
Educating LLMs like Human Students: Structure-aware Injection of Domain Knowledge

Kai Liu^{1,2*}, Ze Chen^{2†}, Zhihang Fu², Rongxin Jiang¹,
Fan Zhou^{1†}, Yaowu Chen¹, Yue Wu², Jieping Ye²

¹Zhejiang University, ²Alibaba Cloud

Abstract

This paper presents a pioneering methodology, termed *StructTuning*, to efficiently transform foundation Large Language Models (LLMs) into domain specialists. It significantly minimizes the training corpus requirement to a mere **0.3%** while achieving an impressive **50%** of traditional knowledge injection performance. Our method is inspired by the educational processes for human students, particularly how structured domain knowledge from textbooks is absorbed and then applied to tackle real-world challenges through specific exercises. Based on this, we propose a novel two-stage knowledge injection strategy: *Structure-aware Continual Pre-Training* (SCPT) and *Structure-aware Supervised Fine-Tuning* (SSFT). In the SCPT phase, we organize the training data into an auto-generated taxonomy of domain knowledge, enabling LLMs to effectively memorize textual segments linked to specific expertise within the taxonomy’s architecture. Subsequently, in the SSFT phase, we explicitly prompt models to reveal the underlying knowledge structure in their outputs, leveraging this structured domain insight to address practical problems adeptly. Our ultimate method has undergone extensive evaluations across model architectures and scales, using closed-book question-answering tasks on LongBench and MMedBench datasets. Remarkably, our method matches 50% of the improvement displayed by the state-of-the-art MMedLM2 on MMedBench, but with only 0.3% quantity of the training corpus. This breakthrough showcases the potential to scale up our StructTuning for stronger domain-specific LLMs. Code will be made public soon.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have recently seen extensive deployment across various applications [42, 1, 20, 6]. When adapting foundational models (*e.g.*, Llama series [39, 40, 2]) for specialized AI assistants in distinct domains [35, 13], developers usually employ two techniques to enhance LLMs’ proficiency: retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [25] and domain knowledge injection [14]. While RAG effectively utilizes an external knowledge base to augment information, the retrieval process’s inherent noise poses challenges to generating reliable responses[55, 8]. Thus, another avenue of research focuses on injecting new knowledge into models via training techniques [11, 18, 30].

Continual pre-training [37, 19] has been preferred for integrating new, domain-specific knowledge into existing LLMs [9, 44, 35]. Nevertheless, it often involves costly auto-regressive training on billions of tokens aimlessly curated from the internet rather than from precise domain-specific textbooks [21]. For example, MMedLM [35] curates 25.5B tokens to derive a medical model, and DeepSeek-Coder [13] uses 2T tokens for coding adaptation. The common failure to learn effectively

*Work done during Kai Liu’s research internship at Alibaba Cloud. Email: kail@zju.edu.cn.

†Corresponding authors. Email: zhihang.fzh@alibaba-inc.com, 0006236@zju.edu.cn.




Figure 1: **Discrepancy between human learning process and vanilla LLM adaptation paradigm.** Human students learn structured knowledge through textbooks section by section, with particular exercises on related knowledge points. Traditional LLM adaptation involves continual pre-training on data chunks from randomly concatenated text segments, with aimless supervised fine-tuning for conversation alignment. The inherent property of structured knowledge is ignored.

from limited textbook content has been attributed to insufficient data diversity [58], which however violates the observation during the human education process in Fig. 1: students gain knowledge by sequentially studying from textbooks, reviewing knowledge points and structures, and applying this knowledge through proper exercises. In this process, all the new data to learn is textbooks (structured content) and exercising examples (question-answering pairs), and students just adopt their world knowledge to memorize, understand, and apply the knowledge to become domain experts [23, 52].

Inspired by this, we propose to inject the domain knowledge from textbooks into LLMs, like educating a human student, through a novel two-stage training strategy: *Structure-aware Continual Pre-Training* (SCPT) and *Structure-aware Supervised Fine-Tuning* (SSFT).

In the SCPT stage, we argue that high-quality textbook data alone can adequately infuse initial domain knowledge [12], where the organization of training corpora is crucial. Traditionally, text corpora are merely concatenated and divided into chunks of 2048 [35] or 4096 [13], while the inherent structure of the texts (*e.g.*, catalogs of textbooks) is disregarded. Instead, we propose an automatic approach to maintain each chunk’s knowledge structure. We view each chunk as a knowledge point, employing advanced LLMs to extract domain knowledge taxonomy from the corpus efficiently, bypassing the need for manual annotation. Subsequently, LLMs are trained to predict textual content *under the condition of* linked knowledge points within the taxonomy, integrating individual training chunks with the entire knowledge framework. Ultimately, models are asked to memorize the knowledge structure to review the whole domain knowledge system.

In the SSFT stage, the goal shifts from knowledge injection to enabling LLMs to recall and utilize their acquired knowledge to tackle real-world challenges. We explicitly elicit knowledge structures in LLMs’ responses, as a beacon for models to targeted information retrieval or logical reasoning for reliable responses. To this end, we derive a scalable strategy to generate question-answer pairs as practice exercises by advanced LLMs such as GPT4 [1] or LLaMA3 [2]. In the scenarios with existing QA pairs like MMedBench [35], we retrieve related knowledge structures and content, instructing LLaMA3 to provide explanations from questions to answers based on these structures. For datasets lacking specific QA samples like LongBench [4], we randomly select knowledge branches from the domain taxonomy and prompt LLaMA3 to craft question-answer-explanation triplets for exercises.

Our ultimate approach, termed *StructTuning*, outperforms conventional methods in domain knowledge injection by emulating human learning processes through SCPT and SSFT phases. We extensively evaluate StructTuning’s effectiveness across different model architectures and sizes. For domain-adapted language models, we first examine their capability to recall injected knowledge through open-ended QA on the LongBench [4] dataset, then assess their application of this knowledge in addressing real-world issues via multiple-choice QA on the MMedBench dataset [35]. Results from both evaluations underscore the superiority of StructTuning. Remarkably, our strategy achieves a **50%** improvement in knowledge injection compared to MMedLM2, the current benchmark in the medical domain, using merely **0.3%** of the training data requirement. These findings underscore the potential to scale our method for enhancing domain-specific AI assistants significantly.

