Large Language Models Are Self-Taught Reasoners: Enhancing LLM Applications via Tailored Problem-Solving Demonstrations

Kai Tzu-iunn Ong, Taeyoon Kwon, Jinyoung Yeo

Department of Artificial Intelligence, College of Computing, Yonsei University ktio89@yonsei.ac.kr

Abstract

Guiding large language models with a selected set of humanauthored demonstrations is a common practice for improving LLM applications. However, human effort can be costly, especially in specialized domains (e.g., clinical diagnosis), and does not guarantee optimal performance due to the potential discrepancy of target skills between selected demonstrations and real test instances. Motivated by these, this paper explores the automatic creation of customized demonstrations, whose target skills align with the given target instance. We present SELF-TAUGHT, a problem-solving framework, which facilitates demonstrations that are "tailored" to the target problem and "filtered" for better quality (i.e., correctness) in a zeroshot manner. In 15 tasks of multiple-choice questions of diverse domains and the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease (AD) with real-world patients, SELF-TAUGHT achieves superior performance to strong baselines (e.g., Few-shot CoT, Planand-Solve, Auto-CoT). We conduct comprehensive analyses on SELF-TAUGHT, including its generalizability to existing prompting methods and different LLMs, the quality of its intermediate generation, and more.¹

Introduction

Recently, large language models (LLMs) have emerged as an alternative knowledge source to human experts, popularizing the paradigm of prompting them to solve problems. In this context, methods such as chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al. 2022), which promotes LLMs to follow the step-by-step fashion of human problem-solving, have brought promising performances to LLM applications in diverse specialized domains (Singhal et al. 2023; Zaki, Krishnan et al. 2024; Liu et al. 2024), such as predicting crystal structures, clinical diagnosis, etc.

Despite the success, most prompt-driven projects rely on human effort. That is, they require domain experts to select representative problems for the task, annotate their solutions (*i.e.*, rationales & answers), and use them as demonstrations to guide LLMs in solving test instances (*i.e.*, few-shot prompting). Such manual effort can make real-world applications costly and, more importantly, has no guarantee of optimal performances due to the one-size-fits-all selection of problem-solving demonstrations (Min et al. 2022), *i.e.*, fixed and potentially unrelated (to the test instance) demonstrations used throughout the inference of the whole test set.

A common remedy to such reliance on crafted demonstrations is zero-shot prompting, i.e., prompting LLMs without demonstrations. Upon this, studies have proposed to enhance LLMs' zero-shot reasoning (Kojima et al. 2022; Chae et al. 2024; Kong et al. 2024). For instance, Wang et al. (2023) present Plan-and-Solve (PS) prompting, where the LLM first devises a plan for the given problem and solves it according to the plan. However, the lack of problemsolution demonstrations still sometimes poses performance gaps between zero-shot approaches and their few-shot counterparts (Kojima et al. 2022). While there is a line of studies proposing to resolve this with automatic demonstration generation, they often require in-domain corpora (i.e., training/test sets) and do not explicitly address the alignment of knowledge/skills between demonstrations and test instances (Zhang et al. 2022; Wan et al. 2023; Li et al. 2024a).

This paper tackles the above bottlenecks in prompt-driven applications of LLMs for specialized domains. Specifically, we focus on invoking the LLM to self-create high-quality and tailored demonstrations for each test instance under a zero-shot setting, and using them to guide its own predictions. To this end, we present **SELF-TAUGHT**, a zero-shot framework of self-directed problem-solving.

Our contributions are three-fold: (1) We present a simple and fully zero-shot framework, **SELF-TAUGHT**. Inspired by self-directed learning (SDL) in educational theories,² SELF-TAUGHT starts by identifying information addressed in the target problem *abstractively* (Phase I). After that, it goes through a tailored creation phase (Phase II), where the LLM creates problems addressing similar information/knowledge to the target as well as their solutions with *high certainty*. Lastly, the self-created problems/solutions are used as tailored demonstrations for solving the target problem (Phase III); (2) In 13 QA tasks of specialized domains and 2 clinical datasets collected from real-world patients of Alzheimer's disease (AD), SELF-TAUGHT shows superior performances to strong baselines, including those powered by domain experts and in-domain demonstration pools; (3) In our analy-

¹Codes, prompts, and expert-annotated demonstrations used in our experiments are in Appendices.

²SDL focuses on activating ones' new problem-solving ability by using their prior knowledge to reflect on related contextualized problems (Christensen et al. 1991; Grow 1991).




Figure 1: Empirical examples and the overview of SELF-TAUGHT. All phases are executed under a zero-shot setting.

ses, we justify SELF-TAUGHT's design via ablation, show its generalizability to existing prompting methods and different LLMs, confirm the quality of our self-created demonstrations, and more.

Formulations

Many LLM-based projects (Singhal et al. 2023; Liu et al. 2024) use human-authored demonstrations \mathcal{D}_{human} to guide LLMs in generating the solution S to a given problem \mathcal{P} :

$$S \sim P_{\theta}(\cdot | \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}_{human})$$
 (1)

Here, \mathcal{D}_{human} often contains pairs of: (1) a selected representative problem of the task; (2) a solution including intermediate reasoning steps (*i.e.*, rationale) and a final answer.

However, the need for crafted demonstrations can make applications in specialized domains costly. More importantly, it is not feasible to customize demonstrations for each test instance, potentially yielding sub-optimal performance due to the discrepancy between them (Min et al. 2022) – problems used as demonstrations and the target may require completely different knowledge to solve, even if they are from the same domain. For instance, when solving physics problems, a demonstration of thermodynamics may not be beneficial to solving a problem of electronics.

Thus, we propose to create high-quality demonstrations \mathcal{D}_{self} via the knowledge of the LLM itself, which are tailored to each test instance. Formally, given \mathcal{P} , the LLM first create \mathcal{D}_{self} tailored for \mathcal{P} , and use it to guide the prediction of \mathcal{S} :

$$\mathcal{D}_{self} \sim P_{\theta}(\cdot | \mathcal{P})$$
 (2)

$$S \sim P_{\theta}(\cdot | \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}_{self})$$
 (3)

Proposed Framework: SELF-TAUGHT

As shown in Figure 1, given a target problem \mathcal{P} , our framework carries out the following phases in a zero-shot manner:

Phase I: Information Identification

To facilitate tailored demonstrations for the target problem \mathcal{P} , it is important for us to first know what \mathcal{P} is targeting. Thus, SELF-TAUGHT starts with an information identification, where we capture what kind of knowledge/skill is addressed by \mathcal{P} . Formally, given \mathcal{P} , the LLM lists the necessary information \mathcal{I} that one must know for solving \mathcal{P} :

$$\bar{\mathcal{I}} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{\mathcal{I}} P_{\mathrm{LLM}}(\mathcal{I}|\mathcal{P}) \tag{4}$$

Note that rather than print out the information specifically in the form of factual statements (*e.g.*, "According to the 2nd law of thermodynamics, idealized reversible processes produce no entropy and no process is..."), the LLM lists the required information in an abstractive manner (*e.g.*, "Understanding the 2nd law of thermodynamics"), as shown in Figure 1 bottom left. This approach is designed to mitigate the potential influences of hallucination (Lyu et al. 2022). We compare this method with a specific identification in Table 3.

Phase II: Tailored Demonstration Creation

Now, the LLM leverages the identified information \mathcal{I} to prepare tailored problem-solution demonstrations for \mathcal{P} :

II-1. Generating Pseudo Problems with High Relevancy. We first create pseudo problems that target the same knowledge/skills as \mathcal{P} based on the identified information \mathcal{I} . Formally, given \mathcal{P} and $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$, the LLM generates a pseudo problem \overline{p} targeting information listed in $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$:

$$\bar{p} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{p} P_{\mathrm{LLM}}(p|\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{I}) \tag{5}$$

II-2. Generating Pseudo Solutions with High Certainty. Intuitively, after generating \bar{p} , we can obtain its solution \bar{s} via any zero-shot prompting approach (*e.g.*, CoT or PS). However, since LLMs may produce non-factual statements, it is necessary to address the correctness of pseudo-solutions. Filtering low-quality outputs with the LLM itself in a zero-shot manner is challenging. Inspired by how LLMs can verbalize their confidence in their predictions,³ we apply a **Certainty Filtering**. Formally, given a pseudo problem \bar{p} , the LLM first create a pseudo solution $\bar{s} = (\bar{r}, \bar{a})$ consisting of a rationale \bar{r} and an answer \bar{a} . Next, it outputs a certainty score \bar{cs} within 0-100 before ending the generation. The form of \bar{r} depends on the zero-shot prompting method of one's choice, *e.g.*, **Direct Prediction**, **CoT**, **PS**, etc:⁴

$$\bar{s} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{s} P_{\mathrm{LLM}}(s|\bar{p}) \tag{6}$$

$$\Rightarrow \bar{cs} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{cs} P_{\mathrm{LLM}}(cs|\bar{p},\bar{s}) \tag{7}$$

where \Rightarrow indicates the sequential generation of tokens. To collect highly-confident *s*, we iterate this process (for at most *t* times) until we get a \bar{s} to \bar{p} that yields a $cs \ge \lambda$.

