

Knowledge Editing through Chain-of-Thought

Changyue Wang
changyuewang02@gmail.com
Department of Computer Science and Technology,
Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Qingyao Ai*
aiqy@tsinghua.edu.cn
Department of Computer Science and Technology,
Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Weihang Su
swh22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn
Department of Computer Science and Technology,
Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Yiqun Liu
yiqunliu@tsinghua.edu.cn
Department of Computer Science and Technology,
Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional capabilities across a wide range of natural language processing (NLP) tasks. However, keeping these models up-to-date with evolving world knowledge remains a significant challenge due to the high costs of frequent retraining. To address this challenge, knowledge editing techniques have emerged to update LLMs with new information without rebuilding the model from scratch. Among these, the in-context editing paradigm stands out for its effectiveness in integrating new knowledge while preserving the model's original capabilities. Despite its potential, existing in-context knowledge editing methods are often task-specific, focusing primarily on multi-hop QA tasks using structured knowledge triples. Moreover, their reliance on few-shot prompting for task decomposition makes them unstable and less effective in generalizing across diverse tasks.

In response to these limitations, we propose **EditCoT**, a novel knowledge editing framework that flexibly and efficiently updates LLMs across various tasks without retraining. EditCoT works by generating a chain-of-thought (CoT) for a given input and then iteratively refining this CoT process using a CoT editor based on updated knowledge. We evaluate EditCoT across a diverse range of benchmarks, covering multiple languages and tasks. The results demonstrate that our approach achieves state-of-the-art performance while offering superior generalization, effectiveness, and stability compared to existing methods, marking a significant advancement in the field of knowledge updating¹.

ACM Reference Format:

Changyue Wang, Weihang Su, Qingyao Ai, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Knowledge Editing through Chain-of-Thought. In *WebConf*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/000.000>

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown remarkable performance across numerous NLP tasks in recent years. However, once an LLM has been fully trained, its parametric knowledge becomes fixed and constrained. Retraining the entire model to incorporate new information is both expensive and time-consuming. To address

this challenge, the field of knowledge editing has emerged, offering techniques to modify or add knowledge efficiently while preserving most of the original model's parameters. Existing knowledge edit approaches can be broadly categorized into two types: parametric and non-parametric [37]. Parametric methods directly modify the model's weights to integrate new knowledge. While this approach enables precise editing, existing research indicates that such changes may negatively affect the model's original performance and interfere with previously learned knowledge that should remain unchanged[12]. In contrast, non-parametric methods, such as in-context editing, are increasingly popular because they utilize the in-context learning ability of LLMs without modifying the original model weights, thereby preserving the model's foundational capabilities and existing knowledge [45].

Most existing in-context knowledge editing frameworks focus on multi-hop question answering (MQA) tasks that rely on knowledge triples as the fundamental units of knowledge representation. Researchers[6, 46] construct multi-hop questions by sequentially linking multiple triples to evaluate the performance of knowledge editing methods. For example, Mello [46] and PokeMQA [11] guide LLMs in decomposing tasks using manually crafted examples, enabling knowledge updates while addressing sub-questions. From another angle, the RAE framework [23] constructs and then edits a knowledge graph, utilizing the retrieval and pruning of the knowledge graph to obtain contextually injected knowledge.

Although these methods perform well on triple-based MQA tasks, their design is overly specialized, limiting their adaptability to other tasks and more complex reasoning. For instance, RAE struggles with tasks from the LeKUBE legal dataset [37], where constructing a knowledge graph is impractical on the domain-specific corpus. For PokeMQA, when it detects that a sub-question involves new knowledge, it directly uses the updated knowledge as the answer to the sub-question. This approach is generally valid for tasks involving knowledge triples, as knowledge edits in such tasks typically correspond to single-hop questions, and a multi-hop question is formed from such single-hop questions. However, in other datasets like DUNE[1] and LeKUBE[37], questions related to new knowledge are usually more complex and require reasoning. In these cases, the new knowledge alone cannot answer the sub-question, leading to poorer performance by PokeMQA. Moreover, the reliance on few-shot prompting for task decomposition makes Mello and PokeMQA unstable and less effective across diverse tasks, which is shown in Figure 4.

*Corresponding author

¹Code and data available at: <https://github.com/bebr2/EditCoT>

To address the limitations of existing in-context knowledge editing approaches, we propose **EditCoT**, a knowledge updating framework that edits LLM’s knowledge through chain-of-thought(CoT). EditCoT is a non-parametric knowledge editing method that does not change the parameters of LLMs, which means that it can preserve the original capacity of the backbone LLMs like other in-context editing methods. Moreover, unlike previous methods that are tailored to specific task types or rely heavily on knowledge triples, EditCoT employs an iterative approach to refining the model’s reasoning process by addressing conflicts with updated knowledge. This flexibility approach allows EditCoT to dynamically adjust its reasoning process without the need for task-specific customization or predefined knowledge structures. Specifically, EditCoT begins by instructing the model to generate an initial CoT based on the user’s input and its direct answer. The original CoT is then iteratively refined by the CoT editor, which integrates new knowledge. The final answer is generated by prompting the LLM to inference based on the updated CoT.

We evaluate EditCoT on a variety of benchmarks, including the traditional knowledge triple multi-hop QA dataset MQuAKE-CF-3k[46], a wide-range and free-form editing task dataset DUNE[1], and a domain-specific Chinese legal knowledge update dataset LeKUBE[37]. These datasets cover different editing formats and test tasks in both Chinese and English language. Experimental results demonstrate that our proposed method achieves state-of-the-art performance with better efficiency and robustness.