Our contribution is summarized as follows:

- We proposed a novel two-stage training strategy, SCPT and SSFT, to inject domain knowledge into LLMs by preserving and utilizing the inherent structure of the training corpus.
- We developed a scalable data construction framework to generate structure-aware training samples from original corpora, so as to facilitate the SCPT and SSFT stages.
- We conducted extensive investigations on our StructTuning strategy on various data and model settings, and achieved competitive knowledge injection performance on MMedBench only using 0.3% of the training corpus.

2 Related Work

Domain Adaptation for Large Language Models. While pre-trained LLMs possess promising capabilities, their performance is often hampered by the scope and recency of their training data, which particularly affects smaller models in downstream applications [56, 43]. Continual Pre-Training (CPT) addresses this by perpetually updating a pre-trained model with domain-specific content [37, 50], with parameter-efficient tuning methods devised to curtail training costs [18, 29]. To keep pace with the latest information, models can be fine-tuned with supervised instruction-response pairs (SFT), thus staying current with the advancing knowledge landscape [30, 35]. Existing literature confirms that combining CPT and SFT is effective for LLMs to remain precise and up-to-date in dynamic fields like law [9, 32], finance [48, 26], medicine [44, 35], and coding [36, 13]. Our study builds upon this CPT-SFT framework, innovating with SCPT-SSFT strategies to efficiently and effectively infuse domain knowledge with the inherent structure hierarchy.

Conditional Language Modeling. The idea of continual pre-training language models on domain corpus in the condition of the knowledge structure is mainly inspired by CTRL [22]. Keskar et al. [22] demonstrates the effectiveness of steering text generation through control codes (one or two words) that signify the desired genre, style, or task. In the era of LLM, system prompt plays a similar role in controlling models' responses to adapt to different needs and functionalities, such as role-playing, language style transfer, task setting, and behavior setting [7, 45, 3]. Our SCPT approach extends the control codes or system prompts to domain-specific knowledge structures, so as to guide the learning process and tailor the model's output more closely to specialized fields.

Data Augmentation and Synthesis. Due to the lack of high-quality datasets, data augmentation has emerged as a promising solution to mimic real-world patterns [28]. Traditionally, these methods aim to artificially expand the training dataset size [49, 31] or generate entirely new samples that could help models learn better or adapt to specific tasks [38]. Yet, such methods often overlook the structured nature of domain knowledge, and the aimlessly generated samples may also lack diversity [33, 30], leading to potentially suboptimal training outcomes when applied for domain adaptations [30, 38]. Unlike these traditional approaches, our SSFT design is an innovative departure to address the challenge of retaining and utilizing the structured knowledge inherent in domain-specific content.

3 Methodology

This section presents our methodology to inject domain knowledge into pre-trained LLMs by utilizing the inherent knowledge structure, and Fig. 2 depicts our StructTuning framework. For a limited set of curated domain corpora (typically textbooks), we first develop an automatic approach to extract the knowledge structure, and associate the training chunks to the extracted knowledge structure and points (Sec. 3.1). Then, we design a two-stage training strategy to inject the highly structured domain knowledge into language models by mimicking the human education process, comprising the SCPT (Sec. 3.2) and SSFT (Sec. 3.3) techniques. The details are introduced as follows.

3.1 Automatic Extraction of Knowledge Structure

For web-crawled corpus, the meta-info of knowledge structures (*e.g.*, the table content for a textbook) is usually inaccessible or inapplicable due to the data-parsing quality limitation, and all we have are those sequentially arranged text segments (*e.g.*, page-by-page-chunked content). As shown in Fig. 2 (a), we aim to extract (or, recover) the knowledge structure from the raw corpus for subsequent domain knowledge injection, which is achieved by the following steps.




Figure 2: **Framework for structure-aware knowledge injection.** We extract the inherent knowledge structure in the training corpus, and associate training chunks to corresponding knowledge points. Models are continually pre-trained on data chunks in the condition of the knowledge structure, and fine-tuned with supervised QA samples to elicit their learned knowledge to solve real-world questions (including knowledge-intensive (KI) QA, 2- or multi-hop QA, *etc.*).

First, we use the spaCy library¹ to split the content from a textbook at the sentence-level, and merge the sentences to form training chunks within a maximum size (*e.g.*, 2048 tokens [35]). After that, we prompt the advanced Llama3-70B [2] model to summarize the title for each chunk, where the textual content with the abstractive title contributes to a “knowledge point”.

Then, we explore an automatic method to aggregate the sequential knowledge points and extract the inherent structure hierarchy by leveraging advanced language models. Particularly, we take the title list of those text chunks as the input (due to the limitation of context length) to instruct Llama3-70B [2] to identify the inherent structure within the title/chunk list, through in-context learning on the provided examples. The prompt template is displayed in Fig. 3, and the full version is in Appendix D.

Through the top-down structurization on the title list, we manage to extract the hierarchical knowledge structure from the original training corpus. Fig. 3 presents an example of the extracted structure, where we use the tree-like mindmap structure [46] to present the knowledge taxonomy from a textbook. The whole process does not involve human annotation, which reduces the cost and makes our method scalable for handling larger amounts of domain training corpora.




Figure 3: **Left:** prompt template to extract hierarchical knowledge structures from the given content. **Right:** example of representing the extracted knowledge structure by using a mindmap template.

¹<https://github.com/explosion/spaCy>

After automatically extracting the domain knowledge structure and associating the original training chunks to related knowledge points, we delve into injecting domain knowledge through structure-aware continual pre-training (SCPT) and structure-aware supervised fine-tuning (SSFT).

3.2 Structure-aware Continual Pre-Training

In conventional knowledge injection methods, training corpora are randomly concatenated and chunked into text segments without distinguishing the original content, leading to the fact that models can only absorb domain knowledge that is emergent in the data diversity [33, 30, 35]. In this section, we present another solution to inject knowledge from limited pieces of textbooks by leveraging the highly abstractive and exhaustive domain knowledge structures for continual pre-training.

