MIKE-random. (a) presents the average score across reliability, generality, locality, and portability. (b-d) show all metrics of each language on three datasets.




Figure 3: Correlation between linguistic feature similarities and cross-lingual knowledge transfer performance.
* : $p < 0.05$.

to misinterpret semantically similar demonstrations as relevant new facts. Therefore, it responds with answers from these examples. Since locality and portability test queries require different answers from the newly injected fact, they are immune to confusion arising from similar KE examples, and do not to a drop in performance.

4.2 Cross-Lingual Knowledge Transfer

Cross-Lingual Transfer Variance Fig. 2 shows the variance in cross-lingual knowledge transfer across various languages. Overall, certain languages, such as ka and ta exhibit superior performance, whereas others like la show poorer results. The disparities in reliability and generality are less pronounced than those in locality and portability, especially for CounterFact and WFD (Fig. 2(c,d)).

Correlation Analysis To investigate the variance in cross-lingual knowledge transfer, we associate it with linguistic typological features. To quantify the linguistic similarity between English and the target languages, we use language vectors as proposed by (Littell et al., 2017). Each language can be encoded as five vectors that respectively represent their syntactic, phonological, phonetic, phylogenetic, and geographic features. Following Nie et al. (2023) and Ma et al. (2024), we calculate the cosine similarities between the source

and target language vectors (Tab. 4), and conduct a correlation analysis. As indicated in Fig. 3, most linguistic feature similarities positively correlate with the transfer performance in reliability and generality except for geographic similarity in WFD. Conversely, these similarities negatively correlate with the performance in locality and portability.

5 Related Work

Traditional KE methods are primarily gradient-based. They either introduce additional parameters to train – as exemplified by MEND (Mitchell et al., 2021) and SERAC (Mitchell et al., 2022) – or they edit specific parameters of the original model, as demonstrated by ROME (Meng et al., 2022) and MEMIT (Meng et al., 2023). However, these methods have high computational demands and are difficult to scale. Recently, gradient-free methods, such as IKE (Zheng et al., 2023), MeLLo (Zhong et al., 2023), and ICE (Cohen et al., 2024), have been studied in KE for LLMs. Given the multilingual in-context learning capabilities of English-centric LLMs (Lai et al., 2023; Nie et al., 2024), such as LLaMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023), LLaMA3 (AI, 2024), and ChatGPT, the potential for cross-lingual KE appears promising. Recent cross-lingual KE work largely employs gradient-based methods (Xu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b; Beniwal et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2024). A notable gradient-free work is ReMaKE (Wang et al., 2023c), a cross-lingual retrieval-augmented KE method. However, their method is specifically applied to a rather special KE scenario – batch edit. In this setting, multiple knowledge pieces, such as the entire knowledge base, are edited simultaneously.

6 Conclusion

We introduce the multilingual KE benchmark BMIKE-53, and use it to demonstrate the potential of gradient-free ICL methods in cross-lingual KE.

Our experiments reveal that search-based demonstrations boost KE performance in locality and portability, while random demonstrations enhance reliability and generality. Moreover, we observed that linguistic similarities positively impact cross-lingual knowledge transfer performance in terms of reliability and generality. We hope that our work and this benchmark will inspire further research of multilingual KE in LLMs.

Limitation

This research concentrates on the application of gradient-free KE methods. While this approach has yielded significant insights, additional exploration of gradient-based KE methodologies within the context of our multilingual KE benchmark, BMIKE-53, could prove beneficial. However, these additional experiments are beyond the scope of this work. Furthermore, our current study did not specifically address the enhancement of cross-lingual KE performance employing the MIKE method. In the forthcoming research phases, our ambition is to delve deeper into optimizing cross-lingual KE performance. We aim to accomplish this through the refinement and improvement of the MIKE method, thereby further advancing our understanding of its potential in cross-lingual KE.

Ethic Statement

This research was conducted in accordance with the ACM Code of Ethics. The datasets used in this paper are publicly available. We do not intend to share any Personally Identifiable Data with this paper. Our project may raise awareness of these low-resource languages in the computational linguistics community.