In practice, we collect plural pairs (*i.e.*, N pairs)⁵ of \bar{p} and \bar{s} to build a set of self-created tailored demonstrations \mathcal{D}_{self} :

$$\mathcal{D}_{self} = \{ (\bar{p_n}, \bar{s_n}) \}_{n=1}^N \tag{8}$$

Phase III: Self-Directed Problem-Solving with Tailored Demonstrations

While many works emphasize diverse and representative demonstrations of the test set (Zhang et al. 2022; Singhal et al. 2023; Li et al. 2024a), it may lead to unrelated demonstrations that provide sub-optimal or misleading guidance, eventually affecting the solving process of target problems (Lightman et al. 2024), especially in scenarios where each test instance requires different knowledge to solve.

We address this by guiding LLMs' problem-solving with its self-created demonstrations, which are tailored to the target. Formally, given \mathcal{P} , $\mathcal{D}_{self} = \{\bar{p_n}, \bar{s_n}\}_{n=1}^N$ is added to the LLM's input to guide the prediction of the solution \bar{S} to \mathcal{P} :

$$\bar{\mathcal{S}} = \operatorname*{argmax}_{\mathcal{S}} P_{\mathrm{LLM}}(\mathcal{S}|\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{K}_{self})$$
(9)

Datasets

To investigate the effectiveness of ours, we adopt several tasks from specialized domains, starting with multiplechoice questions of different emphases:

Question Answering of Diverse Domains

StrategyQA. This dataset contains questions that target multi-hop reasoning over a wide range of knowledge (Geva et al. 2021). For example, a question may require one to know facts about a celebrity and the properties of hydrogen. **ScienceQA.** Proposed by Lu et al. (2022), questions are collected from elementary \sim high school curricula, targeting 26 topics including math, language, geography, etc. We exclude

problems addressing the vision modality, *i.e.*, images.

MedQA. A popular benchmark datasets in the medical domain curated by Jin et al. (2021). The questions are collected from national medical licensing exams in several countries. We only adopt questions written in English.

College-level problems of six domains. We include college-level problems of computer science (CS), medicine (Med), chemistry (Chem), math, physics (Phys), and biology (Bio) domains. The problems are collected from college textbooks and exams by Hendrycks et al. (2020).

Professional-level problems of four domains. We include four datasets addressing professional-level knowledge of accounting (Acct), medicine (Med), psychology (Psych), and legal (Law) domains. The problems are mainly obtained from diverse licensing/bar exams of the corresponding profession by Hendrycks et al. (2020).

Clinical Diagnosis with Real-World Patients

Besides problems from academic scenarios, we further evaluate SELF-TAUGHT on a long-standing real-world challenge: the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease (AD). For that, we incorporate two datasets of actual patients, collected by **ADNI** (Jack Jr et al. 2008) and **AIBL** (Ellis et al. 2009).

AD diagnosis requires the LLM to reason over the electronic health records (EHRs) of patients and make the diagnosis accordingly, *i.e.*, either AD, MCI (mild cognitive impairment), or Normal. The EHRs are structured following the practice of/obtained from Kwon et al. (2024), which list the findings from MRI scans (*e.g.*, volume measurements of each brain region) and patient information such as the results of mental state exams, the presence of APOE4 allele, etc. Details and examples of all datasets are in Appendices.

Experimental Settings

Zero-shot Baselines

Zero-shot prompting has been widely utilized to mitigate human effort in LLM applications. Since SELF-TAUGHT also access to nothing but the target \mathcal{P} and the LLM's own knowledge, we consider these fair comparisons:

Direct prediction (Direct). The LLM directly predicts the solution for \mathcal{P} without any intermediate process.

Chain-of-Thought prompting (CoT). Given a target problem \mathcal{P} , this setting promotes the LLM to generate the intermediate reasoning steps towards the solution using the phrase "*Let's think step-by-step*" (Kojima et al. 2022).

Plan-and-Solve prompting (PS). Wang et al. (2023) present PS prompting, which has shown promising performance in solving math problems. In PS, the LLM first devises a plan based on the problem instance and then solve it step-by-step according to the plan.

Reasoning-in-Conversation (RiC). Inspired by its performance in linguistic tasks such as humor detection (Wang et al. 2024), we modified it for our experiments. This setting prompts an LLM to first simulate a discussion between experts and then conclude the answer from the conversation. **Role-Play prompting.** Proposed by Kong et al. (2024), it outperforms zero-shot CoT in commonsense and math reasoning tasks. Here, the LLM and the user kick off the session

³In math reasoning tasks, Xiong et al. (2024) find LLMs predictions to be more often correct when expressed a higher certainty.

⁴We use zero-shot CoT (Kojima et al. 2022) when not specified.

⁵We empirically set N to 3, λ to 90, and t to 5. In practice, we randomly select an s with the highest cs if we cannot obtain any s with $cs \geq \lambda$ before the end of the t-th iteration.

					MMLU: College Level				MMLU: Professional Level					
Methods / Tasks	StrategyQA	ScienceQA	MedQA	CS	Med	Chem	Math	Phys	Bio	Acct	Med	Psych	Law	Avg
Zero-shot prompti	ng / without r	eal demonstr	ations:											
Zero-shot Direct	66.11	82.42	56.64	55.00	64.16	38.00	31.00	45.10	65.28	44.68	76.84	64.38	46.35	56.61
Zero-shot CoT	70.96	87.59	68.11	61.00	71.10	52.00	43.00	59.80	79.86	58.51	81.25	72.22	50.13	65.81
Plan-and-Solve	70.39	87.72	66.93	65.00	69.94	54.00	49.00	54.90	79.17	60.28	81.25	71.24	49.87	66.13
RiC prompting	64.63	87.63	57.66	54.00	66.47	40.00	43.00	53.92	74.31	53.55	75.00	51.93	46.15	59.10
Role-Play	68.17	86.83	60.49	60.00	72.25	51.00	45.00	59.80	79.86	57.09	75.00	70.75	50.46	64.53
SELF-TAUGHT	73.93	88.44	68.50	64.00	76.16	56.00	48.00	65.69	81.94	60.00	81.25	75.53	50.46	68.47
Oracles (demonstr	rations are m	ade with real	problems)	:										
Few-shot Direct	66.99	86.20	57.71	54.64	68.24	42.71	37.23	50.00	80.14	51.25	79.18	73.89	51.08	61.48
Manual CoT	74.81	87.37	69.99	63.92	73.41	55.21	50.00	62.50	78.01	58.06	80.51	75.04	45.11	67.19
Retrieval CoT	70.31	89.43	69.44	65.00	71.68	56.00	49.00	56.86	79.86	54.61	82.72	72.50	48.71	66.58
Auto-CoT	73.11	88.17	70.93	<u>57.45</u>	70.00	<u>55.21</u>	<u>45.74</u>	54.64	78.72	58.42	81.78	75.37	49.05	66.05

Table 1: Model performances (accuracy) in question-answering. Underlines: Oracles that are outperformed by ours.

with a short conversation that helps the LLM get into the role of an expert (*e.g.*, a math teacher). Then, the problem-solving will be performed in a "teaching the user" manner.

Few-shot Baselines (Oracles)

We further compare SELF-TAUGHT with few-shot prompting methods. Since these methods have access to demonstrations made with real problems from the dataset, we consider them oracles following Lyu et al. (2022):

Manual Chain-of-Thought (Manual CoT). A popular setting of few-shot CoT prompting in LLM applications, where the problem-solving is guided by demonstrations written by human domain experts (curated by prior work or our domain experts). Details are provided in Appendices.

Retrieval CoT. Following Zhang et al. (2022), when given \mathcal{P} , we retrieve top-N similar problems from the training set via text similarity. Then, we use the LLM to annotate CoT rationales/solutions for the retrieved problems, using them as demonstrations for solving \mathcal{P} . Similar to SELF-TAUGHT, this setting also pursues demonstrations that address similar or identical knowledge/information to \mathcal{P} .

Automatic CoT (Auto-CoT). It is widely applied for scenarios where demonstrations are unavailable (Zhang et al. 2022). It is similar to Retrieval-CoT, but we instead sample N most "diverse" problems from the training set via k-clustering as demonstrations that represent the whole task.

Models and Implementation Details

Large language models. We use gpt-3.5-turbo-0125 and llama-3.1-8B (OpenAI 2023; Meta 2024), w/ temperature of 0.7. We report GPT's results in Table 1-3, Llama's summarized results in RQ6, and full results in Appendices.

Encoder for Auto-/Retrieval CoT. Following Zhang et al. (2022), we use Sentence-BERT (Reimers and Gurevych 2019) to encode problems for clustering and retrieval.

Demonstrations in few-shot baselines. If a dataset does not provide a training set, the demonstrations will be based on instances from the test set. They will be ignored during performance measurements. Also, we set N to 3 for QA. For

AD diagnosis, we set it to 2 to match the radiologist demonstrations provided by Kwon et al. (2024).

Evaluation Metrics. We report accuracy (%). For AD diagnosis, we further include precision, recall, and F1 score for a more comprehensive comparison.

Preventing randomness. We report the median performance of three runs for all experiments in this work.

Results and Discussions

We present the results of the following Research Questions: **RQ1:** Can SELF-TAUGHT's tailored demonstrations enhance the LLM's reasoning in QA of diverse domains? **RQ2:** Is SELF-TAUGHT also beneficial in the clinical diagnosis with real-world patients of Alzheimer's disease? **RQ3:** How phases in SELF-TAUGHT affect performances? **RQ4:** Can SELF-TAUGHT also be applied to other zero-shot prompting methods besides CoT, and vice versa? **RQ5:** How cost-efficient is SELF-TAUGHT? **RQ6:** Can SELF-TAUGHT generalize to other LLMs?