In summary, the contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We propose a novel framework, *EditCoT*, that edits the chain-of-thought of LLMs, enabling more effective and task-agnostic knowledge updates.
- We demonstrate that our approach performs well across various knowledge editing benchmarks with different editing formats and task types, exhibiting significantly better effectiveness, robustness, and generalizability compared to other baselines.

2 Related Work

2.1 Knowledge Editing

Knowledge editing methods refer to techniques for modifying, updating, or deleting the knowledge stored within LLMs. These methods can be broadly categorized into parametric and non-parametric approaches based on whether they modify the model’s parameters[37]. Parametric strategies directly update the model’s internal parameters. One notable approach is ROME[17], proposed by Meng et al., which treats the feedforward neural network (FFN) layers in LLMs as key-value storage. By performing low-rank updates to specific FFN layers, ROME enables precise modification of fact-based associations within the model. MEMIT[18] extends this approach by applying weight updates across multiple key FFN layers, allowing for the batch updating of a large set of factual knowledge. In contrast, non-parametric approaches primarily leverage in-context learning[2] for knowledge editing. IKE[45] explores the potential of editing knowledge through contextual information rather than changing the model’s parameters. In-context Editing has the advantage of mitigating the risk of forgetting untargeted knowledge and is particularly suited for black-box models. Several follow-up studies have advanced this idea. Mello[46] decomposes tasks into

sub-tasks and uses prompts to guide the model to compare the edited knowledge with intermediate answers. PokeMQA[11] further improves this work by introducing a scope detector and entity extraction mechanism, making the method more robust. RAE[23] takes a different approach by constructing a knowledge graph for the task, performing knowledge editing through graph modification, and utilizing the model to assist in pruning and refining the search results.

2.2 Chain-of-Thought

Chain-of-thought reasoning has gained significant attention in natural language processing due to its ability to enhance the performance of LLMs on complex tasks by providing a step-by-step reasoning process. Recent work highlights key advances in this area. Wei et al. [40] introduce Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting, where manually provided reasoning chains encourage LLMs to generate coherent, multi-step solutions. Building on this, Kojima et al. [14] show that appending phrases like "Let’s think step by step" enables zero-shot CoT reasoning, allowing models to handle complex tasks without human annotations. Gao et al. [10] propose Program-aided Language Models, translating problems into Python code for better mathematical reasoning. Similarly, Chen et al. [4] introduce Program of Thoughts, which uses programming languages to annotate reasoning and generate executable outputs for structured tasks.

In addition to enhancing reasoning, recent work has explored improving the factuality and accuracy of CoT reasoning. Wang et al. [39] propose a self-consistency decoding method, which samples multiple reasoning paths and selects the one with the highest consistency, enhancing the reliability of CoT. Similarly, Zhao et al. [44] introduce a Verify-and-Edit framework that, on the surface, appears similar to our approach as it also involves editing the generated CoT. However, there are several key distinctions: (1) their verification process relies on the self-consistency, which works well for general QA tasks but is less applicable to knowledge editing since the model often shows high confidence in outdated information, leading to high consistency even when incorrect. We conducted tests on MQuAKE-CF-3k, focusing only on the triggering of editing and ignoring subsequent edit results. Using the self-consistency, edits were triggered in only 37% of cases on the knowledge editing dataset, while our method triggered edits in 95% of cases.; (2) their editing relies on the model’s ability to learn from context, whereas in subsection 5.4.1, we demonstrate that our proposed CoT editor significantly outperforms this self-editing approach in knowledge editing tasks; and (3) their method actually resembles Mello et al.’s [46] strategy of decomposing tasks, whereas our approach modifies the entire CoT in each round of editing, allowing for more comprehensive adjustments.

3 Methodology

In this section, we present the methodology of the EditCoT framework in detail. We begin with an overview of our proposed approach, followed by a step-by-step description of the framework’s workflow. We then explain the CoT editor training process in depth, concluding with a discussion of implementation details and dataset construction.




Figure 1: The EditCoT framework updates LLMs by iteratively editing the chain-of-thought (CoT) to integrate new knowledge while preserving the model’s reasoning abilities. It generates an initial CoT, detects conflicts with updated facts, and revises the CoT until alignment is achieved.

3.1 Methodology Overview

The primary objective of the EditCoT framework is to update Large Language Models (LLMs) by editing their chain-of-thought (CoT), thereby integrating new factual knowledge without compromising their inherent reasoning capabilities. Traditional parametric knowledge editing methods often require retraining the entire model or fine-tuning, which can be resource-intensive and may lead to loss of previously acquired knowledge. In contrast, EditCoT introduces an iterative editing mechanism that efficiently incorporates updates by focusing solely on the CoT, ensuring that the model remains both accurate and logically consistent.

The framework leverages two components: an unedited version of the LLM responsible for generating the initial CoT, detecting conflict, and generating the final answer, and an editor capable of editing CoT based on the new knowledge. The following subsection delves into each step of the EditCoT framework in detail.

3.2 Workflow of EditCoT

Figure 1 illustrates the EditCoT framework’s overall workflow, which is also described in pseudocode in Appendix A. The core steps of EditCoT are as follows:

3.2.1 Generate Initial CoT by the Original LLM. At the beginning of the process, the unedited LLM generates an initial chain-of-thought in response to a query. This chain represents the sequence of reasoning steps that lead to the model’s final answer. We are more concerned with the completeness of the reasoning path than the accuracy of the answer, so we let the model give the answer directly first and then give the CoT based on the question and answer.