We first transform the knowledge structure into natural languages using the same mindmap template in Fig. 3, and prepend it to each training chunk, forcing LLMs to memorize the textual content (knowledge points) in the condition of the associated knowledge path in the structure hierarchy. We collected 20 diversified templates from GPT-4 [1] to bridge mindmap structures and training chunks, one of which is displayed in Fig. 4. The prepended mindmap, as well as the template, does not produce auto-regressive loss. Losses are only calculated in the *content* part. Formally, we turn the original language modeling in vanilla CPT to conditioned modeling [22] in our SCPT stage:

SCPT chunk example

In the realm of *{field}*, a conceptual mindmap is depicted using a tree-like structure to represent hierarchical relationships and thematic branches:

{mindmap}

Within this organized layout of *{field}*, the detailed subsection on *{section}* is described as:

{content}

Figure 4: Example of prompt templates to bridge mindmap structure and textual contents.

$$p(\mathbf{x}^k) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i^k | x_{<i}^k) \implies p(\mathbf{x}^k | \mathbf{s}^k) = \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i^k | x_{<i}^k, \mathbf{s}^k) \quad (1)$$

where $p(\mathbf{x}^k)$ models the probability distribution for the k -th chunk $\mathbf{x}^k = (x_1^k, \dots, x_n^k)$ via the chain rule of probability [5] on each token x_i^k , and \mathbf{s}^k denotes the associated knowledge mindmap paths.

As illustrated in Fig. 2 (b), after traversing the m knowledge points in extracted structures, models are asked to recall the whole knowledge hierarchy, *i.e.*, to model the composed probability distribution:

$$p(\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = \prod_{k=1}^m p(\mathbf{s}^k) \quad (2)$$

In SCPT, we mimic the human education process to inject knowledge into LLMs in a section-by-section manner, and replay the entire knowledge structure for the models to review and summarize the learned domain knowledge. These two steps iteratively alternate throughout training epochs.

Next, we will introduce how to teach LLMs to explicitly utilize their domain knowledge, which is learned in the SCPT stage, to solve practical problems by doing exercises with our SSFT technique.

3.3 Structure-aware Supervised Fine-Tuning

In traditional knowledge injection paradigms, supervised fine-tuning serves as a tool to align the (continually) pre-trained models to interactive chatbots, *e.g.*, through massive question-answering exercises [9, 35]. However, most QA data augmentation or generation strategies aim at enlarging the quantity and enhancing the diversity of training samples [49, 31, 28], which neglects the nature of the highly structured domain knowledge. Therefore, our structure-aware supervised fine-tuning (SSFT) technique focuses on eliciting models' structured knowledge learned during the SCPT stage, adapting LLMs to interactive and reliable domain experts.

Fig. 2 (c) illustrates the idea of synthesizing SSFT samples guided by domain knowledge structures, as extracted in Sec. 3.1. Specifically, we use the random walk algorithm to create knowledge paths with 1 to l branches in the original mindmap. For paths with only one knowledge point, we use the




Figure 5: **QA samples synthesized for SSFT.** We instruct Llama3-70B to generate (a) knowledge-intensive and (b) multi-hop questions and derive the diagnosis answers with explicit reasoning.

corresponding text content to prompt Llama3-70B [2] to generate knowledge-intensive question-answering pairs. For paths with two or more branches, we prompt Llama3-70B with the knowledge path and textual contents to synthesize 2- or multi-hop QA samples, which require specific reasoning along the knowledge structure to derive from questions to answers. Fig. 5 presents several examples.

For every synthesized QA sample (z), we will prepend the relevant mindmap hierarchy to the answer, and add a CoT prompt in the question to construct another type of QA data (z') for SFT alignment. This design explicitly elicits the learned knowledge in models' responses, teaching them how to apply the structured knowledge to address real-world problems. We use the two types of QA samples for training, as recommended by Qiu et al. [35]. During testing, we can either use the vanilla question as input to efficiently gather models' answers, or take the CoT prompt to probe to what extent LLMs can memorize and leverage the injected knowledge to answer the questions.

Integrating with SCPT and SSFT, our StructTuning approach translates into remarkable efficacy and efficiency in domain knowledge injection, as comprehensively evaluated in the following sections.

4 Experiments

We design a comprehensive evaluation of our StructTuning through several experiments on two benchmarks. First, we investigate the free-form question-answering task on the LongBench [4] dataset, in order to verify the memorization and understanding of injected knowledge (the answer can be directly found in training corpora). Then, we delve into the multi-choice question-answering task on MMedBench [35], to explore how LLMs apply the injected knowledge in basic medicine to determine the real-world diagnosis for patients with logical reasoning.

4.1 Preliminary Investigation on Free-form Question-Answering

Datasets and Tasks. LongBench [4] is a multi-task benchmark tailored for open-book reading comprehension evaluation, where LLMs generate answers to given questions based on one or several lengthy passages. To focus on knowledge injection, we turn the open-book evaluation into a closed-book QA task, where contextual passages are injected into LLMs with training techniques, and models answer questions without input passages. We choose 7 subsets with 1,350 test examples from LongBench for single- and multi-document question-answering evaluation, and the remaining synthetic or code-orientated tasks are eliminated. More details are described in Appendix A.1.

Evaluation Metrics. For free-form QA in LongBench [4], we report the *F1-Score* between models' outputs and ground-truth answers for both open-book and closed-book QA tasks. Besides, we also report the *Recall* for model responses to quantify the memorization degree of injected knowledge.

Investigated Models. For LongBench, we mainly investigate the knowledge injection to the Llama2-7B model [40], and report the Open- and Closed-Book QA performance for comparison.

Implementation Details. On LongBench for closed-book QA, we continually pre-train the Llama2-7B model on 10,476 passages for 3 epochs using a batch size of 128. The initial learning rate is $2e-5$, decayed to 0 at the end of training with a cosine scheduler. Then, we query Llama3-70B to generate

Table 1: F1 Score evaluation of Open-Book QA (OBQA) and Closed-Book QA (CBQA) tasks on the LongBench [4] dataset. The best results are marked in **bold**, and the secondary results are marked with underlines. The backbone model is Llama2-7B [40].