Tailored demonstrations allow SELF-TAUGHT to outperform baselines in diverse QA tasks (RQ1). Table 1 shows model performances in 13 QA tasks. SELF-TAUGHT ranks first in 10 tasks, second in the rest of 3, and achieves better average acc than zero-shot baselines (top half).

Compared with oracles, ours outperforms Manual and Auto-CoT in 10 and 11 tasks (out of 13). This suggests that using a fixed set of demonstrations (whether human-written or machine-generated) throughout the inference of all test data may yield sub-optimal performance, justifying our goal of tailored demonstrations. Retrieval CoT performs almost as well as ours when compared head-to-head (6 vs. 7 wins). We assume that it is because it also leverages problems relevant to \mathcal{P} as demonstrations. Still, ours yields a much higher Avg acc, indicating that our generative method can elicit better related demonstrations than similarity-based retrieval.

In Law, few-shot Direct outperforms all settings that involve intermediate reasoning (*i.e.*, rationale). This may be because while problems are collected from the US, there is no clear regulation specifying which state's law should be

Patients from:		ADNI & AIBL							
Methods / Metrics	F1	Precision	Recall	Accuracy					
Zero-shot Direct	49.22	52.90	53.54	53.54					
Zero-shot CoT	52.81	54.92	55.97	55.97					
Plan-and-Solve	50.57	53.49	55.70	55.88					
RiC Prompting	51.12	51.16	52.54	52.54					
Role-Play	48.73	55.62	56.49	56.49					
SELF-TAUGHT	56.08	58.15	59.27	58.56					
Oracles (demonstrations are made with real problems):									
Few-shot Direct	44.03	52.10	54.47	54.47					
Manual CoT	63.12	64.19	64.72	64.73					
Retrieval CoT	50.32	54.49	52.25	52.20					
Auto-CoT	56.27	57.31	57.75	57.75					

Table 2: Model performances in AD diagnosis (average of datasets). <u>Underlines</u>: Oracles outperformed by ours. Precision, recall, and F1 are weighted Avg of 3 diagnosis classes.

referenced in each problem. This can cause misquotation of law and make the correct annotation/generation of rationales challenging, negatively affecting problem-solving. Interestingly, in Physics (Phys), SELF-TAUGHT and Manual CoT have much higher acc than others. This may suggest that ensuring the quality of demonstrations is relatively more important in physics domains than in other domains.⁶

Ours is less effective than Manual CoT in AD diagnosis due to the high similarity between instances (RQ2). In AD diagnosis (Table 2), SELF-TAUGHT beats all baselines in all metrics, except for Manual CoT. This pattern is much different from the findings in RQ1. We conjecture that it is because the discrepancy between each instance is extremely small here: all instances require LLMs to perform the same task w/ the same 3 output classes, via EHRs that are structured in the identical key-value format. This can marginalize the effect of tailored demonstrations and amplify the benefit of fixed human-crafted demonstrations.

Regardless, ours presents a much smaller performance gap between it and Manual-CoT (6.18 percentage points of acc; avg of all classes/datasets) than other baselines ($8.25 \sim$ 12.54 percentage points). In real clinical settings, each patient's EHR may be constructed diversely due to each radiologist's preference and other situational factors, thus requiring different reasoning to diagnose (Norman 2005). With insights from RQ2, we presume one can adjust SELF-TAUGHT for real-world applications by combining it with slight manual effort. For instance, including a minimal demonstration in the generation of pseudo problems/EHRs (Phase II), *i.e.*, demonstration expansion, to tackle different EHR styles and diagnostic processes. We leave this to future work.

Designed phases contribute to performance improvement (RQ3). To investigate how our phasic design affects model performance, we evaluate ablated and modified SELF-TAUGHT in all 15 tasks in Table 3. First, ablations of information identification and certainty filtering both lead to worse performance, while the former has a larger impact.⁷ This shows: (1) having a phase for identifying what \mathcal{P} is targeting is crucial for creating tailored demonstrations, which is beneficial for CoT prompting; (2) when tailored pseudo problems are available, quality-controlling their solutions can further boost system performance.

We also report a version where the information identification (Phase I) is done by printing out the specific factual statements that are required to solve \mathcal{P} . We find this performing worse than the SELF-TAUGHT and the 2nd ablation (both are equipped with an abstractive identification). This justifies our design of Phase I.

SELF-TAUGHT enhances existing prompting methods (**RQ4**). So far, all solution generation of pseudo and target problems (*i.e.*, Phase II-2 and III) has been driven by CoT prompting. As a formal study on improving LLM applications, it is necessary to validate SELF-TAUGHT's efficacy when implemented with different prompting methods. Thus, we repeat the above experiments with SELF-TAUGHT's variants, where the generation of solutions (Phase II-2 and III) is based on zero-shot direct and PS prompting.

Figure 4 reports the improvement of average acc in all 15 tasks.⁸ Firstly, when incorporating SELF-TAUGHT to existing methods, we observe performance gains in all of them. The most significant improvement is in 0-shot Direct, where system performance increases by 2.35 percentage points of acc. Zero-shot PS benefits not as much from SELF-TAUGHT, we hypothesize that it is because the "plan" devised in PS has already worked as a self-created guidance for problem-solving, marginalizing the help of self-generated demonstrations from SELF-TAUGHT. We also present the improvement brought by SELF-TAUGHT w/o certainty filtering (CF). Performance gains are still achieved. This provides us with a relatively more cost-efficient implementation (than original SELF-TAUGHT) for incorporating existing methods.

There exists a cost-performance trade-off (RQ5). A concern of SELF-TAUGHT is its higher API cost. Regardless, we argue that ours is competitive when taking both performance and cost into account. Figure 2 plots accuracy against gpt-3.5-turbo-0125's API cost per instance (calculated based on input and output tokens in six college-level tasks). We find SELF-TAUGHT and its ablation (w/ certainty filtering) lying on the Pareto frontier, indicating an efficient cost-performance trade-off. This suggests SELF-TAUGHT's value when performance is prioritized over the API cost.

SELF-TAUGHT generalizes to a smaller open-source LLM (RQ6). To address RQ5, we test if ours' can generalize to an LLM that is both smaller and open-source. We report the performance of Llama-3.1-8B regarding the above Pareto-efficient methods in Figure 3. SELF-TAUGHT generally yield the best performance among the Pareto-efficient methods, suggesting that it can be a strong candidate method in settings with limited computational power and budget.

⁶When the certainty filtering in SELF-TAUGHT is ablated, the accuracy drops by 2.94 percentage points to 62.75.

⁷We prompt the LLM to generate pseudo questions that address the same/similar information as \mathcal{P} directly based on \mathcal{P} only.

⁸The dataset-specific results are available in Appendices.

Settings / Tasks	StrategyQA	ScienceQA	MedQA	COLLEGE	PRO ADNI	AIBL	Avg
SELF-TAUGHT (Ours; as reference)	73.93	88.44	68.5	67.42	60.33 60.34	56.78	67.96
w/o Information Identification (Phase I) w/o Certainty Filtering (CF; in Phase II-2) w/o Both Specific Information Identification	$ \frac{73.10}{73.10} \\ \frac{73.10}{73.10} \\ 74.24 $	87.95 86.87 86.87 86.74	$ \begin{array}{r} \underline{63.71} \\ \overline{65.36} \\ \overline{65.36} \\ \overline{64.65} \\ \end{array} $	61.79 66.48 <u>61.63</u> 62.90	57.0859.2960.1559.9556.8458.8956.1659.82	56.54 6 53.04 6	66.92 (-1.04) 65.10 (-2.86)

Table 3: Performance (accuracy) of ours' ablations and modification. COLLEGE and PRO are the weighted Avg of the corresponding 6 and 4 datasets. <u>Underlines</u> are the worst performances across variants of SELF-TAUGHT.

Method:	Direct	СоТ	PS
None	59.68	65.86	65.56
Self-Taught w/o CF	· · · ·	67.96 (+2.10) 66.92 (+1.06)	· · · ·

Table 4: Performance (avg. accuracy of all 15 datasets) when powering SELF-TAUGHT with diverse zero-shot prompting.




Figure 2: Cost-performance comparisons (ours' cost = 1.0).

Settings \ Tasks	StrategyQA	ScienceQA	MedQA	COLLEGE	PRO	ADNI	AIBL	Average
Zero-shot Direct	67.47	75.22	57.58	54.80	50.22	48.35	43.22	56.69
Zero-shot CoT	72.20	92.48	63.14	67.59	59.37	52.83	54.67	66.04
Zero-shot PS	71.20	92.22	67.56	63.70	57.66	52.83	57.01	66.03
SELF-TAUGHT	73.95	90.20	67.24	68.01	60.93	54.28	58.40	67.57
Few-shot Direct	<u>69.74</u>	<u>82.33</u>	<u>57.68</u>	<u>50.47</u>	44.56	<u>36.36</u>	<u>34.58</u>	<u>53.67</u>
Manual CoT	<u>72.31</u>	88.62	<u>65.99</u>	<u>62.43</u>	50.33	61.26	<u>56.07</u>	<u>65.29</u>

Figure 3: Ours' performances with Llama-3.1-8B (acc).