3.2.2 Retrieve Step by Step and Detect Conflicts. Once the initial Chain of Thought (CoT) is generated, we treat each step of the CoT as a query and retrieve it from the memory of edited knowledge. This memory is typically organized in two ways: one where the pre- and post-edit knowledge are paired together (e.g., MQuAKE [46]), and another where only the post-edit knowledge is provided (e.g., DUNE [1]). For the former, we search the knowledge base for the pre-edit knowledge and then match the post-edit knowledge according to the corresponding relationship. For the latter, we directly search within the post-edit knowledge. Once updated knowledge is found, we proceed to the conflict detection stage.

EditCoT uses the original LLM as a detector of knowledge conflicts. Specifically, given the question, the initial CoT, and the retrieved knowledge, the model is tasked with completing a three-class classification task: conflict, support, or irrelevant. We use the probability of the prefix of the corresponding word output by the model to represent the judgment result. This step is crucial for identifying whether the original reasoning diverges from new, more accurate, or updated knowledge.

3.2.3 Edit the chain-of-thought. Once a knowledge conflict is detected, we input the question, new knowledge, and the old CoT into a CoT editor. This editor generates a new CoT based on the input. Then, our iterative process returns to Step 2, where this new CoT is treated as the old CoT for retrieval and conflict detection. The process continues until no conflicts are found between the CoT and the memory, or the maximum number of iterations is reached.

3.2.4 Get Final Answer. Once the CoT has been fully edited and no further conflicts are detected, the final chain-of-thought is used to generate the final answer. The original LLM is responsible for this step, ensuring that the model’s answer adheres to its existing inferential abilities, while also incorporating the new factual knowledge. We instruct the original LLM to pay more attention to the new CoT in the context since the new CoT often conflicts with the model’s intrinsic knowledge.

3.3 CoT Editor Training

We design an automated approach to generate training data required for the CoT editor, where human annotation is unnecessary, except for the use of some human-posed questions, thus making the training nearly unsupervised. Notably, our data construction method does not rely on state-of-the-art AI models such as GPT-4, too. Furthermore, the data construction and training process are not tailored to any specific dataset or task. The editor, during training, simply learns the ability to edit CoT. Once trained, this editor is applicable to various tasks without needing to be retrained when exposed to new knowledge. Additionally, the CoT editor is trained from the original LLM, ensuring that no knowledge distillation issues arise.

3.3.1 Task Formulation. The input to the editor consists of: a *question*, a *CoT*, and *new knowledge* (which conflicts with the CoT). The goal is to produce a new CoT based on the new knowledge. Mathematically, the editor can be formalized as:

$$\text{Editor}(Q, \text{CoT}, K_{\text{new}}) \rightarrow \text{CoT}_{\text{new}}$$




Figure 2: Diagram of the dataset construction process: Our data source consists solely of questions from HotpotQA, without requiring human-annotated answers or related articles. In Part II, the blue sections represent the prefix used to guide generation which have been generated in Part I, while the red sections indicate the newly generated reasoning paths in this part.

where Q denotes the question, CoT is the original chain-of-thought, K_{new} represents the conflicting new knowledge, and CoT_{new} is the revised chain-of-thought that reconciles the new knowledge.

3.3.2 Data Construction. To construct training data, we start by collecting high-quality, human-generated questions. In practice, we use the validation and test sets from the HotpotQA[42] dataset, which contains diverse multi-hop questions that often require multiple Wikipedia articles to answer. HotpotQA is selected for its diversity of question types, and multi-hop reasoning tasks generally yield more complex CoTs. After obtaining these questions, we use the following construction steps:

Part I: Retrieve, then Generate CoT and Answer. For each question, we first retrieve top-5 relevant Wikipedia paragraphs and then use a retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) method to generate the CoT and the corresponding answer. We consider this initial CoT and answer as a basic version, and in the following sections, these are highlighted as CoT and Answer for clarity. To facilitate step-level separation, we prompt the model to indicate each step with the [STEP] token.

Part II: Prefix-Guided CoT Generation. Given a CoT with N steps generated in Part I, we take the first $(k-1)$ steps ($k = 1, 2, \dots, N$) as a prefix and prompt the model to generate the remaining steps and the final answer, marked as CoT k and Answer k respectively. It is important to note that this step does not use RAG, and the model is only prompted with the first $(k-1)$ steps of the CoT as context. We finally obtain N CoTs in this part.

Part III: Conflict Detection. We then compare each of the N CoTs generated in Part II to the original CoT and instruct the model to

detect any knowledge conflicts. A data point is accepted into the final dataset only if:

- There is a conflict in the final answers.
- There is a conflict at the first diverging step between the two CoTs.

For example, considering CoT k and CoT, the first diverging step is step k . If the original Step k and the new Step k conflict with each other, and there is also a conflict between Answer and Answer k , they are eligible to be added to the final dataset. This ensures that conflicting knowledge can be pinpointed at a specific step in the reasoning chain. Here we assume that the divergence occurs only once in most of the cases.

Part IV: Rewrite to Extract New Knowledge. In this step, we rewrite the identified diverging step from the original CoT to explicitly extract the new knowledge. Specifically, for the example above, a complete training data entry is formed as a tuple:

$$(Q, \text{CoT}, K_{\text{new}}, \text{CoT}_{\text{new}}) = (\text{Question}, \text{CoT } k, \text{rewrite}(\text{Step } k), \text{CoT}).$$

We also apply regular expressions to filter out low-quality examples, such as those overly influenced by the retrieved documents in RAG, ensuring the quality of the constructed dataset. Figure 2 illustrates the overall process of dataset construction.