Task	Adaptation	SingleDoc-QA			MultiDoc-QA				Average
		Qasper	MFQA	MFQAzh	HpQA	2Wiki	Musiq	Duzh	
OBQA	-	<u>19.2</u>	36.8	11.9	<u>25.4</u>	32.8	9.4	5.2	<u>18.7</u>
CBQA	-	17.3	15.9	1.4	5.7	6.7	3.3	1.8	7.4
	CPT	16.8	<u>23.6</u>	<u>17.5</u>	18.0	18.6	6.7	<u>14.3</u>	16.5
	CPT+SFT	16.8	23.1	13.2	21.3	19.1	<u>10.4</u>	13.4	16.8
	SCPT	15.2	21.5	15.2	14.9	19.8	5.6	14.1	15.2
	SCPT+SSFT	19.7	23.5	19.5	26.4	<u>24.1</u>	12.2	15.4	20.1

2,700 SSFT QA examples, and eliminate the generated data whose answer shares over 0.5 F1-Score with one of the test samples to avoid data leakage. We train the knowledge-injected models for 1 epoch to avoid overfitting. Models are trained with the LLaMA-Factory framework ².

Main Results. In Tab. 1, we first report the Open-Book QA (OBQA) baseline for Llama2-7B with passages inputs, which shows the best performance on MultiFieldQA (MFQA) [4] and 2WikiMultihopQA (2Wiki) [17] subsets. Then, we establish the Closed-Book QA (CBQA) baseline for pre-trained Llama2-7B, which aims to identify the knowledge that has already been equipped from the newly injected knowledge. Consequently, we follow the traditional CPT+SFT paradigm to inject passage contents into model parameters, and supplement the experiment of our SCPT+SSFT technique for comparison. According to the results shown in Tab. 1, the traditional continual pre-training strategy immediately improves the QA performance on six out of seven subsets (except the Qasper [10] subset), while the supervised fine-tuning alignment does not bring significant gains on the overall F1-Score measure. In contrast, our SCPT+SSFT approach successfully boosts the closed-book QA performance to 20.1% on average, even surpassing the open-book QA baseline of 18.7%. It indicates the vanilla SFT strategy can only regularize LLMs’ response styles, while our SSFT could teach LLMs to utilize their knowledge (injected in the SCPT stage) to answer corresponding questions, as exemplified in Fig. 6.




Figure 6: An example for structure-aware responses.

Table 2: Recall evaluation of the Closed-Book QA task. The best results are marked in **bold**.

Adaptation	SingleDoc-QA			MultiDoc-QA				Average
	Qasper	MFQA	MFQAzh	HpQA	2Wiki	Musiq	Duzh	
CPT	13.4	33.0	16.6	28.1	27.7	15.9	13.1	21.1
CPT+SFT	<u>20.7</u>	35.3	<u>20.6</u>	29.9	32.1	18.9	12.0	24.2
SCPT	18.8	<u>42.5</u>	17.7	<u>35.7</u>	<u>36.4</u>	<u>20.5</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>26.7</u>
SCPT+SSFT	30.5	44.6	24.3	40.8	42.0	21.8	16.8	31.5

²<https://github.com/hiyouga/LLaMA-Factory>

To further support this claim, we compute *Recall* between model outputs and ground-truth answers in Tab. 2 as a proxy measure for memorizing and manipulating the injected knowledge [59]. Specifically, we use a CoT instruction of *Answer the question and explain why.* to elicit models’ knowledge in their responses. As shown in Tab. 2, our SCPT strategy has already achieved higher knowledge recall than the CPT-SFT paradigm (26.7% v.s. 24.2%). It implies our structure-aware continually pre-trained model has successfully associated the relevant passages with their entire knowledge structure for the given question, which provides the knowledge path to seek targeted information to derive the answer. As displayed in Fig. 6, our SSFT technique explicitly teaches the model to recall the learned knowledge and answer the questions, which further improves the knowledge recall in Tab. 2.

In addition, we also statistically quantify the memorization of injected knowledge structures by comparing the mindmap in models’ responses with the ground-truth answers via lexical ROUGE-L [27] and semantic BERTScore [54] measures. The results shown in Fig. 7 indicate a relatively good memorization of the injected knowledge mindmap, showing the efficacy of our SCPT strategy.

Figure 7: MindMap Recall

F1-Score	BERTScore
0.61	0.87

4.2 In-depth Evaluation for Multi-choice QA Application

Datasets and Tasks. MMedBench [35] is a multilingual medical multi-choice QA benchmark, with 45,048 QA pairs for adapting LLMs to medical experts and 8,518 for testing. We collect 76M textbook corpora from MedTextBooks [21] and MMedC [35] for medical knowledge injection and use the training/test split from MMedBench for SFT/evaluation. Detailed setup is in Appendix A.2.

Evaluation Metrics. For the multi-choice QA task in MMedBench [35], we follow the default setting to calculate the accuracy on six language subsets, as well as the averaged scores.

Investigated Models. For MMedBench, we extend the investigated LLMs across model scales and architectures including Llama2-7B, Llama2-13B [40], and InternLM2-7B [57]. We also compare our knowledge-injected models with other open- or closed-source LLMs, such as the domain-specified MedAlpaca [15], ChatDoctor [53], PMC-LLaMA [47], and MMedLM [35] models.

Implementation Details. We first train LLMs for 3 epochs on medical textbooks with a batch size of 128. Then, we ask Llama3-70B to create structure-aware explanations for existing 45K QA samples in MMedBench’s training split and 33K extra entries by traversing extracted knowledge structures. Syntheses with overlapped options in the test set are removed. In the SFT phase, the learning rate is set as 1e-6 to avoid overfitting on such an amount of SFT samples, as suggested by Qiu et al. [35].

Main Results. In Tab. 3, we present the overall performance across a series of LLMs on the testing split of MMedBench. The results demonstrate the promising enhancement achieved by our StructTuning technique, which translates into consistently significant improvements on Llama2-7B (+8.78%), Llama2-13B (+6.17%), and InternLM2-7B (+4.46%). It shows the generalizability and scalability of our StructTuning strategy across model architectures and sizes. Notably, our method, comprising SCPT on 76M curated textbook corpora and SSFT on 78K QA samples, achieves **50%** performance (4.46% v.s. 8.76%) against the state-of-the-art MMedLM2-7B model, which is trained on a huge MMedC [35] corpora of 25.5B tokens. Our approach shows much more efficiency in transforming pre-trained LLMs into domain experts by structured-aware knowledge injection, which largely reduces the cost for LLMs’ domain adaptation to **0.3%**. However, our method is currently unable to achieve 100% of knowledge injection efficacy against MMedLM2, which may comprise two major reasons: (1) some of the knowledge in the training corpus has already been learned by the foundation InternLM2 model, and (2) the knowledge in our curated 76M training data cannot cover all the testing samples. We leave the promotion of achieving 100% improvement in our future work.