Human Evaluations and Further Analyses Evaluating SELF-TAUGHT's Intermediate Phases

To further assess SELF-TAUGHT's intermediate phases, we conduct human evaluations on 108 pseudo problem/solution

pairs sampled from six college-level tasks (Figure 4). Overall (red numbers), thanks to proper information identification (94.4%), 86.1% of the pseudo problems address

similar information as target \mathcal{P} . Also, 83.3% of pseudo solutions contain helpful CoT rationales and 77.8% of them correctly answer the pseudo problems. These suggest the quality of SELF-TAUGHT's intermediate generation.

When looking at SELF-TAUGHT's correct and wrong problem-solving separately. The largest difference (blue numbers) is that successful problem-solving is usually in the company of helpful CoT rationales (94.5%) and correct final answers (91.7%) in the pseudo solutions, while

failed cases yield a much lower occurrence of them (58.3%) and 58.3%). Interestingly, failed problem-solving comes with pseudo problems that are easier than the target problem two times more often than successful cases (36.1% vs. 16.7%); green numbers). This provides a direction for future work, where one can more explicitly address the difficulty of machine-generated demonstrations to improve the final problem-solving.

Criteria \ Sampled from:	Overall (n=36)	Correctly solved (n=36)	Wrongly solved (n=36)
Information properly identified	94.4	100.0	83.3
Pseudo problem addresses similar information	86.1	88.9	80.6
Pseudo Helpful CoT rationale	83.3	94.5	58.3
solution Correct answer	77.8	91.7	58.3
Difficulty of the Similar as P	66.7	66.7	58.3
created Easier than P	22.2	16.7	36.1
pseudo problem Harder than P	11.1	16.7	2.8

Figure 4: Human evaluation of ours' intermediate outputs. We present the percentage of approval voting.

Case Study

Figure 5 shows a representative case of how SELF-TAUGHT better elicits demonstrations that address the same knowledge as the target problem instance. In settings where demonstrations is built upon the in-domain training or test set (*e.g.*, Retrieval CoT), unrelated demonstrations (regarding "collision" and "spring") may appear when there is no any instance in the given dataset targeting the same knowledge as \mathcal{P} (targeting "energy dissipation in the circuit"). By contrast, ours can get rid of such bottleneck and generatively facilitate tailored demonstrations with our designed phases. More empirical examples are available in Appendices.

Target Problem: A resistor in a circuit dissipates energy at a rate of 1W. If the voltage across the resistor is doubled, what is the new rate of energy dissipation?					
Retrieval-CoT (Top-1 & 2)	SELF-TAUGHT				
Problem in Demonstration 1: In a nonrelativistic, 1-dimensional collision , a particle of mass 2m collides with a particle of mass m at rest.	Problem in Demonstrations 1: If the resistance of a resistor in a circuit is doubled, and the voltage remains the same, what will happen to the rate of energy dissipation?				
Problem in Demonstration 2: One end of a horizontal, massless spring is attached to a wall. A mass of 0.30 kg is attached what is the total mechanical energy of the system?	Problem in Demonstrations 2: If the resistance of a resistor in a circuit is halved, and the voltage remains the same, what will happen to the rate of energy dissipation?				

Figure 5: Demonstrations in Retrieval CoT and Ours.

Comparing SELF-TAUGHT with Zero-shot CoT

Here, we investigate the improvement brought by SELF-TAUGHT (using 0-shot CoT in Phase II and III) over vanilla CoT in Figure 6 by comparing their prediction correctness. Among problems that 0-shot CoT is wrong, SELF-TAUGHT solve 15.4% of them correctly, even though they are both based on 0-shot CoT prompting. This exhibits the benefit of tailored demonstrations in LLM problem-solving.




Figure 6: SELF-TAUGHT's predictions in college-level problems that are correctly and wrongly solved by zero-shot CoT.

Number of Pseudo Shots

We analyze the effect of varying the number of self-created pseudo shots using the six college-level tasks (Figure 7). First, SELF-TAUGHT outperforms Manual CoT and Retrieval CoT (both have N = 3) with fewer shots (N = 2). This suggests the effectiveness of tailored demonstrations generated with our framework, as well as the possibility of tuning N to further decrease our computational cost. Also, we observe that when $N \ge 3$, model performance remains almost consistent. This pattern matches the findings from regular prompting with real demonstrations (Brown et al. 2020).




Figure 7: Ours with varying numbers of pseudo shots.

SELF-TAUGHT and Task Difficulty

Lastly, we investigate the relation between SELF-TAUGHT and task difficulty (approximated by the most un-engineered setting, *i.e.*, 0-shot Direct). Figure 8 shows a trend that as the performance of 0-shot direct decreases, the improvement increases, indicating that the LLM benefits more from SELF-TAUGHT in tasks that are initially harder for it w/o additional techniques. This provides a guideline for us to judge the priority when applying ours to LLM applications. Also, when plotting CoT against Direct, the regression coefficient $\beta =$ -0.14, showing that SELF-TAUGHT generally brings more improvement ($\beta = -0.21$) than CoT as the task gets difficult.




Figure 8: SELF-TAUGHT's effect w.r.t. task difficulty.

Related Work

General-purpose LLMs have been widely applied to diverse domains thanks to their ability to learn from user input: Li et al. (2024b) prompt LLMs to predict drug synergy; Chiang, Chou, and Riebesell (2024) build a prompt-driven system with material science APIs for crystal generation; Kwon et al. (2024) use LLMs to annotate raw patient data. However, they often rely on human demonstrations, which can be costly and yield sub-optimal performance when encountering the above-discussed demonstration-target discrepancy.

Besides the mentioned works (e.g., PS, Auto-CoT, etc.), several studies have proposed to mitigate human efforts in prompt construction: Zhou et al. (2024) and Chae et al. (2024) invoke LLMs to generate task-level plans shared across all instances to guide instance-level inference. Lyu et al. (2022) use sentences from external related corpora along with random labels as pseudo demonstrations for text classification. Wan et al. (2023) use LLMs to create a large demonstration pool by repeatedly running the test set with 0-shot CoT and using majority-vote-based criteria to select good demonstrations for problem-solving. Similarly, Li et al. (2024a) use LLMs to generate a pseudo dataset of 5K questions with 29 designed topics from scratch and use it as the demonstration pool. Recently, Yang et al. (2024) use LLMs as optimizers, where the LLM iteratively updates the problem-solving instruction (e.g., "Break this down") until it yields a maximum accuracy on the training set. To address the lack of annotated rationales for CoT fine-tuning, Hwang et al. (2024) first run the training set with LLMs to collect correct/wrong CoT rationales. Then, the "first wrong step" in wrong rationales is identified with designed algorithms and used as fine-grained rewards for preference learning.

Similar to ours, Kim et al. (2022) and Chen et al. (2023) generate pseudo demonstrations by prompting LMs with phrases like "generate a negative review" or "Come up with diverse creative instances for the task". However, the former requires the same output span (*e.g.*, positive & negative) across all test instances. The latter focuses on facilitating diverse representative problems following Auto-CoT (Zhang et al. 2022). It neglects the discrepancy (addressed information) between test and pseudo problems as well as the correctness of pseudo solutions (we show the effect of such neglection in Table 3). Inspired by them, SELF-TAUGHT resolve human effort by creating demonstrations that are both "quality-controlled" and "tailored" to each target instance, which is under-explored so far to the best of our knowledge.

Conclusions

We present **SELF-TAUGHT**, a problem-solving framework for specialized domains. It addresses the costly human effort and the demonstration-target discrepancy in LLM applications, by creating demonstrations that are quality-controlled and tailored to each test instance. It outperforms baselines in 15 tasks of QA and AD diagnosis. It is Pareto efficient regarding cost and performance and generalizable to different prompting methods and LLMs. The quality of self-created problems/solutions is confirmed in expert evaluations. We discuss the limitations of our work in Appendices.

Acknowledgements

Jinyoung Yeo is the corresponding author. This work is partly supported by an IITP grant funded by the Korean Government (MSIT) (No. RS-2020-II201361, Artificial Intelligence Graduate School Program of Yonsei University).

Additionally, besides the first author, who has a BSc in mechanical engineering, the following domain experts contribute to the annotation of human demonstrations (for tasks from MMLU) as well as human evaluations: *Cheng-Wei Hsu* (licensed doctor at MacKay Memorial Hospital, Taiwan), *Chun-Hsiang Chou* (licensed doctor at Shuang Ho Hospital, Taiwan), *Shuan Chen* (PhD in chemical engineering), *William Jackson* (licensed lawyer), *Yongho Song* (MSc in computer science), *Ruo-qiao Wen* (licensed tax accountant), *Sekwon Oh* (BSc in electrical and electronic engineering), *SeongHyeon Bae* (BSc in mathematics), and *Bryan Oh* (BSc in electrical engineering). We sincerely appreciate their help.

References

Brown, T.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J. D.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 1877– 1901.

Chae, H.; Kim, Y.; Kim, S.; Ong, K. T.-i.; Kwak, B.-w.; Kim, M.; Kim, S.; Kwon, T.; Chung, J.; Yu, Y.; et al. 2024. Language Models as Compilers: Simulating Pseudocode Execution Improves Algorithmic Reasoning in Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02575*.

Chen, W.-L.; Wu, C.-K.; Chen, Y.-N.; and Chen, H.-H. 2023. Self-ICL: Zero-Shot In-Context Learning with Self-Generated Demonstrations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 15651–15662.

Chiang, Y.; Chou, C.-H.; and Riebesell, J. 2024. LLaMP: Large Language Model Made Powerful for High-fidelity Materials Knowledge Retrieval and Distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.17244*.