3.4 Implementation Details

In practice, we implement conflict detection using a multiple-choice format. We set a probability threshold of 0.6 for determining conflicts, meaning that if the model assigns a probability of 0.6 or higher



Figure 3: A data example constructed by Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct. The black part of the two CoTs indicates a shared prefix.

to a conflict between two answers or reasoning steps, we treat them as inconsistent. Additionally, during prefix-guided generation, to encourage the model to focus on the same topic at the diverging step, we explicitly provide the first word of the original CoT at the diverging step as part of the input prompt. The prompt templates of dataset construction are detailed in subsection E.1. There are 14,810 questions in the dev and test sets of HotpotQA. After employing two different LLMs: Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct[8] and Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct[35, 41], to create training data, we obtain a total of 459 and 316 examples from the two models respectively. Figure 3 is an example of a constructed data instance.

4 Experimental Settings

4.1 Dataset and Metrics

We evaluate the performance of EditCoT and other baselines across the following three datasets:

- **MQuAKE-CF-3k[46]:** This dataset is designed for knowledge editing using Wikipedia-based knowledge triples, with queries in the form of multi-hop questions. The evaluation metric is *Multihop-Accuracy*, as in the original paper. Each instance contains three questions, and if anyone is answered correctly, it is considered accurate. We follow the official implementation of MQuAKE and PokeMQA, using *Exact Match* to assess correctness.
- **DUNE[1]:** This dataset includes various editing tasks, where edits are natural language instructions for the model to follow specific facts, requirements, or preferences. Each edit is associated with one or more queries to test adherence to the changes. DUNE covers four areas: correcting reasoning and arithmetic errors, adding new information, and reducing bias. It consists of five sub-datasets: *Arithmetic Reasoning*, *Scientific Reasoning*, *New Information*, *Debiasing Split I*, and *Debiasing Split II*. The performance metric is *Accuracy*. In *Debiasing Split I* and *Debiasing Split II*, answers contain biases, and the aim is to encourage unbiased responses; thus, lower accuracy signifies better bias mitigation. For these debiasing tasks, irrelevant content from less robust methods is also considered correct to avoid rewarding nonsensical outputs.

- **LeKUBE[36]:** This is a Chinese legal knowledge editing dataset, involving modifications to articles in Chinese civil and criminal law. We focus on two particularly challenging tasks, where prior baselines have shown poor performance: *Multiple-Choice Questions of the Legal Scenario* and *True-or-False Questions of Change in Statute*. The evaluation metric for both tasks is *Accuracy*. The statistics of the three benchmarks are detailed in Appendix B.

4.2 Models

We evaluate two open-source models: Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct[8] and Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct[35, 41]. Since the former does not support Chinese, we evaluate Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct on LeKUBE. Following LeKUBE’s experimental protocol, we first fine-tune the model on the STARD corpus[28], which contains Chinese laws and judicial interpretations, to ensure the model acquires Chinese legal knowledge before any updates.

We also assess GPT-4o-2024-08-06[21] on MQuAKE-3k-CF. Due to its proprietary nature, we test only a few non-parametric editing methods on this model. Following RAE[23], we randomly sample 300 data points to minimize costs. Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct is used as a proxy model for tasks the proprietary model cannot perform. In RAE, this proxy extracts and prunes knowledge graphs based on probabilities, while in EditCoT, it acts as a CoT editor.

4.3 Baselines

We compare EditCoT with a range of model editing techniques, including knowledge neuron-based (KN)[7], rank-one model editing (ROME)[17], and in-context methods such as Mello[46], PokeMQA[11], and RAE[23]. We also include full-parameter fine-tuning (FT) and retrieval-augmented generation (RAG)[15] as baselines. This provides a broad comparison of parametric and non-parametric editing approaches. Detailed information on the baselines is available in Appendix C. Notably, for DUNE’s Debiasing subset, we cannot apply ROME and KN due to the inability to construct knowledge triples. RAE is not applicable to datasets other than MQuAKE-CF-3k since it requires the construction of knowledge graphs and constructing knowledge graphs is impractical on these datasets.

4.4 Implementation Details

For the CoT editor, the data construction process is outlined in subsection 3.4. During training, we use 80% of the filtered data generated by the respective model and train for one epoch. To generate the initial answer, CoT, and final answer, and detect conflicts, we construct 5-shot prompts following the style of Mello and PokeMQA and apply this format across all tasks, which are details in subsection E.2. For conflict detection, we instruct the model to classify outputs into three categories: "Contradict", "Support", or "Unrelated". We take the token with the highest probability as the final classification result. Note that while we use the [STEP] token during dataset construction, in actual inference, we allow the model to freely generate the chain-of-thought (CoT), with steps separated by newline characters.

For the EditCoT retrieval corpus, we show the settings from subsection 3.2.2. Specifically, for datasets providing both pre- and post-edit knowledge (e.g., MQuAKE-CF-3k and LeKUBE), we retrieve from the pre-edit corpus and attempt to match with the

corresponding post-edit sentences. For datasets providing only post-edit knowledge (e.g., DUNE), we directly retrieve from the post-edit corpus. Similar to Mello, we use the Contriever[13] retriever trained on MS MARCO[20], while for Chinese datasets, we use BM25[22], which performs well in LeKUBE’s tasks.