Ablation Studies. We conduct a comprehensive ablation study with the English split of the MMedBench dataset to evaluate our efficacy. Specifically, we take Llama2-7B as the backbone model, select the English textbooks [21] (with 26M tokens) for vanilla and our structure-aware continual pre-training, and use different QA samples for supervised fine-tuning. In particular, in Tab. 4, *SFT* refers to vanilla SFT with 10K English QA samples provided in MMedBench’s [35] training split, *SSFT* indicates structure-aware SFT on 10K training data, where the questions are the same as *SFT* while the answers are enhanced with knowledge structure explanation by Llama3-70B, as described in Sec. 3.3. *SSFT** includes another 8K structure-aware QA syntheses by Llama3-70B, consisting of 18K entries for training. The training hyper-parameters follow the main experiment.

Table 3: Multiple-choice accuracy evaluation on MMedBench [35]. We report each model’s accuracy across six languages separately, with “Average” denoting the mean score over six languages. We also list out the data quantity for CPT and SFT stages during medical knowledge injection.

Model	CPT	SFT	English	Chinese	Japanese	French	Russian	Spanish	Average
InternLM-7B	-	45K	44.07	64.62	37.19	24.92	58.20	44.97	45.67 +0.00
MMedLM-7B	25B	45K	49.88	70.49	46.23	36.66	72.27	54.52	55.01 +9.34
InternLM2-7B	-	45K	57.27	77.55	47.74	41.00	68.36	59.59	58.59 +0.00
MMedLM2-7B	25B	45K	61.74	80.01	61.81	52.09	80.47	67.65	67.30 +8.71
Llama2-7B	-	45K	43.36	50.29	25.13	20.90	66.80	47.10	42.26 +0.00
+Ours	76M	78K	49.41	65.15	36.68	35.21	69.14	50.62	51.04 +8.78
Llama2-13B	-	45K	51.37	57.97	32.66	25.08	69.92	52.99	48.33 +0.00
+Ours	76M	78K	53.02	68.30	37.78	41.71	70.70	55.51	54.50 +6.17
InternLM2-7B	-	45K	57.27	77.55	47.74	41.00	68.36	59.59	58.59 +0.00
+Ours	76M	78K	60.80	79.19	50.75	45.34	75.39	66.85	63.05 +4.46

Results in Tab. 4 imply the vanilla CPT+SFT injection paradigm does bring considerable improvement of 1.73% in the English split, while our SCPT technique with vanilla SFT strategy presents a slightly higher accuracy of 46.50%. However, when combining SSFT with SCPT, our method immediately leads to a significant boost in the English split (49.96% v.s. 44.54%), demonstrating the efficacy and necessity of eliciting the learned structured knowledge to solve practical problems. Moreover, the supplementation of 8K extra QA syntheses surprisingly enhances the model performance on the other five subsets, resulting in a valuable gain on the average accuracy of 38.27%. This result demonstrates the knowledge transferability across different languages [24, 34]. After training with our SSFT strategy, LLMs can actively utilize the knowledge injected in one language to solve the problem in another language, further evidencing our superiority against the traditional SFT technique.

In addition, we observe that the commonly used RAG [25] strategy does not bring significant advantages to the MMedBench evaluation. The main reason lies in the gap between the pre-training corpus (comprising official knowledge statements from textbooks) and evaluated QA samples (originating from practical diagnosis records). To teach LLMs to apply relevant medical knowledge for reliable diagnosis answers, knowledge injection by CPT and SFT shows more advantages in this situation.

Table 4: Ablation studies with Llama2-7B on the English subset of MMedBench. The best results are marked in **bold**, and the secondary results are marked with underlines.

Adaptation		English	Chinese	Japanese	French	Russian	Spanish	Average
-	SFT	44.54	<u>32.81</u>	26.63	15.27	<u>53.91</u>	<u>42.30</u>	<u>35.91</u>
CPT	SFT	46.27	<u>32.57</u>	<u>26.13</u>	17.36	50.00	40.63	35.49
SCPT	SFT	46.50	32.14	20.10	<u>18.17</u>	<u>53.91</u>	39.97	35.13
SCPT	SSFT	49.96	32.63	22.11	17.52	51.17	41.28	35.78
SCPT	SSFT*	<u>49.10</u>	33.92	18.33	27.14	57.42	43.73	38.27
RAG		38.12	29.22	22.61	23.34	53.91	36.47	33.95

5 Conclusion

This work pioneers in incorporating structure-aware methodologies to enhance domain knowledge injection into large language models (LLMs). Through a novel two-stage training strategy, combining the SCPT and SSFT techniques, we have set a new precedent for efficiently adapting LLMs to specialized domains. The promising results and the scalable data construction framework we developed underscore the viability and potential of our method. The limitations and broader impacts are discussed in Appendix C. We hope to inspire further research in efficient and effective domain adaptation, moving a step closer to models that can truly emulate human intelligence.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Meta AI. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. 2024.
- [3] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- [4] Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Hongchang Lyu, Jiankai Tang, Zhidian Huang, Zhengxiao Du, Xiao Liu, Aohan Zeng, Lei Hou, et al. Longbench: A bilingual, multitask benchmark for long context understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14508*, 2023.
- [5] Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, and Pascal Vincent. A neural probabilistic language model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13, 2000.
- [6] Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, Qiushi Du, Zhe Fu, et al. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*, 2024.
- [7] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [8] Hung-Ting Chen, Fangyuan Xu, Shane A Arora, and Eunsol Choi. Understanding retrieval augmentation for long-form question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12150*, 2023.
- [9] Jiayi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, Bohua Chen, and Li Yuan. Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16092*, 2023.
- [10] Pradeep Dasigi, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Arman Cohan, Noah A Smith, and Matt Gardner. A dataset of information-seeking questions and answers anchored in research papers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.03011*, 2021.
- [11] Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH)*, 3(1):1–23, 2021.
- [12] Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, et al. Textbooks are all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11644*, 2023.
- [13] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y Wu, YK Li, et al. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming—the rise of code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14196*, 2024.
- [14] Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A Smith. Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10964*, 2020.
- [15] Tianyu Han, Lisa C Adams, Jens-Michalis Papaioannou, Paul Grundmann, Tom Oberhauser, Alexander Löser, Daniel Truhn, and Keno K Bressemer. Medalpaca—an open-source collection of medical conversational ai models and training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08247*, 2023.
- [16] Wei He, Kai Liu, Jing Liu, Yajuan Lyu, Shiqi Zhao, Xinyan Xiao, Yuan Liu, Yizhong Wang, Hua Wu, Qiaoqiao She, et al. Dureader: a chinese machine reading comprehension dataset from real-world applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05073*, 2017.
- [17] Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. Constructing a multi-hop qa dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.01060*, 2020.
- [18] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [19] Adam Ibrahim, Benjamin Thérien, Kshitij Gupta, Mats L Richter, Quentin Anthony, Timothée Lesort, Eugene Belilovsky, and Irina Rish. Simple and scalable strategies to continually pre-train large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08763*, 2024.