Christensen, C. R.; et al. 1991. Education for judgment: The artistry of discussion leadership. ERIC.

Ebrahimi, A.; Luo, S.; and Chiong, R. 2020. Introducing transfer learning to 3D ResNet-18 for Alzheimer's disease detection on MRI images. In 2020 35th international conference on image and vision computing New Zealand (IVCNZ), 1–6. IEEE.

Ellis, K. A.; Bush, A. I.; Darby, D.; De Fazio, D.; Foster, J.; Hudson, P.; Lautenschlager, N. T.; Lenzo, N.; Martins, R. N.; Maruff, P.; et al. 2009. The Australian Imaging, Biomarkers and Lifestyle (AIBL) study of aging: methodology and baseline characteristics of 1112 individuals recruited for a longitudinal study of Alzheimer's disease. *International psychogeriatrics*, 21(4): 672–687.

Geva, M.; Khashabi, D.; Segal, E.; Khot, T.; Roth, D.; and Berant, J. 2021. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 9: 346–361.

Grow, G. O. 1991. Teaching learners to be self-directed. *Adult education quarterly*, 41(3): 125–149.

Hendrycks, D.; Burns, C.; Basart, S.; Zou, A.; Mazeika, M.; Song, D.; and Steinhardt, J. 2020. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*.

Hwang, H.; Kim, D.; Kim, S.; Ye, S.; and Seo, M. 2024. Self-Explore to Avoid the Pit: Improving the Reasoning Capabilities of Language Models with Fine-grained Rewards. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10346*.

Jack Jr, C. R.; Bernstein, M. A.; Fox, N. C.; Thompson, P.; Alexander, G.; Harvey, D.; Borowski, B.; Britson, P. J.; L. Whitwell, J.; Ward, C.; et al. 2008. The Alzheimer's disease neuroimaging initiative (ADNI): MRI methods. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging: An Official Journal of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*, 27(4): 685–691.

Jang, J.; and Hwang, D. 2022. M3T: three-dimensional Medical image classifier using Multi-plane and Multi-slice Transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 20718–20729.

Jin, D.; Pan, E.; Oufattole, N.; Weng, W.-H.; Fang, H.; and Szolovits, P. 2021. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14): 6421.

Kim, H. J.; Cho, H.; Kim, J.; Kim, T.; Yoo, K. M.; and Lee, S.-g. 2022. Self-generated in-context learning: Leveraging auto-regressive language models as a demonstration generator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08082*.

Kojima, T.; Gu, S. S.; Reid, M.; Matsuo, Y.; and Iwasawa, Y. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 22199–22213.

Kong, A.; Zhao, S.; Chen, H.; Li, Q.; Qin, Y.; Sun, R.; and Zhou, X. 2024. Better zero-shot reasoning with role-play prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07702*.

Kwon, T.; Ong, K. T.-i.; Kang, D.; Moon, S.; Lee, J. R.; Hwang, D.; Sohn, B.; Sim, Y.; Lee, D.; and Yeo, J. 2024. Large Language Models Are Clinical Reasoners: Reasoning-Aware Diagnosis Framework with Prompt-Generated Rationales. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, 18417–18425.

Labrak, Y.; Bazoge, A.; Morin, E.; Gourraud, P.-A.; Rouvier, M.; and Dufour, R. 2024. Biomistral: A collection of open-source pretrained large language models for medical domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10373*.

Li, J.; Wang, J.; Zhang, Z.; and Zhao, H. 2024a. Self-Prompting Large Language Models for Zero-Shot Open-Domain QA. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 296–310.

Li, T.; Shetty, S.; Kamath, A.; Jaiswal, A.; Jiang, X.; Ding, Y.; and Kim, Y. 2024b. CancerGPT for few shot drug pair

synergy prediction using large pretrained language models. *npj Digital Medicine*, 7(1): 40.

Lightman, H.; Kosaraju, V.; Burda, Y.; Edwards, H.; Baker, B.; Lee, T.; Leike, J.; Schulman, J.; Sutskever, I.; and Cobbe, K. 2024. Let's Verify Step by Step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Liu, H.; Yin, H.; Luo, Z.; and Wang, X. 2024. Integrating Chemistry Knowledge in Large Language Models via Prompt Engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14467*.

Lu, P.; Mishra, S.; Xia, T.; Qiu, L.; Chang, K.-W.; Zhu, S.-C.; Tafjord, O.; Clark, P.; and Kalyan, A. 2022. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 2507–2521.

Lyu, X.; Min, S.; Beltagy, I.; Zettlemoyer, L.; and Hajishirzi, H. 2022. Z-ICL: zero-shot in-context learning with pseudo-demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09865*.

Meta. 2024. Llama. https://llama.meta.com/.

Min, S.; Lyu, X.; Holtzman, A.; Artetxe, M.; Lewis, M.; Hajishirzi, H.; and Zettlemoyer, L. 2022. Rethinking the Role of Demonstrations: What Makes In-Context Learning Work? In Goldberg, Y.; Kozareva, Z.; and Zhang, Y., eds., *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 11048–11064. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Norman, G. 2005. Research in clinical reasoning: past history and current trends. *Medical education*, 39(4): 418–427.

Ong, K. T.-i.; Kim, H.; Kim, M.; Jang, J.; Sohn, B.; Choi, Y. S.; Hwang, D.; Hwang, S. J.; and Yeo, J. 2023. Evidenceempowered transfer learning for Alzheimer's disease. In 2023 IEEE 20th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI), 1–5. IEEE.

OpenAI. 2023. ChatGPT. https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt.

Qiu, S.; Joshi, P. S.; Miller, M. I.; Xue, C.; Zhou, X.; Karjadi, C.; Chang, G. H.; Joshi, A. S.; Dwyer, B.; Zhu, S.; et al. 2020. Development and validation of an interpretable deep learning framework for Alzheimer's disease classification. *Brain*, 143(6): 1920–1933.

Reimers, N.; and Gurevych, I. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:1908.10084.

Singhal, K.; Azizi, S.; Tu, T.; Mahdavi, S. S.; Wei, J.; Chung, H. W.; Scales, N.; Tanwani, A.; Cole-Lewis, H.; Pfohl, S.; et al. 2023. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 620(7972): 172–180.

Wan, X.; Sun, R.; Dai, H.; Arik, S.; and Pfister, T. 2023. Better Zero-Shot Reasoning with Self-Adaptive Prompting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL* 2023, 3493–3514.

Wang, L.; Xu, W.; Lan, Y.; Hu, Z.; Lan, Y.; Lee, R. K.-W.; and Lim, E.-P. 2023. Plan-and-solve prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04091*.

Wang, X.; Wang, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Luo, F.; Li, P.; Sun, M.; and Liu, Y. 2024. Reasoning in Conversation: Solving Subjective Tasks through Dialogue Simulation for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17226*.

Wei, J.; Wang, X.; Schuurmans, D.; Bosma, M.; Xia, F.; Chi, E.; Le, Q. V.; Zhou, D.; et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 24824–24837.

Xiong, M.; Hu, Z.; Lu, X.; LI, Y.; Fu, J.; He, J.; and Hooi, B. 2024. Can LLMs Express Their Uncertainty? An Empirical Evaluation of Confidence Elicitation in LLMs. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Yang, C.; Wang, X.; Lu, Y.; Liu, H.; Le, Q. V.; Zhou, D.; and Chen, X. 2024. Large Language Models as Optimizers. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Zaki, M.; Krishnan, N. A.; et al. 2024. MaScQA: investigating materials science knowledge of large language models. *Digital Discovery*, 3(2): 313–327.

Zhang, C.; Adeli, E.; Zhou, T.; Chen, X.; and Shen, D. 2018. Multi-Layer Multi-View Classification for Alzheimer's Disease Diagnosis. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI' 18/IAAI' 18/EAAI' 18. AAAI Press. ISBN 978-1-57735-800-8.

Zhang, Z.; Zhang, A.; Li, M.; and Smola, A. 2022. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*.

Zhou, P.; Pujara, J.; Ren, X.; Chen, X.; Cheng, H.-T.; Le, Q. V.; Chi, E. H.; Zhou, D.; Mishra, S.; and Zheng, H. S. 2024. Self-discover: Large language models self-compose reasoning structures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03620*.

Zhu, W.; Sun, L.; Huang, J.; Han, L.; and Zhang, D. 2021. Dual attention multi-instance deep learning for Alzheimer's disease diagnosis with structural MRI. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 40(9): 2354–2366.

Appendices

1 Limitations

This work has limitations. First of all, SELF-TAUGHT can be less cost-efficient. Although we have shown that SELF-TAUGHT's cost-performance trade-off is acceptable (*i.e.*, Pareto efficient), addressing the system cost more explicitly can be necessary for real-world deployment. A plausible direction is combining Retrieval CoT, SELF-TAUGHT, and an additional logic (*e.g.*, a threshold of text similarity) that determines whether problems addressing similar knowledge to the target problem are available in the training/test corpora (for us to retrieve) and selectively generate tailored demonstrations only when such problems are absent or not enough for the desired number of shots.

Another concern is that although SELF-TAUGHT generally brings more performance gains to the adopted LLM in tasks that are initially more challenging for it (Figure 8), the final performance may still be far from optimal due to the lack of related knowledge in its parameter. One may address this by (1) adopting LLMs that are fine-tuned with corpora of the corresponding domains, *e.g.*, running SELF-TAUGHT with BioMistral (Labrak et al. 2024) when solving medical problems, or (2) retrieving relevant information from external knowledge bases and use them to augment the generation of tailored demonstrations. We leave these to future work.