References

- Meta AI. 2024. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>.
- Himanshu Beniwal, Kowsik D, and Mayank Singh. 2024. *Cross-lingual editing in multilingual language models*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*, pages 2078–2128, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Boxi Cao, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, Lingyong Yan, Meng Liao, Tong Xue, and Jin Xu. 2021. *Knowledgeable or educated guess? revisiting language models as knowledge bases*. In *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 1860–1874, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Roi Cohen, Eden Biran, Ori Yoran, Amir Globerson, and Mor Geva. 2024. *Evaluating the Ripple Effects of Knowledge Editing in Language Models*. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:283–298.
- Damai Dai, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Zhifang Sui, Baobao Chang, and Furu Wei. 2022. *Knowledge neurons in pretrained transformers*. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8493–8502, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2021. *Editing factual knowledge in language models*. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6491–6506, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Jeremy R. Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W. Cohen. 2022. *Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases*. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:257–273.
- Nora Kassner, Philipp Dufter, and Hinrich Schütze. 2021. Multilingual lama: Investigating knowledge in multilingual pretrained language models. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 3250–3258.
- Hichem Ammar Khodja, Frédéric Bechet, Quentin Brabant, Alexis Nasr, and Gwénolé Lecorvè. 2024. Wikifactdiff: A large, realistic, and temporally adaptable dataset for atomic factual knowledge update in causal language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 17614–17624.
- Viet Lai, Nghia Ngo, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Hieu Man, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, and Thien Nguyen. 2023. *ChatGPT beyond English: Towards a comprehensive evaluation of large language models in multilingual learning*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 13171–13189, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Omer Levy, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. *Zero-shot relation extraction via reading comprehension*. In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*, pages 333–342, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Patrick Littell, David R. Mortensen, Ke Lin, Katherine Kairis, Carlisle Turner, and Lori Levin. 2017. **URIEL and lang2vec: Representing languages as typological, geographical, and phylogenetic vectors**. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 8–14, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bolei Ma, Ercong Nie, Shuzhou Yuan, Helmut Schmid, Michael Färber, Frauke Kreuter, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024. **ToPro: Token-level prompt decomposition for cross-lingual sequence labeling tasks**. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2685–2702, St. Julian’s, Malta. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex J Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2022. **Locating and editing factual associations in GPT**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex J Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. 2023. **Mass-editing memory in a transformer**. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sewon Min, Xinxi Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. **Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work?** In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D Manning. 2021. Fast model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2022. Memory-based model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15817–15831. PMLR.
- Ercong Nie, Sheng Liang, Helmut Schmid, and Hinrich Schütze. 2023. Cross-lingual retrieval augmented prompt for low-resource languages. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 8320–8340.
- Ercong Nie, Shuzhou Yuan, Bolei Ma, Helmut Schmid, Michael Färber, Frauke Kreuter, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024. **Decomposed prompting: Unveiling multilingual linguistic structure knowledge in english-centric large language models**. Preprint, arXiv:2402.18397.
- Jirui Qi, Raquel Fernández, and Arianna Bisazza. 2023. Cross-lingual consistency of factual knowledge in multilingual language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10650–10666.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Biket, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenjin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Miaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. **Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models**. Preprint, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. 2014. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85.
- Boshi Wang, Sewon Min, Xiang Deng, Jiaming Shen, You Wu, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Huan Sun. 2023a. **Towards understanding chain-of-thought prompting: An empirical study of what matters**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2717–2739, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiaan Wang, Yunlong Liang, Zengkui Sun, Yuxuan Cao, and Jiarong Xu. 2023b. Cross-lingual knowledge editing in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08952*.
- Weixuan Wang, Barry Haddow, and Alexandra Birch. 2023c. Retrieval-augmented multilingual knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13040*.
- Zihao Wei, Jingcheng Deng, Liang Pang, Hanxing Ding, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. Mlake: Multilingual knowledge editing benchmark for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04990*.
- Yang Xu, Yutai Hou, Wanxiang Che, and Min Zhang. 2023. **Language anisotropic cross-lingual model editing**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 5554–5569, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yunzhi Yao, Peng Wang, Bozhong Tian, Siyuan Cheng, Zhoubo Li, Shumin Deng, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2023. Editing large language models: Problems, methods, and opportunities. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10222–10240.

Hanning Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Yong Lin, Yi R Fung, Qing Lian, Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Heng Ji, and Tong Zhang. 2023. R-tuning: Teaching large language models to refuse unknown questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09677*.

Ningyu Zhang, Yunzhi Yao, and Shumin Deng. 2024. Knowledge editing for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024): Tutorial Summaries*, pages 33–41, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.

Ce Zheng, Lei Li, Qingxiu Dong, Yuxuan Fan, Zhiyong Wu, Jingjing Xu, and Baobao Chang. 2023. Can we edit factual knowledge by in-context learning? In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.