5 Experimental Results

5.1 Effectiveness

Generalizability. EditCoT demonstrates superior dataset generalization and model robustness compared to baseline methods. As shown in Table 1, we evaluate EditCoT on the MQuAKE-3k-CF and DUNE datasets, where it achieves the best performance on 7 out of 12 results and the second-best on 4 out of 12 results, significantly outperforming all baselines. Moreover, EditCoT performs consistently well across both Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct and Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct. In contrast, other in-context editing methods, such as Mello, PokeMQA, and RAE, excel on Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct but perform poorly on Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct. Interestingly, RAG seem to improve the performance of Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct more effectively. For Mello and PokeMQA, the lack of robustness and generalization stems from their heavy reliance on strict instruction-following and hand-crafted few-shot examples, which exhibit varying effectiveness across models and tasks. Additionally, safety-aligned models tend to reject external edits, as further illustrated in our case analysis below.

Applicability to Vertical Domains and Black-box Models. EditCoT is also effective in specialized vertical domains and proprietary models. The last two columns of Table 1 presents the evaluation results on LeKUBE, where EditCoT outperforms all baselines across two tasks, significantly surpassing other methods in the multiple-choice questions of the legal scenario. Furthermore, Table 2 reports GPT-4o’s performance on MQuAKE-CF, where EditCoT also demonstrates competitive results, achieving second-best overall. Notably, the proxy model in this experiment is Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct. When we compare the performance of the proxy model itself with the GPT-4o, we find that, while RAE’s accuracy improves from 54.1% to 59.7% with GPT-4o, EditCoT achieves a larger relative improvement, rising from 35.4% to 45.0%. This suggests that EditCoT’s success may depend more on the model’s internal reasoning abilities, whereas RAE benefits primarily from leveraging external knowledge.

Challenges in General-Purpose In-Context Editing. Developing a broadly applicable in-context editing framework remains a significant challenge across both dataset and model dimensions. The three datasets we evaluate spanning multi-hop reasoning, generalized edits, and domain-specific knowledge. And they include both English and Chinese tasks, posing considerable difficulty for current editing methods. Among other baselines, PokeMQA performs well on multi-hop questions with Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct, and simpler methods like fine-tuning and RAG excel in narrow settings (e.g., the DUNE Debiasing task). However, these methods perform poorly on other datasets and models. RAE excels on the MQuAKE-3k-CF dataset, because it constructs structured knowledge graphs and accesses a broader range of external knowledge (e.g., Wikipedia), but it struggles to generalize beyond structured

datasets. In contrast, EditCoT preliminarily addresses these limitations, achieving the best or second-best performance across most datasets and models, though it still falls short of optimal in some cases.

Case Studies: In Figure 4, we compare EditCoT with Mello and PokeMQA on two questions. The first question from the Scientific Reasoning subset of DUNE shows that EditCoT initially generates an incorrect answer and CoT. However, after retrieval and conflict detection, it modifies the CoT to arrive at the correct solution. In contrast, Mello retrieves a relevant edit but fails to detect any conflict with the initial answer, missing the opportunity for correction. This demonstrates the strength of EditCoT’s conflict detection mechanism, which evaluates the entire reasoning chain against retrieved edits. PokeMQA struggles with both sub-questions, producing a repetitive decomposition and failing to trigger an edit.

The second question from MQuAKE-CF-3k again illustrates EditCoT’s ability to transition from an incorrect inference to the correct answer through CoT editing. Although both PokeMQA and Mello successfully retrieve and detect the relevant edit (changing the author of Harry Potter to Maurice Maeterlinck), they do not apply it. This indicates that models designed with safety in mind may resist incorporating external knowledge in favor of their internal knowledge. EditCoT addresses this issue by decoupling conflict detection from the editing process and training a model specifically for CoT editing, leading to more effective reasoning updates.

5.2 Robustness

In this section, we evaluate EditCoT against other in-context knowledge editing methods from multiple perspectives. The model tested in this section is Meta-Llama3-8B-Instruct.

5.2.1 Locality. An essential metric for knowledge editing is locality, which evaluates a method’s ability to update specific knowledge without degrading performance on untargeted information [19]. We evaluate locality using the New Information (Locality) subset of DUNE, where the retrieval scope is limited to the edited set (consistent with the main experimental setup), but test tasks pertain to knowledge outside this set. The results, presented in Table 3, are compared with the unedited base model’s performance. While all editing methods show some decline in performance relative to the unedited model, EditCoT exhibits the best locality, followed by Mello. RAG performs the worst, as it lacks conflict detection between documents and queries, leading to poor performance when faced with irrelevant information.

5.2.2 Performance with Different Batch Sizes. The performance of knowledge editing methods can vary with the size of the editing batch. Here we consider the size of the editing batch as the number of questions in one batch, because one question may involve multiple edits. In this section, we test the sensitivity of Mello, PokeMQA, and EditCoT to different batch sizes.² We evaluate batch sizes of 1, 10, 100, and 300 on a 300-sample dataset from MQuAKE-CF-3k. The results are shown in Figure 6. All three methods perform best when editing a single sample, and their performance decreases as

²We do not compare RAE here because the locality of in-context editing is primarily influenced by the retrieval process. RAE uses knowledge graph retrieval, which is not comparable to the other three methods.

Table 1: The test results of MQuAKE-CF-3k, DUNE, and LeKUBE, where MQuAKE-CF-3k is evaluated using the Multi-hop Accuracy metric, and the others are evaluated using Accuracy. The best performance on each dataset and model is highlighted in bold, while the second-best is underlined. A dash ("-") indicates that the method is not applicable to the given dataset. For Debiasing Split I and II, lower scores indicate better performance, while for other datasets, higher scores are preferred.