2 Supplementary Results

Combining SELF-TAUGHT with Other Zero-shot Prompting Methods

We hereby present the full result of Table 4:

- Table 9: The results for SELF-TAUGHT that is combined with zero-shot Direct.
- Table 10: The results for SELF-TAUGHT that is combined with zero-shot Plan-and-Solve (PS).

Combining SELF-TAUGHT with a Smaller Open-source LLM

We show the detailed results of Figure 3 at:

- Table 11: SELF-TAUGHT's performances when run with Llama-3.1-8B in question-answering.
- Table 12: SELF-TAUGHT's performances when run with Llama-3.1-8B in the diagnosis of AD.

3 Further Details on the Datasets

Question Answering of Diverse Domains

StrategyQA. This dataset contains questions that target multi-hop reasoning over a wide range of knowledge (Geva et al. 2021). The main feature of this dataset is that the necessary knowledge required for solving the question is not explicitly stated in the question text (*e.g.*, "Yes or No: *Did Aristotle Use a Laptop?*"). We adopted the test set (of 2,290 data) provided in BIG-bench.⁹

ScienceQA. This dataset is proposed by Lu et al. (2022), questions are collected from elementary \sim high school curricula, targeting 26 topics including math, language, geography, etc. We adopt the test set and exclude problems addressing the vision modality, *i.e.*, images (the final test set has a size of 2,224.) An example question is shown below:

Complete the statement. Hydrogen chloride is

(A) "a compound"

(B) "an elementary substance"

MedQA. This is a popular benchmark datasets in the medical domain curated by Jin et al. (2021). Since the questions are collected from national medical licensing exams in several countries (*i.e.*, multi-lingual), we only adopt questions written in English. We use the test set with a size of 1,273. An example is shown below:

A 21-year-old sexually active male complains of fever, pain during urination, and inflammation and pain in the right knee. A culture of the joint fluid shows a bacteria that does not ferment maltose and has no polysaccharide capsule. The physician orders antibiotic therapy for the patient. The mechanism of action of action of the medication given blocks cell wall synthesis, which of the following was given?"

- (A) "Gentamicin"
- (B) "Ciprofloxacin"
- (C) "Ceftriaxone"
- (D) "Trimethoprim"

College-level QA of 6 domains. We include collegelevel problems of computer science (CS), medicine (Med), chemistry (Chem), math, physics (Phys), and biology (Bio) domains. The problems are collected from college textbooks and exams by Hendrycks et al. (2020) as a part of the MMLU (Massive Multitask Language Understanding) dataset. The statistic is provided in Table 5 and an example is shown below:

Nitronyl nitroxides are stable radicals in which the unpaired electron is coupled to two equivalent nitrogen nuclei. How many lines will appear in the EPR spectrum of a solution of a rigid nitronyl nitroxide diradical with J << a?

(A) 3 lines
(B) 9 lines
(C) 5 lines
(D) 7 lines

Domains	CS	Med	Chem	Math	Phys	Bio
Size	100	173	100	100	102	144

Table 5: Statistics of the college-level datasets (test sets).

Professional-level QA of 4 domains. We include four datasets addressing professional-level knowledge of accounting (Acct), medicine (Med), psychology (Psych), and

⁹https://github.com/google/BIG-bench/tree/main

legal (Law) domains. The problems are mainly obtained from diverse licensing/bar exams of the corresponding profession by Hendrycks et al. (2020) as a part of the MMLU (Massive Multitask Language Understanding) dataset. An example is shown below and the statistic is provided in Table 6.

An off-duty police officer was standing on a street corner waiting for a bus. A man came up from behind and stole the police officer's wallet from his pants pocket. As the man was running away with the wallet, the police officer pulled out his service revolver. The police officer yelled at the man to stop and then fired several shots in the man's direction. The police officer did not aim directly at the man but shot at the pavement intending to frighten him. One of the bullets ricocheted off the sidewalk and struck the man, killing him. The police officer is guilty of

(A) assault with a deadly weapon.

(B) involuntary manslaughter.

(C) voluntary manslaughter.

(D) murder.

Domains	Accounting	Med	Psychology	Law
Size	282	272	612	1534

Table 6: Statistics of the pro-level datasets (test sets).

AD Diagnosis with Real Patients

ADNI. The Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) (Jack Jr et al. 2008) is a long-term research project with the goal of addressing the diagnosis of AD. Data from ADNI has been widely used in prior works and significantly influenced the development of deep learning-based AD diagnosis (Ebrahimi, Luo, and Chiong 2020; Zhang et al. 2018; Jang and Hwang 2022; Ong et al. 2023).

AIBL. The Australian Imaging, Biomarker and Lifestyle Flagship Study of Ageing (AIBL) (Ellis et al. 2009) is a project to investigate which biomarkers, cognitive characteristics, and health/lifestyle factors determine the subsequent progression of symptomatic AD. Data from AIBL is also one of the most widely used data for deep learning-based AD diagnosis (Qiu et al. 2020; Zhu et al. 2021; Jang and Hwang 2022).

Features of both AD datasets. Each patient data from ADNI and AIBL has the following elements: (1) MRI scans of patients; (2) demographic information; (3) education level; (4) results from the mini-mental state examination; (5) the presence of APOE4 allele; (6) The ground-truth label of diagnosis.

Textualized MRI data. Since this work focuses on monomodal problem-solving, *i.e.*, without considering the imaging modality, we incorporate the textualized ADNI and AIBL (only test sets) curated by Kwon et al. (2024), where the MRI scans are transformed into textual descriptions in the form of EHR via an automatic process based on the structural features of brain regions.¹⁰ We provide an example of such textualized data based on a patient from ADNI in Table 7. The data derived from AIBL has the exact same format.

Patient Description (EHR):
This patient is a 65-year-old Male who has completed
16 years of education and is Married.
The patient has a Mini-mental State Examination score
of 26.0/30 and has no APOE4 gene.
Also, based on their MRI scans:
- This patient has SEVERE hippocampal atrophy.
- This patient has MILD
- This patient has NO
Diagnosis:
Alzheimer's Disease

Table 7: Partially masked example of ADNI data (one must be authorized by ADNI for full access). The typewriter font indicates values being inserted in the EHR template as mentioned in RQ2 result.

Statistics. The statistics of the test sets we used for our experiment is provided in Table 8.

Diagnoses	# AD	# MCI	# NC
ADNI	248	259	252
AIBL	130	158	140

Table 8: Statistics of the two AD datasets (test sets).

Additional ethical statements. All data for AD diagnosis used in this work are approved by the Institutional Review Board. They should not be shared without permission and only be used by researchers authorized by ADNI and AIBL for research purposes. Therefore, all patient information shown as examples is partially masked or omitted.

4 Demonstrations for Manual CoT and Few-shot Direct

We provide the prompts for these baselines on our GitHub page.¹¹ Here, we discuss how we acquire the few-shot demonstrations for them:

¹⁰Kwon et al. (2024) select 14 regions associated with AD: Hippocampus, Amygdala, Entorhinal, Parahippocampus, Medial Temporal Lobe, Fusiform, Precuneus, Superior Paretal, Lateral Ventricle, Frontal Lobe, Temporal Lobe, Parietal Lobe, Occipital Lobe, and Cerebral Cortex.

¹¹[link omitted during the review period]

Our Expert Annotation for MMLU Tasks.

For college-level QA of 4 domains and profession-level QA of 6 domains from MMLU, we manually annotated the fewshot examples (*i.e.*, CoT rationales) for Manual CoT with a group of experts of corresponding domains. The names of the experts are listed in Acknowledgements. Note that because some of our experts do not speak English as their first language, generative AI may be applied during the annotation process purely for text translation/correction purposes.

Demonstrations Annotated by Prior Work

For StrategyQA, we adopt the human-annotated few-shot demonstration from Wei et al. (2022); For ScienceQA, we use the golden explanations provided in the original dataset as the CoT rationales in the few-shot demonstrations for Manual CoT; For MedQA, we use the human-annotated demonstrations provided by Singhal et al. (2023); For ADNI and AIBL, we adopt the clinical CoT rationales provided by Kwon et al. (2024).¹². We also present all of them on our GitHub page.¹³

Demonstrations for Few-shot Direct

For demonstrations in the few-shot Direct, we adopt the above-mentioned demonstrations and remove their rationale parts (*i.e.*, only the problem text and the final answer are preserved).

5 Codes and Prompts for SELF-TAUGHT

Codes for SELF-TAUGHT

We provide the code for our proposed framework in our GitHub page.¹⁴

Prompts for SELF-TAUGHT

We hereby provide the prompts for each of SELF-TAUGHT's phases. While the prompt structures for QA and AD diagnosis are exactly identical, we make small adjustments (*e.g.*, [QUESTION] \rightarrow [PATIENT CASE]) due to the nature of the tasks:

- Figure 9: Prompts for SELF-TAUGHT in QA tasks.
- Figure 10: Prompts for SELF-TAUGHT in AD diagnosis.

6 Empirical Examples of SELF-TAUGHT

Besides Figure 1 and Figure 5, we provide several more examples of SELF-TAUGHT's tailored demonstration in:

- Figure 11 and 12: We compare the tailored/relevant demonstrations in SELF-TAUGHT and Retrieval CoT.
- Figure 13 and 14: We show the generation of SELF-TAUGHT's each phase.