Zexuan Zhong, Zhengxuan Wu, Christopher Manning, Christopher Potts, and Danqi Chen. 2023. MQuAKE: Assessing knowledge editing in language models via multi-hop questions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15686–15702, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2024. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

A BMIKE-53 Details

A.1 Language Coverage

BMIKE-53 encompasses a total of 53 languages. A comprehensive list of these languages can be found in Tab. 4. Additionally, the table outlines the linguistic feature similarities between each target language and English.

A.2 Data Entry Example

Fig. 4 shows the data item examples of BMIKE-53 for all three datasets.

B Experiment Implementation Details

C Full Results

We show the full experimental results for all three tasks in Tab. 5 (zsRE), Tab. 6 (CounterFact), and Tab. 7 (WFD), respectively.

Parameter	Value
Model	meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct
Temperature	0.6
Top-p	0.9
Max. length	4096
Num. of demonstration	8
Type of demonstration	Reliability, Generality, Locality, Portability
Proportion of demo.	1:3:2:2
GPU Type	NVIDIA A100-SXM4-80GB
Number of GPU	4
Running hours	72

Table 3: Experimental Implementation Details.

lid	language	Family	syn_sim	pho_sim	inv_sim	gen_sim	geo_sim
af	Afrikaans	Indo-European (Germanic)	84.94	81.83	69.10	50.46	86.84
ar	Arabic	Semitic	65.11	70.09	70.81	0.15	97.04
az	Azerbaijani	Turkic	52.00	81.83	67.86	0.19	96.96
be	Belarusian	Slavic	78.64	85.83	70.42	16.80	99.35
bg	Bulgarian	Slavic	85.78	85.83	68.38	13.73	99.01
bn	Bengali	Indo-European (Indo-Aryan)	58.36	76.30	74.38	12.71	88.96
ca	Catalan	Indo-European (Romance)	87.30	85.83	75.22	10.64	99.66
ceb	Cebuano	Austronesian	62.17	76.30	75.22	0.13	81.50
cs	Czech	Slavic	73.99	85.83	66.51	13.73	99.71
cy	Welsh	Indo-European (Celtic)	71.90	81.83	77.85	13.73	99.99
da	Danish	Indo-European (Germanic)	88.01	81.83	77.54	40.90	99.89
de	German	Indo-European (Germanic)	90.26	80.60	76.28	54.49	99.76
el	Greek	Indo-European (Hellenic)	78.31	95.35	64.76	15.03	98.96
es	Spanish	Indo-European (Romance)	82.16	85.83	63.83	9.71	99.59
et	Estonian	Uralic	77.35	85.83	66.94	0.23	99.45
eu	Basque	Isolate	62.36	85.29	56.88	3.33	99.76
fa	Persian	Indo-European (Iranian)	50.03	78.35	72.83	13.73	94.23
fi	Finnish	Uralic	71.08	87.05	70.00	0.19	99.19
fr	French	Indo-European (Romance)	81.18	75.28	74.09	9.71	99.93
ga	Irish	Indo-European (Celtic)	72.01	85.83	69.35	12.71	99.96
gl	Galician	Indo-European (Romance)	80.23	90.46	70.75	10.14	99.65
he	Hebrew	Semitic	75.15	72.55	64.37	0.13	97.16
hi	Hindi	Indo-European (Indo-Aryan)	61.63	78.35	70.91	12.71	91.10
hr	Croatian	Slavic	83.18	85.83	69.67	12.71	99.50
hu	Hungarian	Uralic	69.40	85.83	74.03	0.33	99.46
hy	Armenian	Indo-European (Satem)	63.03	69.66	68.73	19.39	97.23
id	Indonesian	Austronesian	72.66	90.92	75.58	0.12	79.16
it	Italian	Indo-European (Romance)	85.78	85.83	70.00	11.21	99.53
ja	Japanese	Isolate	50.03	66.77	65.40	0.19	85.65
ka	Georgian	Caucasian	68.50	66.93	62.93	0.19	97.09
ko	Korean	Isolate	55.29	74.65	70.94	0.33	86.93
la	Latin	Indo-European (Romance)	78.27	85.83	76.76	15.03	99.47
lt	Lithuanian	Indo-European (Baltic)	69.33	80.42	74.63	19.39	99.44
lv	Latvian	Indo-European (Baltic)	75.39	81.83	75.22	19.39	99.42
ms	Malay	Austronesian	70.49	90.92	72.49	0.15	80.49
nl	Dutch	Indo-European (Germanic)	92.43	81.83	72.24	44.51	99.96
pl	Polish	Slavic	78.64	85.83	65.29	15.03	99.63
pt	Portuguese	Indo-European (Romance)	84.24	90.46	78.68	10.14	99.68
ro	Romanian	Indo-European (Romance)	79.60	90.46	73.42	11.89	99.22
ru	Russian	Slavic	81.18	85.83	64.76	16.80	95.81
sk	Slovak	Slavic	82.16	85.83	70.66	15.03	99.55
sl	Slovenian	Slavic	80.59	85.83	75.58	15.03	99.62
sq	Albanian	Indo-European (Other)	79.60	87.05	72.49	33.48	99.19
sr	Serbian	Slavic	79.60	85.83	72.94	12.71	99.23
sv	Swedish	Indo-European (Germanic)	93.34	81.83	67.98	40.90	99.62
ta	Tamil	Dravidian	51.36	85.29	65.81	0.11	87.95
th	Thai	Kra-Dai	63.95	78.35	74.91	0.11	85.25
tr	Turkish	Turkic	50.68	81.83	66.59	0.14	98.25
uk	Ukrainian	Slavic	84.73	85.83	74.38	15.03	99.28
ur	Urdu	Indo-European (Indo-Aryan)	61.63	85.83	71.57	12.71	92.54
vi	Vietnamese	Austroasiatic	66.04	78.35	74.74	0.19	85.25
zh-cn	Chinese	Sino-Tibetan	71.08	72.55	69.73	0.33	88.42