- [20] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [21] Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13081*, 2020.
- [22] Nitish Shirish Keskar, Bryan McCann, Lav R Varshney, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. Ctrl: A conditional transformer language model for controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.05858*, 2019.
- [23] David R Krathwohl. A revision of bloom’s taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice*, 41(4):212–218, 2002.
- [24] Viet Dac Lai, Nghia Trung Ngo, Amir Poursan Ben Veysseh, Hieu Man, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, and Thien Huu Nguyen. Chatgpt beyond english: Towards a comprehensive evaluation of large language models in multilingual learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05613*, 2023.
- [25] 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.
- [26] Yangning Li, Shirong Ma, Xiaobin Wang, Shen Huang, Chengyue Jiang, Hai-Tao Zheng, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, and Yong Jiang. Ecomgpt: Instruction-tuning large language models with chain-of-task tasks for e-commerce. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18582–18590, 2024.
- [27] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- [28] Ruibo Liu, Jerry Wei, Fangyu Liu, Chenglei Si, Yanzhe Zhang, Jinneng Rao, Steven Zheng, Daiyi Peng, Diyi Yang, Denny Zhou, et al. Best practices and lessons learned on synthetic data for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07503*, 2024.
- [29] Shih-Yang Liu, Chien-Yi Wang, Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Yu-Chiang Frank Wang, Kwang-Ting Cheng, and Min-Hung Chen. Dora: Weight-decomposed low-rank adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09353*, 2024.
- [30] Nick Mecklenburg, Yiyu Lin, Xiaoxiao Li, Daniel Holstein, Leonardo Nunes, Sara Malvar, Bruno Silva, Ranveer Chandra, Vijay Aski, Pavan Kumar Reddy Yannam, et al. Injecting new knowledge into large language models via supervised fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00213*, 2024.
- [31] Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02707*, 2023.
- [32] Ha-Thanh Nguyen. A brief report on lawgpt 1.0: A virtual legal assistant based on gpt-3. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05729*, 2023.
- [33] Oded Ovadia, Menachem Brief, Moshik Mishaeli, and Oren Elisha. Fine-tuning or retrieval? comparing knowledge injection in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05934*, 2023.
- [34] Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Yuhang Zhou, Zhi Chen, Yinghui Li, Lizi Liao, Min Li, Wanxiang Che, and Philip S Yu. Multilingual large language model: A survey of resources, taxonomy and frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04925*, 2024.
- [35] Pengcheng Qiu, Chaoyi Wu, Xiaoman Zhang, Weixiong Lin, Haicheng Wang, Ya Zhang, Yanfeng Wang, and Weidi Xie. Towards building multilingual language model for medicine. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13963*, 2024.
- [36] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [37] Yu Sun, Shuohuan Wang, Yukun Li, Shikun Feng, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. Ernie 2.0: A continual pre-training framework for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 8968–8975, 2020.

- [38] Zhengyang Tang, Xingxing Zhang, Benyou Wan, and Furu Wei. Mathsacle: Scaling instruction tuning for mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02884*, 2024.
- [39] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [40] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [41] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. Musique: Multihop questions via single-hop question composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:539–554, 2022.
- [42] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [43] Cunxiang Wang, Xiaoze Liu, Yuanhao Yue, Xiangru Tang, Tianhang Zhang, Cheng Jiayang, Yunzhi Yao, Wenyang Gao, Xuming Hu, Zehan Qi, et al. Survey on factuality in large language models: Knowledge, retrieval and domain-specificity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07521*, 2023.
- [44] Haochun Wang, Chi Liu, Nuwa Xi, Zewen Qiang, Sendong Zhao, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. Huatuo: Tuning llama model with chinese medical knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06975*, 2023.
- [45] Zekun Moore Wang, Zhongyuan Peng, Haoran Que, Jiaheng Liu, Wangchunshu Zhou, Yuhan Wu, Hongcheng Guo, Ruitong Gan, Zehao Ni, Man Zhang, et al. Rolellm: Benchmarking, eliciting, and enhancing role-playing abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00746*, 2023.
- [46] Yilin Wen, Zifeng Wang, and Jimeng Sun. Mindmap: Knowledge graph prompting sparks graph of thoughts in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09729*, 2023.
- [47] Chaoyi Wu, Weixiong Lin, Xiaoman Zhang, Ya Zhang, Weidi Xie, and Yanfeng Wang. Pmc-llama: toward building open-source language models for medicine. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, page ocae045, 2024.
- [48] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabrovolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023.
- [49] Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023.
- [50] Yan Xu, Mahdi Namazifar, Devamanyu Hazarika, Aishwarya Padmakumar, Yang Liu, and Dilek Hakkani-Tür. Kilm: Knowledge injection into encoder-decoder language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09170*, 2023.
- [51] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*, 2018.
- [52] Jifan Yu, Xiaozhi Wang, Shangqing Tu, Shulin Cao, Daniel Zhang-Li, Xin Lv, Hao Peng, Zijun Yao, Xiaohan Zhang, Hanming Li, et al. Kola: Carefully benchmarking world knowledge of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09296*, 2023.
- [53] Li Yunxiang, Li Zihan, Zhang Kai, Dan Ruilong, and Zhang You. Chatdoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on llama model using medical domain knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14070*, 2023.
- [54] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert, 2020.
- [55] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: a survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*, 2023.
- [56] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.