We plan to present more examples on our GitHub page after the review period.

7 Further Implementation Details

As mentioned in Phase II-2, we empirically set N to 3, λ to 90, and t to 5. We randomly select an s with the highest cs if we cannot obtain any s with $cs \ge \lambda$ before the end of the t-th iteration. The random seed for the random selection is 7 with the "random" module from Python.¹⁵

¹²https://github.com/ktio89/ClinicalCoT

¹³[link omitted during the review period]

¹⁴[link omitted during the review period]

¹⁵https://docs.python.org/3/library/random.html

Settings / Tasks	StrategyQA	ScienceQA	MedQA	COLLEGE	PRO ADNI	AIBL Avg	;
Zero-shot Direct	66.11	82.42	56.64	52.16	53.33 55.20	51.87 59.68	8
SELF-TAUGHT (based on Zero-shot Direct) w/o Certainty Filtering	70.22 69.35	84.40 85.75	57.42 57.66			52.34 62.03 (+2) 50.70 61.21 (+	

Table 9: Improvement brought by SELF-TAUGHT to zero-shot Direct.

Settings / Tasks	StrategyQA	ScienceQA	MedQA	COLLEGE	PRO ADNI	AIBL	Avg
Zero-shot PS	70.39	87.72	66.93	63.84	58.30 56.62	55.14	65.56
SELF-TAUGHT (based on Zero-shot PS) w/o Certainty Filtering	71.67 71.44	87.99 88.17	66.93 64.89	65.23 64.90	57.52 59.03 58.24 59.29	58.41 54.18	66.68 (+1.12) 65.87 (+0.31)

Table 10: Improvement brought by SELF-TAUGHT to zero-shot Plan-and-Solve (PS).

					MMLU: College Level			MMLU: Professional Level						
Methods / Tasks	StrategyQA	ScienceQA	MedQA	CS	Med	Chem	Math	Phys	Bio	Acct	Med	Psych	Law	Avg
Zero-shot prompti	ng / without r	eal demonstr	ations:											
Zero-shot Direct Zero-shot CoT Plan-and-Solve SELF-TAUGHT	67.47 72.20 71.20 73.95	75.22 92.48 92.22 90.20	57.58 63.14 67.56 67.24	67.00 62.00	72.83 68.21	00.00	53.00 44.00	62.75 65.69	81.94 78.47			72.39 67.97	42.7 50.07 49.47 52.22	56.55 68.29 66.08 69.28
Oracles (demonstr	rations are ma	ade with real	problems)):										
Few-shot Direct Manual CoT	<u>69.74</u> 72.31	$\frac{\underline{82.33}}{\underline{88.62}}$	<u>57.68</u> <u>65.99</u>	$\frac{46.39}{61.86}$	$\frac{56.24}{67.63}$	$\frac{43.30}{46.39}$	$\frac{\underline{28.87}}{\underline{49.48}}$	$\frac{48.04}{66.83}$	<u>68.06</u> <u>73.61</u>	$\frac{40.43}{50.71}$	$\frac{50.44}{76.84}$	$\frac{\underline{61.27}}{\underline{66.83}}$	$\frac{37.61}{38.98}$	$\left \frac{53.11}{63.54}\right $

Table 11: Performances (question-answering) of Pareto efficient methods (presented in Figure 2) when adopting a small opensource LLM, Llama-3.1-8B. <u>Underlines</u> show oracles outperformed by ours. We report the accuracy.

Patients from:	ADNI & AIBL					
Methods / Metrics	F1	Precision	Recall	Accuracy		
Zero-shot Direct	40.28	47.92	44.93	45.79		
Zero-shot CoT	52.10	52.90	54.96	53.75		
Plan-and-Solve	53.46	54.50	56.65	54.92		
Self-Taught	53.50	54.44	53.96	56.34		
Oracles (demonstrations are made with real problems):						
Few-shot Direct	18.35	38.20	32.52	35.47		
Manual CoT	55.19	58.51	58.52	58.67		

Table 12: Performances (AD diagnosis) of Pareto efficient methods (presented in Figure 2) when adopting a small open-source LLM, Llama-3.1-8B. <u>Underlines</u> show oracles outperformed by ours. Precision, recall, and F1 are weighted Avg of 3 diagnosis classes.

Phase I: Information Identification [QUESTION]

{target_problem}

After reading [QUESTION], abstractively list the necessary knowledge/concept required to solve this question. [List of Required Necessary Knowledge]

1.

Phase II-1: Generating Pseudo Problems with High Relevancy

- Required Knowledge -{information_identified_in_Phase_I} [QUESTION 1] {target_problem} # Insert "Yes or NO: " in front of the target problem for StrategyQA.

The above is a question and the necessary knowledge required to solve it. Write three new multiple-choice questions ([QUESTION 2] ~ [QUESTION 4]) that address the above knowledge in the same format and style as the above question. # "multiple-choice" \rightarrow "yes-or-no" for StrategyQA.

Phase II-2: Generating Pseudo Solutions with High Certainty

Read the question ("[QUESTION]"), provide the answer, and let me know how confident you are (0-100%) that your answer is correct. Please be honest! It's okay if your confidence level is not 100%. Think step-by-step and end your generation with:

"The correct option is (option_label) option_content. The confidence level = number%" # "The answer is yes_or_no. The confidence ..." for StrategyQA.

[QUESTION] {pseudo_problem} [ANSWER] Let's think step-by-step.

Phase III: Self-Directed Problem-Solving with Tailored Demonstrations Below "-YOUR TASK-", think step-by-step and generate the answer to the question. End your generation with "The correct option is (option_label) option_content". # "The answer is yes_or_no" for StrategyQA.

-EXAMPLE 1-[QUESTION] {pseudo_problem_1} [ANSWER] Let's think step-by-step. {pseudo_solution_1} ... N-1 shots omitted ...

-YOUR TASK-[QUESTION] {target_problem} [ANSWER] Let's think step-by-step.

Figure 9: Prompts for all phases in SELF-TAUGHT for **question-answering** tasks. Gray comments (highlighted with "#") show adjustments for different tasks, if any (not parts of the prompt). Phase I and II are performed completely under a zero-shot setting without any demonstrations. Phase II-2 is repeated if there is more than one pseudo problem to answer.

Phase I: Information Identification

[PATIENT CASE] Descriptions for the given patient: {target_problem (EHR)} What is the diagnosis of this patient? (A) Alzheimer's Disease (B) Mild Cognitive Impairment (C) Normal Cognition

After reading [PATIENT CASE], abstractively list the knowledge/concept required to correctly diagnose this specific patient based on his/her description. [List of Required Necessary Knowledge] 1.

Phase II-1: Generating Pseudo Problems with High Relevancy - Required Knowledge -{information_identified_in_Phase_I} [QUESTION 1] Descriptions for the given patient: {target_problem (EHR)} What is the diagnosis of this patient? (A) Alzheimer's Disease (B) Mild Cognitive Impairment (C) Normal Cognition

The above is a question text (descriptions of a patient) and the necessary knowledge required to correctly diagnose this patient. Write two new patient cases ([QUESTION 2] and [QUESTION 3]) that present similar findings (EHR) to the above patient case and address the above knowledge in the same format and style.

Phase II-2: Generating Pseudo Solutions with High Certainty

Based on the given descriptions of a patient, think step-by-step and diagnose the patient: either (A) Alzheimer's Disease (B) Mild Cognitive Impairment, or (C) Normal Cognition. Let me know how confident you are (0-100%) that your answer is correct. Please be honest! It's okay if your confidence level is not 100%. End your generation with: "Final Diagnosis: (label) diagnosis_name. The confidence level = number%"

[Descriptions for the given patient]: {Pseudo_problem} What is the diagnosis of this patient? (A) Alzheimer's Disease (B) Mild Cognitive Impairment (C) Normal Cognition [Clinical Rationale]: Let's think step-by-step.

Phase III: Self-Directed Problem-Solving with Tailored Demonstrations

Based on the given patient description, generate a clinical rationale representing your thinking and diagnose the patient. End your generation with: "Final Diagnosis: (label) diagnosis_name" [Case 1]

[Descriptions for the given patient]: {pseudo_problem_1} What is the diagnosis of this patient? (A) Alzheimer's Disease (B) Mild Cognitive Impairment (C) Normal Cognition [Clinical Rationale]: Let's think step-by-step. {pseudo_solution_1} ... N-1 shots omited ...

[Case N+1]

[Descriptions for the given patient]: {target_problem (EHR)} What is the diagnosis of this patient? (A) Alzheimer's Disease (B) Mild Cognitive Impairment (C) Normal Cognition [Clinical Rationale]: Let's think step-by-step.

Figure 10: Prompts for all phases in SELF-TAUGHT for **AD diagnosis** tasks. Phase I and II are performed completely under a zero-shot setting without any demonstrations. Phase II-2 is repeated if there is more than one pseudo problem to answer.