Table 4: Detailed information of the languages covered by BMIKE-53. The right five columns show the linguistic feature similarities between the target language and English. syn: syntax, pho: phonology, inv: phonetics, gen: phylogenetic, geo: geographic, sim: similarity.

zsRE

```
"en": {
  "case_id": 23,
  "subject": "Chlorophyll Kid",
  "src": "Which fictional universe is Chlorophyll Kid part of?",
  "rephrase": "What fictitious universe is the figure of Chlorophyll Kid associated with?",
  "alt": "Image Universe",
  "loc": "nq question: the recipient of first jnanpith award was an author which language?",
  "loc_ans": "Malayalam",
  "portability": {
    "New Question": "Who is one of the founders of the fictional universe that Chlorophyll Kid is part of?",
    "New Answer": "Todd McFarlane"
  }
},
"th": {
  "subject": "คลอโรฟิลล์คิด",
  "src": "អាគចំនួល គិត បែងស្ថានអ៊ីងជោករវាងសមាជិកទៅ",
  "rephrase": "វាទេរួចគុណធម៌ទូទៅដែលត្រូវបានការពាល់សម្រាតិត្រូវ",
  "alt": "ស្បែកជាអ្នករវាងសាស្ត្រ",
  "loc": "ថ្វីរូបរាងរាជ jnanpith គ្រងរោកគិតដែលបានបង្កើតឡើងភាពណាតែង",
  "loc_ans": "ភាគខ្មែរតាំង",
  "portability": {
    "New Question": "កីឡាធីហែងនៃផ្លូវតែងជោករវាងសមាជិកទៅមិនគឺគិត ឬម៉ែនបានដោយខ្លួនទេ?",
    "New Answer": "គិតចំណុច មេគារន៍"
  }
}
```

CounterFact

```
"en": {
  "case_id": 46,
  "subject": "Maso da San Friano",
  "src": "Maso da San Friano passed away at",
  "rephrase": "Maso da San Friano's life ended in",
  "alt": "Vienna",
  "loc": "Lina Cavalieri passed away at",
  "loc_ans": "Florence",
  "portability": {
    "New Question": "What cultural aspect is Vienna known for that might have influenced Maso da San Friano's work?",
    "New Answer": "Art and music"
  }
},

```

WFD

```
"en": {
    "case_id": 18,
    "subject": "Kaive Parish",
    "src": "Kaive Parish is situated in",
    "rephrase": "Kaive Parish falls under the jurisdiction of",
    "alt": "Cēsis Municipality",
    "old": "Vecpiebalga Municipality",
    "loc": "Prode Parish is situated in",
    "loc_ans": "Ilūkste Municipality",
    "portability": {
        "New Question": "The population of the place where Kaive Parish is situated is",
        "New Answer": "16628"
    }
},

```

Figure 4: Data Item Examples of BMIKE-53.

Table 5: Full Results on zsRE

Table 6: Full Results on CounterFact.

Table 7: Full Results on WED