- [57] Cai Zheng, Cao Maosong, and et al Haojiong. Internlm2 technical report, 2024.
- [58] Zeyuan Allen Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Physics of language models: Part 3.1, knowledge storage and extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14316*, 2023.
- [59] Zeyuan Allen Zhu and Yuanzhi Li. Physics of language models: Part 3.2, knowledge manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14402*, 2023.

A Implementation Details

A.1 Detailed Setup on LongBench

To focus on the investigation of knowledge injection, we choose 7 subsets from LongBench [4] across single- and multi-document QA tasks in English and Chinese, and the remaining synthetic or code-orientated tasks are eliminated:

- **Single-Doc QA.** For single-document QA, we take three subsets from LongBench: (1) *Qasper* [10], featured by question-answering over NLP technical papers and annotated by NLP practitioners; (2) *MultiFieldQA* [4], manually curated from multiple data sources and annotated by Ph.D. students; and (3) *MultiFieldQA-zh*, the Chinese split also provided by Bai et al. [4], covering multiple Chinese scenarios. *MultiFieldQA* contains 150 Context-Question-Answer triplets to test, and the others adopted subsets include 200 pieces of test samples respectively.
- **Multi-Doc QA.** Multi-document QA requires LLMs to extract and combine information from multiple documents to derive the answer, which is generally more challenging than single-doc QA. We take four multi-hop QA datasets: (1) *HotpotQA* [51], containing 2-hop questions written by native speakers given two related paragraphs; (2) *2WikiMultihopQA* [17], involving up to 5-hop questions synthesized through manually designed templates on Wikipedia passages; (3) *MuSiQue* [41], carefully composed with up to 4-hop reasoning on an increased number of supporting and distracting context evidence; and (4) *Dureader* [16], developed based on Baidu Search and Baidu Zhidao and filtered by Bai et al. [4] to reduce the data noise. Each subset has 200 test samples.

A.2 Detailed Setup on MMedBench

Data for Evaluation. The Multilingual Medical Benchmark (MMedBench) [35] represents a comprehensive and diverse multilingual medical Question and Answering (QA) benchmark designed to evaluate models’ capabilities of understanding and processing medical content.

MMedBench’s robust dataset extends across 6 languages (*i.e.*, English, Chinese, Japanese, French, Russian, and Spanish) and 21 medical fields, which include, but are not limited to, Internal Medicine, Biochemistry, Pharmacology, Psychiatry, and many others. It provides 45,048 training pairs and 8,518 testing pairs for diverse learning and testing scenarios. The training split is specifically designed for domain-specific finetuning of large language models (LLMs), while the entire testing set allows for a precise assessment of multi-choice question-answering performance. Statistics on six languages are displayed in Tab. A1. Notably, the benchmark includes scenarios where questions may have multiple correct answers (*i.e.*, in Japanese and French subsets), introducing additional complexity for the model evaluation process.

Table A1: Sample statistics on MMedBench.

Split	English	Chinese	Japanese	French	Russian	Spanish	Total
Train	10,178	27,400	1,590	2,171	1,052	2,657	45,048
Test	1,273	3,426	199	622	256	2,742	8,518

Data for Continual Pre-Training. To investigate high-quality domain knowledge injection for LLMs, we collect 18 English textbooks and 33 Chinese textbooks from the National Medical Board Examination in the USA and Mainland China, respectively [21]. All collected textbooks are originally in PDF format and Jin et al. [21] converted them into digital text via OCR and performed some clean-up pre-processing strategies to reduce the data noise. The English and Chinese textbooks count for around 26.1M and 21.5M tokens by Llama2 tokenizer [40]. Then, we randomly sample an extra 28M textbook corpora from MMedC [35] for the other languages (except the unavailable Japanese textbooks), and the final statistics are displayed in Tab. A2.

Data for Supervised Fine-Tuning. As introduced in Sec. 3.3, we prompt Llama3-70B [2] to build the structure-aware answer explanations on top of the raw SFT samples in MMedBench’s training split, and generate extra QA pairs by traversing the extracted knowledge structure from textbooks. The final quantity statistics are presented in Tab. A2.

Table A2: Sample statistics on training data.

Stage	English	Chinese	Japanese	French	Russian	Spanish	Total
CPT	26.1M	21.5M	-	8.1M	10.3M	10.1M	76.1M
SFT	18.8K	39.1K	1.6K	5.3K	5.9K	7.5K	78.2K

B Resource Requirement

We use 8 NVIDIA A100-80G GPUs to train all the models, and leverage 1-2 NVIDIA A100-80G GPUs for inference.

C Limitations and Discussions

Limitations. A noteworthy limitation of our work, despite its significant achievements, is centered around the exploration of the full potential of our StructTuning strategy for knowledge injection. While our method has successfully demonstrated a remarkable 50% improvement in domain-specific knowledge application and retention using merely 0.3% of the training corpus, the extent of data scalability needed to achieve 100% of the desired effectiveness remains unexplored. This limitation primarily arises from constraints in time and resources available during our research phase. We will delve into the investigations in our future work.

Broader Impacts. We discuss the positive and negative societal impacts as follows:

- *Positive Societal Impacts.* Our StructTuning strategy could democratize access to advanced AI, enabling specialized AI assistants across various sectors such as healthcare and education. This method’s efficiency could improve diagnostic tools, personalized learning experiences, and enhanced decision-making processes. Furthermore, by mirroring the human learning process, our approach facilitates the development of AI systems that are easier for people to trust and interact with.
- *Negative Societal Impacts.* The enhanced capabilities of LLMs might be exploited for generating convincing yet fraudulent content, raising concerns over misinformation and intellectual deceit. Additionally, if the structured knowledge base contains biases, it could inadvertently reinforce societal stereotypes, necessitating rigorous curation to ensure fairness and accuracy. To counteract potential misuse, controlled model releases and continuous monitoring for abuse are recommended. Ensuring the diversity and contemporaneity of training data can mitigate bias. Collaborative efforts with domain experts, ethicists, and policymakers are vital in developing guidelines for the technology’s ethical use.