Target Problem: Suppose today is Wednesday. What day of the week will it be 10^(10^(10)) days from now? (A) Sunday (B) Monday

(C) Tuesday (D) Wednesday

Demonstrations in Retrieval CoT (Top 1~3)	SELF-TAUGHT
Problem in Demonstration 1: What is the units digit in the standard decimal expansion of the number 7^25? (A) 1 (B) 3 (C) 5 (D) 7	Problem in Demonstration 1: Given that today is a Saturday, what day of the week will it be 365 days from now? (A) Monday (B) Tuesday (C) Wednesday (D) Thursday
Problem in Demonstration 2: It takes Kate k days to write a GRE math practice test. It takes John j days to write a GRE math practice test. If Kate and John work on a practice test in alternating 2-day shifts, it takes them 10 days when Kate starts and 10.5 days when John starts. How long would it take the two to complete a practice test if Kate and John worked simultaneously? (A) 9/2 days (B) 5 days (C) 41/8 days (D) 36/7 days	 Problem in Demonstration 2: If today is the 23rd of the month, what day of the week will it be 100 days from now? (A) Sunday (B) Monday (C) Tuesday (D) Wednesday
Problem in Demonstration 3: (1+i)^10 = (A) 1 (B) i (C) 32 (D) 32i	Problem in Demonstration 3: If today is the 15th of the month, what day of the week will it be 50 days from now? (A) Friday (B) Saturday (C) Sunday (D) Monday

Figure 11: Demontrations in Retrieval CoT and SELF-TAUGHT (1). Our method facilitates better relevant/tailored demonstrations than naively using in-domain corpora as the demonstration pool.

Target Problem: Of the following ions, which has the	he smallest radius? (A) K+ (B) Ca2+ (C) Sc3+ (D) Rb+				
Demonstrations in Retrieval CoT (Top 1~3)	SELF-TAUGHT				
 Problem in Demonstration 1: Of the following solutions, which will have the highest ionic strength? (Assume complete dissociation.) (A) 0.050 M AlCl3 (B) 0.100 M NaCl (C) 0.050 M CaCl2 (D) 0.100 M HCl 	 Problem in Demonstration 1: Which of the following factors primarily determines the size of an ion? (A) Number of protons in the nucleus (B) Number of neutrons in the nucleus (C) Number of electrons in the outermost shell (D) Number of electrons in the inner shells 				
Problem in Demonstration 2: Considering 0.1 M aqueous solutions of each of the following, which solution has the lowest pH? (A) Na2CO3 (B) Na3PO4 (C) Na2S (D) NaCl	Problem in Demonstration 2: As you move from left to right across a period in the periodic table, the atomic radius generally: (A) Increases (B) Decreases (C) Remains constant (D) Fluctuates randomly				
Problem in Demonstration 3: Of the following compounds, which has the lowest melting point? (A) HCl (B) AgCl (C) CaCl2 (D) CCl4	Problem in Demonstration 3: Among the following ions, which would have the largest radius? (A) F- (B) O2- (C) N3- (D) Li+				

Figure 12: Demontrations in Retrieval CoT and SELF-TAUGHT (2). Our method facilitates better relevant/tailored demonstrations than naively using in-domain corpora as the demonstration pool.

and parties average, w if you worl weekends?	t a limousine for \$98,000 and are planning to rent it for weddings, ceremonies at \$245 per hour. If you estimate the car will be hired for 2 hours a day on ith daily costs at about \$50, what is the estimated yearly yield on your investment c all year round, i.e. every day of the year, including any festivities and (B) 1.64% (C) 0.45% (D) 183%				
Phases	Outputs				
Phase I: Information Identification	 1. Understanding of how to calculate yearly yield on an investment 2. Knowledge of how to calculate daily costs and revenue for a rental business 3. Understanding of how to calculate the total revenue generated by renting out a product for a certain amount of time 				
Phase II-1: Generating Pseudo Problems with High Relevanc	Pseudo Problem 1 You invested \$5,000 in a stock that has an annual return rate of 8%. What is the estimated yearly yield on your investment if you keep the money invested for the entire year? (A) \$400 (B) 0.08% (C) \$5,400 (D) 8%				
	Pseudo Problem 2 You own a rental property that brings in \$1,200 in monthly rent. If your monthly expenses for the property, including maintenance and taxes, total \$500, what is the estimated monthly profit on your investment? (A) \$500 (B) \$1,200 (C) \$700 (D) \$1,700				
	Pseudo Problem 3 You run a catering business where you charge \$20 per person for a buffet meal. If you cater an average of 50 people per event and your total expenses for each event amount to \$500, what is the estimated profit you make per event? (A) \$500 (B) \$1,000 (C) \$5000 (D) \$5000				
Phase II-2: Generating Pseudo Solutions with High Certainty					
	Pseudo Solution 2First, calculate the monthly profit by subtracting the monthly expenses from the monthly rent. \$1,200 (monthly rent) - \$500 (monthly expenses) = \$700 (monthly profit)Therefore, the estimated monthly profit on your investment is \$700. The correct option is (C) \$700. The confidence level = 100%				
	 <u>Pseudo Solution 3</u> First, calculate the total revenue per event by multiplying the number of people catered (50) by the price per person (\$20). 50 people * \$20 = \$1000 Next, subtract the total expenses per event (\$500) from the total revenue to find the estimated profit. \$1000 - \$500 = \$500 Therefore, the estimated profit made per event is \$500. The correct option is (A) \$500. The confidence level = 100% 				
Phase III: Self-Directed Problem-Solving with Tailored Demonstrations	Solution to the Target Problem First, calculate the daily revenue by multiplying the hourly rental rate (\$245) by the estimated hours hired per day (2). \$245 * 2 = \$490 (daily revenue) Next, calculate the daily profit by subtracting the daily costs (\$50) from the daily revenue. \$490 - \$50 = \$440 (daily profit) Then, calculate the yearly profit by multiplying the daily profit by the number of days in a year, assuming you work every day. \$440 * 365 = \$160,600 (yearly profit)				
	To find the estimated yearly yield on your investment, divide the yearly profit by the initial investment ($\$98,000$) and multiply by 100 to get a percentage. ($\$160,600 / \$98,000$) * $100 = 164\%$ Therefore, the estimated yearly yield on your investment is 164%. The correct option is (A) 164%.				

Figure 13: Examples of SELF-TAUGHT's generation. Red texts are removed when used as pseudo demonstrations in Phase III.

replicating (I (C) A DNA s	sequence that can move from one site in the genome to another without 3) A DNA sequence that can be deleted from the genome without consequence sequence that replicates via an RNA intermediate sequence that replicates via a protein intermediate
Phases	Outputs
Phase I: Information Identification	 Understanding of the structure and function of DNA Knowledge of the process of transposition and retrotransposition Understanding of the differences between DNA and RNA replication Familiarity with the concept of retrotransposons and their mechanisms of replication.
Phase II-1: Generating Pseudo Problems with High Relevancy	 <u>Pseudo Problem 1</u> Which of the following accurately describes the process of transposition? (A) The movement of a DNA sequence from one site in the genome to another without replicating (B) The deletion of a DNA sequence from the genome without consequence (C) The replication of a DNA sequence via an RNA intermediate (D) The replication of a DNA sequence via a protein intermediate
	 <u>Pseudo Problem 2</u> What is the main difference between DNA replication and RNA replication? (A) DNA replication occurs in the nucleus, while RNA replication occurs in the cytoplasm (B) DNA replication is a semiconservative process, while RNA replication is conservative (C) DNA replication requires a primer, while RNA replication does not (D) DNA replication is catalyzed by DNA polymerase, while RNA replication is catalyzed by RNA polymerase
	<u>Pseudo Problem 3</u> Which of the following statements best describes the mechanism of retrotransposons? (A) Retrotransposons move within the genome by simple diffusion
	(B) Retrotransposons replicate by directly copying their DNA sequence (C) Retrotransposons use an RNA intermediate to replicate and insert themselves into new genomic locations (D) Retrotransposons rely on a protein intermediate for their replication process
Phase II-2: Generating Pseudo Solutions with High Certainty	<u>Pseudo Solution 1</u> Transposition is the movement of a DNA sequence from one site in the genome to another without replicating. This accurately describes the process of transposition. The correct option is (A) The movement of a DNA sequence from one site in the genome to another without replicating. The confidence level = 100%
	<u>Pseudo Solution 2</u> The main difference between DNA replication and RNA replication is that DNA replication is catalyzed by DNA polymerase, while RNA replication is catalyzed by RNA polymerase. This is because DNA polymerase is respon- sible for synthesizing new DNA strands during DNA replication, while RNA polymerase synthesizes RNA strands during RNA replication. The correct option is (D) DNA replication is catalyzed by DNA polymerase, while RNA replication is catalyzed by RNA polymerase. The confidence level = 100%
	<u>Pseudo Solution 3</u> Retrotransposons are a type of transposable element that replicates via an RNA intermediate using a process called retrotransposition. This means that they use an RNA molecule as a template to make a DNA copy of themselves, which is then inserted into a new location in the genome. Therefore, the statement that best describes the mechanism of retrotransposons is: (C) Retrotransposons use an RNA intermediate to replicate and insert themselves into new genomic locations. The confidence level = 100%
Phase III: Self-Directed Problem-Solving with Tailored Demonstrations	Solution to the Target Problem A retrotransposon is a type of transposable element that replicates via an RNA intermediate using a process called retrotransposition. This means that it uses an RNA molecule as a template to make a DNA copy of itself, which is then inserted into a new location in the genome. Therefore, the statement that most accurately describes a retrotransposon is: (C) A DNA sequence that replicates via an RNA intermediate. The correct option is (C) A DNA sequence that replicates via an RNA intermediate.

Figure 14: Examples of SELF-TAUGHT's generation. Brown texts are removed when used as demonstrations in Phase III.