Models	Methods	MQuAKE	DUNE					LeKUBE	
			Arithmetic	Scientific	New Info	Debiasing I	Debiasing II	MCQ	T/F
Llama-3-8B-Instruct	Fine-tuning	11.2	74.1	11.1	30.3	9.2	15.9		
	KN	2.8	80.4	<u>82.1</u>	66.6	-	-		
	ROME	4.0	80.5	81.4	69.1	-	-		
	RAG	9.7	<u>84.0</u>	81.6	89.2	19.8	5.3		
	Mello	10.0	73.7	77.1	<u>89.8</u>	19.8	22.2		
	PokeMQA	26.1	83.8	61.7	58.7	50.2	87.9		
	RAE	54.1	-	-	-	-	-		
	EditCoT(Ours)	<u>35.4</u>	90.7	85.0	91.3	<u>14.7</u>	<u>6.4</u>		
Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	Fine-tuning	9.3	82.8	13.8	76.2	<u>3.5</u>	4.3	42.2	65.9
	KN	3.2	86.9	75.3	73.4	-	-	38.9	55.8
	ROME	0.0	86.9	<u>75.5</u>	73.1	-	-	38.3	56.1
	RAG	10.0	<u>89.7</u>	70.7	96.8	1.0	<u>3.1</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>69.2</u>
	Mello	5.8	61.0	37.0	34.3	61.6	61.4	6.7	18.6
	PokeMQA	5.3	35.2	7.7	17.3	74.7	47	0.0	0.0
	RAE	<u>26.9</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EditCoT(Ours)	34.2	97.3	86.3	<u>93.8</u>	4.3	2.5	58.3	69.5

Table 2: Performance on GPT-4o (a black-box LLM). Results are obtained using Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct as the proxy model for both RAE and EditCoT.

	RAG	Mello	PokeMQA	RAE	EditCoT(Ours)
Score	12.0	15.0	9.7	59.7	<u>45.0</u>

Table 3: Locality Evaluation on the New Information (Locality) subset of DUNE. EditCoT is closest to the performance before editing.

	Before Editing	RAG	Mello	PokeMQA	EditCoT
Accuracy	65.2	34.3	58.0	45.6	59.7

batch size increases. However, EditCoT consistently outperforms the other methods across all batch sizes. The performance degradation of EditCoT from batch size 1 to 300 is the smallest (around 20%), while the other two methods experience declines of over 30%.

5.3 Efficiency

We investigate the relationship between inference time and performance on 100 sampled questions from MQuAKE-CF-3k, comparing Mello, PokeMQA, RAE, and EditCoT. By varying the maximum number of iterations for Mello, PokeMQA, and EditCoT, we record their corresponding inference time and performance metrics, with all experiments conducted on a single Nvidia A100 (40G) GPU. Figure 5 illustrates these results, where the x-axis represents the average inference time per question and the y-axis indicates performance. Superior methods are located in the top-left corner, signifying shorter inference time and higher performance.

Table 4: Impact of conflict detection and trained CoT editor, evaluated on MQuAKE-CF.

MQuAKE-CF	
EditCoT	40.3
w/o conflict detection	33.0
w/o trained CoT editor	26.7

RAE’s official implementation uses Wikipedia API calls; hence, we exclude network latency from its reported inference time (including this would place RAE around 46 seconds on the x-axis). Despite this, RAE has a notably longer inference time due to multiple forward propagations for knowledge graph retrieval and pruning, particularly when selecting the next relation, which requires feeding all candidates into the model respectively.

EditCoT, in contrast, achieves high performance with the shortest inference time and outperforms Mello and PokeMQA at similar inference time. The efficiency of EditCoT is attributed to fewer required iterations: while PokeMQA averages 4.33 iterations, EditCoT needs only 3.65, indicating fewer long-text generation steps. Here a full retrieval-generation cycle is defined as one iteration. Moreover, EditCoT demonstrates good performance within the first two iterations, unlike the other methods that require more iterations for comparable performance. Further details on the impact of iteration limits are provided in Appendix D.

5.4 Ablation Study

We conduct ablation studies using a dataset of 300 examples sampled from MQuAKE-CF (which is the same as that mentioned above), with the model Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct.




Figure 4: A face-to-face comparison of our proposed EditCoT method with other baseline approaches. The first example comes from the Scientific Reasoning subset of DUNE. The second example comes from MQuAKE-CF-3k. The model here is Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct.

Table 5: Impact of training settings on the performance of the CoT editor, evaluated on MQuAKE-CF.

# Epoch	1	2	3	4	5
Accuracy	40.3	40.7	40.3	40.0	40.0
# Training Data	50	100	200	250	316(All)
Accuracy	39.0	39.3	40.7	40.3	40.3

5.4.1 *Impact of Components.* We evaluate two alternative setups: (1) removing conflict detection before editing the CoT in EditCoT; and (2) using the original model as the CoT editor, without further training. The results are shown in Table 4. Both configurations lead to a significant drop in performance compared to the default setup, particularly in the case of using the original model as the CoT editor.

The first setup suggests that relying solely on the retriever without conflict detection can introduce irrelevant information, negatively affecting the CoT editor’s performance. The second setup highlights the necessity of training the CoT editor; relying on prompting alone is insufficient to fully utilize the model’s editing capability.

5.4.2 *Impact of Training Configurations.* Table 5 illustrates the effect of different training dataset sizes and epochs on the CoT editor. While increasing the number of epochs has little impact, performance stabilizes after expanding the training data size to 200 examples, suggesting that the CoT editor requires a sufficient amount of diverse data to learn effectively. This also supports our main experimental setup, where training for one epoch with 80% of generated data (252 training examples) is a reasonable choice.




Figure 5: Average inference time vs. performance. A better method is positioned toward the top-left corner, indicating both shorter inference time and higher performance. Because the horizontal span is too long, we cut it in the middle.