D Prompt Template for Structurization

Fig. A1 displays the few-shot prompt template to query giant commercial LLMs to execute structurization. We first introduce the instruction for structurization (including the task definition and output formats), then provide two representative examples to further illustrate the process. The first example in Fig. A2 tells the model to focus on the existing numerical or enumeration indicators to assist in constructing the aspect-description structure. The second example in Fig. A3 teaches the model to automatically summarize the aspects and attach their corresponding descriptions from the raw text sequences. Finally, in Fig. A1 we ask commercial LLMs to structurize the *input_statement* from user input as expected.

You are a sophisticated AI expert in Natural Language Processing (NLP), with the specialized capability to deconstruct complex sentences and map their semantic structure. Your task is to analyze the given sentences to extract and represent the intrinsic semantic hierarchy systematically.

Follow this approach to ensure clarity and utility in your analysis:

- 1. Comprehension**: Begin with a thorough reading to understand the overarching theme of the input sentences.
- 2. Defining Scope**: Summarize the central theme to establish the scope of the semantic analysis.
- 3. Aspect Breakdown**: Identify the core aspects of the discussion. For any aspect with additional layers, delineate "SubAspects" and repeat as necessary for complex structures. Each aspect or subaspect should be highly summarized and self-contained.
- 4. Mapping**: Assign sentence numbers to their respective aspects or subaspects, indicating where in the text they are addressed.

Structure your analysis in a YAML format according to this template, and ensure the format is clean, well-organized, and devoid of extraneous commentary:

```

`yaml
Scope: <central theme summary>
Aspects:
- AspectName: <main aspect>
  SentenceRange:
    start: <start sentence number>
    end: <end sentence number>
  SubAspects:
- AspectName: <subaspect>
  SentenceRange:
    start: <start sentence number>
    end: <end sentence number>
  # Recursively repeat "SubAspects" structure as needed
  # Adjust "SubAspect" entries as needed
# Adjust "Aspect" entries as needed
...

---

{fewshot_examples}

---
```

Now, analyze the provided sentences with the structured analytical process, and output your analysis in the structured YAML format. NOTE: each aspect or subaspect should be highly summarized and self-contained, which covers at least two sentences, except for introduction or conclusion aspects.

Figure A1: Prompt template for few-shot structuring.

Here is an example to clarify the steps. Pay attention to numerical or enumeration indicators in the original text, like '1.', '2.', '(1)', '(2)', etc, which usually indicates the aspect-levels.

Sentences:

...

- Sentence 1: Comprehensive prevention measures for malignant diseases in the rice seedling stage are as follows:
- Sentence 2: 1. Choose disease-free seeds.
- Sentence 3: Do not leave seeds in diseased fields and nearby rice fields.
- Sentence 4: Choose healthy rice and eliminate diseased, dead, and injured rice.
- Sentence 5: 2. Seed disinfection.
- Sentence 6: Before sowing, soak the seeds with 25% 100g (Xibok) EC 3000 times liquid for 1 to 2 days, or take 20 grams of 17% Dexinqing wettable powder for every 6 kilograms of rice seeds.
- Sentence 7: Soak the seeds in 8 kg of water for 60 hours.
- Sentence 8: 3. Deal with diseased rice straw.
- Sentence 9: Do not cover germinated or dry seedlings with diseased straw.

...

Analysis:

``yaml

Scope: "comprehensive prevention measures for malignant diseases in rice seedling"

Aspects:

- AspectName: "Introduction of malignant prevention measures"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 1
 - end: 1
- AspectName: "Choose disease-free seeds"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 2
 - end: 4
- AspectName: "Seed disinfection"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 5
 - end: 7
- AspectName: "Deal with diseased rice straw"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 8
 - end: 9

...

Figure A2: The first example for few-shot structurization.

Here is another example to illustrate the desired analysis structure. When there are no explicit words indicating the statement's scope and main aspects, please use a few words to precisely summarize the scope as well as the main aspects. Then carefully assign the descriptive sentences to each main aspect and subspects respectively.

Sentences:

...

- Sentence 1: The water absorption curve of rice after soaking is a unimodal curve.
- Sentence 2: The inflection point of the curve is the peak period of water absorption.
- Sentence 3: The relationship between rice water absorption and time is non-linear and can be expressed by the following formula: $a*t+b=c$, where a, b, and c are constants.
- Sentence 4: Under different humidity conditions, the change in the water absorption rate of rice with time is basically similar, that is, the water absorption rate is between 0 and the point d inflection, and the rate of change accelerates over time.
- Sentence 5: After the inflection point, the increase in water absorption gradually stabilizes.
- Sentence 6: The changing rules of water absorption and moisture content of rice are similar, but under different humidity conditions, the relationship between water absorption of rice and moisture content is different.
- Sentence 7: When the moisture content is low, the water absorption of rice increases as the moisture content increases.
- Sentence 8: When the moisture content is high, the increase in water absorption of rice gradually stabilizes.
- Sentence 9: There are three obvious steps for rice seeds to absorb water:
- Sentence 10: First, at the beginning of water absorption, the water content of the seeds gradually increases, and the water absorption rate slowly increases.
- Sentence 11: Second, during the peak water absorption period, the water absorption rate increases rapidly.
- Sentence 12: Third, in the later stage of water absorption, the water content of seeds slowly increases, and the water absorption rate increases.
- Sentence 13: The water absorption rate of rice seeds is closely related to temperature.
- Sentence 14: In general, water absorption increases as temperature increases.
- Sentence 15: The relationship between water absorption and temperature can be expressed as: unsaturated water absorption (%) = $14.289T-10.719$ (where T is temperature, °C).

...

Analysis:

``yaml

Scope: "Study of water absorption characteristics in rice seeds"

Aspects:

- AspectName: "General description of water absorption curve"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 1
 - end: 3
- AspectName: "Rice water absorption and moisture content under varied humidity"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 4
 - end: 8
 - SubAspects:
 - AspectName: "Water absorption dynamics under varied humidity"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 4
 - end: 5
 - AspectName: "Relationship between water absorption and moisture content"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 6
 - end: 8
 - AspectName: "Stages of water absorption in rice seeds"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 9
 - end: 12
 - AspectName: "Temperature influence on water absorption"
 - SentenceRange:
 - start: 13
 - end: 15

...

Figure A3: The second example for few-shot structurization.