Figure 6: Performance with different batch sizes on MQuAKE-CF. The metrics here is multi-hop accuracy.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we introduce EditCoT, a framework designed for efficiently updating large language models through iterative CoT editing. EditCoT enhances editing generalizability and robustness across diverse tasks without requiring model retraining. Our experiments, conducted on various benchmarks, demonstrate that EditCoT outperforms existing methods, proving its effectiveness in both general-purpose and domain-specific applications. This approach presents a flexible solution for continuous knowledge updates in large language models.

However, EditCoT has limitations, particularly in its reliance on two distinct models. While this design does not increase inference time, it does result in higher GPU resource consumption, which can be a challenge in environments with limited hardware resources. Future work could explore the possibility of replacing the editor with a smaller model, aiming to reduce the computational burden without compromising performance.

References

[1] Afra Akyürek, Eric Pan, Garry Kuwanto, and Derry Wijaya. 2023. DUNE: Dataset for Unified Editing. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 1847–1861. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.114>

[2] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Matusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6–12, 2020, virtual*, Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (Eds.). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>

[3] Junjie Chen, Weihang Su, Zhumin Chu, Haitao Li, Qinyao Ai, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2024. An Automatic and Cost-Efficient Peer-Review Framework for Language Generation Evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12265* (2024).

[4] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. 2023. Program of Thoughts Prompting: Disentangling Computation from Reasoning for Numerical Reasoning Tasks. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.* 2023 (2023). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YfZ4ZPt8zd>

[5] Xuesong Chen, Ziyi Ye, Xiaohui Xie, Yiqun Liu, Xiaorong Gao, Weihang Su, Shuqi Zhu, Yike Sun, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2022. Web search via an efficient and effective brain-machine interface. In *Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM international conference on web search and data mining*. 1569–1572.

[6] Roi Cohen, Eden Biran, Ori Yoran, Amir Globerson, and Mor Geva. 2024. Evaluating the Ripple Effects of Knowledge Editing in Language Models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 12 (2024), 283–298. https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00644

[7] Damai Dai, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Zhifang Sui, Baobao Chang, and Furu Wei. 2022. Knowledge Neurons in Pretrained Transformers. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 8493–8502. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.581>

[8] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab Al-Badawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelder van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhatta, Lauren Rantala-Young, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collet, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Vladan Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyan Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuewei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue

- Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papakipos, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhard, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovitch, Didem Foss, Dingkang Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Sweeney, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhotia, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabza, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Gegeo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Maheswari, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaojuan Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosenbriek, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>
- [9] Yan Fang, Jingtao Zhan, Qingyao Ai, Jiaxin Mao, Weihang Su, Jia Chen, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Scaling laws for dense retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1339–1349.
- [10] Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. PAL: Program-aided Language Models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 202)*, Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett (Eds.). PMLR, 10764–10799. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/gao23f.html>
- [11] Hengrui Gu, Kaixiong Zhou, Xiaotian Han, Ninghao Liu, Ruobing Wang, and Xin Wang. 2024. PokeMQA: Programmable knowledge editing for Multi-hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 8069–8083. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.438>
- [12] Jia-Chen Gu, Hao-Xiang Xu, Jun-Yu Ma, Pan Lu, Zhen-Hua Ling, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2024. Model Editing Harms General Abilities of Large Language Models: Regularization to the Rescue. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.04700>
- [13] Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. Unsupervised Dense Information Retrieval with Contrastive Learning. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.* 2022 (2022). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jKN1pXi7b0>
- [14] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.). http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/8bb0d291acd4acf06ef112099c16f326-Abstract-Conference.html
- [15] Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Kuttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, Hugo Larochelle, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin (Eds.). <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/6b493230205f780e1bc26945df7481e5-Abstract.html>
- [16] Yixiao Ma, Yueyue Wu, Weihang Su, Qingyao Ai, and Yiqun Liu. 2023. CaseEncoder: A Knowledge-enhanced Pre-trained Model for Legal Case Encoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05393* (2023).
- [17] Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2022. Locating and Editing Factual Associations in GPT. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.). http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/6f1d43d5a82a37e89b0665b33b3a182-Abstract-Conference.html
- [18] Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex J. Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. 2023. Mass-Editing Memory in a Transformer. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=MkbcAHlYgYs>
- [19] Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2022. Memory-Based Model Editing at Scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 162)*, Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato (Eds.). PMLR, 15817–15831. <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v162/mitchell22a.html>
- [20] Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. MS MARCO: A Human Generated Machine Reading Comprehension Dataset. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Computation: Integrating neural and symbolic approaches 2016 co-located with the 30th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2016), Barcelona, Spain, December 9, 2016 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings, Vol. 1773)*, Tarek Richard Besold, Antoine Bordes, Artur S. d'Ávila Garcez, and Greg Wayne (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org. https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1773/CoCoNIPS_2016_paper9.pdf
- [21] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Alameddini, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Adria, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Berwick, Lora Berrong, Sherry Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Liam Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Justin Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Lukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Lukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael

- Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayarvigiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [22] Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 3, 4 (2009), 333–389.
- [23] Yucheng Shi, Qiaoyu Tan, Xuansheng Wu, Shaochen Zhong, Kaixiong Zhou, and Ninghao Liu. 2024. Retrieval-enhanced Knowledge Editing in Language Models for Multi-Hop Question Answering. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.19631>
- [24] Weihang Su, Qingyao Ai, Xiangsheng Li, Jia Chen, Yiqun Liu, Xiaolong Wu, and Shengluan Hou. 2023. Wikiformer: Pre-training with Structured Information of Wikipedia for Ad-hoc Retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10661* (2023).
- [25] Weihang Su, Qingyao Ai, Yueyue Wu, Yixiao Ma, Haitao Li, and Yiqun Liu. 2023. Caseformer: Pre-training for Legal Case Retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00333* (2023).
- [26] WEIHANG SU, QINGYAO AI, YUEYUE WU, ANZHE XIE, CHANGYUE WANG, YIXIAO MA, HAITAO LI, ZHIJING WU, YIQUN LIU, and MIN ZHANG. 2024. Pre-training for Legal Case Retrieval Based on Inter-Case Distinctions. (2024).
- [27] Weihang Su, Yiran Hu, Anzhe Xie, Qingyao Ai, Quezi Bing, Ning Zheng, Yun Liu, Weixing Shen, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. STARD: A Chinese Statute Retrieval Dataset Derived from Real-life Queries by Non-professionals. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. 10658–10671.
- [28] Weihang Su, Yiran Hu, Anzhe Xie, Qingyao Ai, Zibing Que, Ning Zheng, Yun Liu, Weixing Shen, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. STARD: A Chinese Statute Retrieval Dataset with Real Queries Issued by Non-professionals. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.15313>
- [29] Weihang Su, Yiran Hu, Anzhe Xie, Qingyao Ai, Zibing Que, Ning Zheng, Yun Liu, Weixing Shen, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. STARD: A Chinese Statute Retrieval Dataset with Real Queries Issued by Non-professionals. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15313* (2024).
- [30] Weihang Su, Xiangsheng Li, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2023. THUR2 at NTCIR-16 Session Search (SS) Task. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00250* (2023).
- [31] Weihang Su, Yichen Tang, Qingyao Ai, Changyue Wang, Zhijing Wu, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Mitigating Entity-Level Hallucination in Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09417* (2024).
- [32] Weihang Su, Yichen Tang, Qingyao Ai, Zhijing Wu, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. DRAGIN: Dynamic Retrieval Augmented Generation based on the Real-time Information Needs of Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand, 12991–13013. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.702>
- [33] Weihang Su, Changyue Wang, Qingyao Ai, Yiran Hu, Zhijing Wu, Yujia Zhou, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Unsupervised Real-Time Hallucination Detection based on the Internal States of Large Language Models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, 14379–14391. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.854>
- [34] Weihang Su, Changyue Wang, Anzhe Xie, Qingyao Ai, Yiran Hu, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. LegalAID: A Large Language Model for the Chinese Legal Field. <https://github.com/oneal2000/LegalAID>.
- [35] Qwen Team. 2024. Qwen2.5: A Party of Foundation Models. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5/>
- [36] Changyue Wang, Weihang Su, Yiran Hu, Qingyao Ai, Yueyue Wu, Cheng Luo, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2024. LeKUBE: A Knowledge Update BEenchmark for Legal Domain. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region*. 175–185.
- [37] Changyue Wang, Weihang Su, Hu Yiran, Qingyao Ai, Yueyue Wu, Cheng Luo, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2024. LeKUBE: A Legal Knowledge Update BEenchmark. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.14192>
- [38] Peng Wang, Ningyu Zhang, Xin Xie, Yunzhi Yao, Bozhong Tian, Mengru Wang, Zekun Xi, Siyuan Cheng, Kangwei Liu, Guozhou Zheng, et al. 2023. Easyedit: An easy-to-use knowledge editing framework for large language models. *ArXiv preprint abs/2308.07269* (2023). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07269>
- [39] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-Consistency Improves Chain of Thought Reasoning in Language Models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net. <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=1PL1NIMMrw>
- [40] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (Eds.). http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/9d5609613524ecf4f15af0f7b31abca4-Abstract-Conference.html
- [41] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuxiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zhihao Fan. 2024. Qwen2 Technical Report. *ArXiv preprint abs/2407.10671* (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10671>
- [42] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun’ichi Tsujii (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Brussels, Belgium, 2369–2380. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D18-1259>
- [43] Ziyi Ye, Xiaohui Xie, Qingyao Ai, Yiqun Liu, Zhihong Wang, Weihang Su, and Min Zhang. 2023. Relevance Feedback with Brain Signals. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* (2023).
- [44] Ruochen Zhao, Xingxuan Li, Shafiq Joty, Chengwei Qin, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Verify-and-Edit: A Knowledge-Enhanced Chain-of-Thought Framework. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoki Okazaki (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Toronto, Canada, 5823–5840. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.320>
- [45] Ce Zheng, Lei Li, Qingxiu Dong, Yuxuan Fan, Zhiyong Wu, Jingjing Xu, and Baobao Chang. 2023. Can We Edit Factual Knowledge by In-Context Learning?. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 4862–4876. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.296>
- [46] Zexuan Zhong, Zhengxuan Wu, Christopher Manning, Christopher Potts, and Danqi Chen. 2023. MQuAKE: Assessing Knowledge Editing in Language Models via Multi-Hop Questions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Singapore, 15686–15702. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.971>

A Pseudocode Description of EditCoT

The pseudocode description of EditCoT is shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 EditCoT Framework

```

1: Input: Query  $q$ , Original Model  $M$ , Edited Model  $M_{\text{edit}}$ , Memory of Facts  $K$ , Maximum Iterations  $N$ , Mapping of old facts to new facts  $F$ 
2: Output: Final Answer  $A_{\text{final}}$ 
3:  $A_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \text{GenerateAnswer}(M, q)$  ▷ Generate initial answer
4:  $CoT_{\text{old}} \leftarrow \text{GenerateCoT}(M, q, A_{\text{old}})$  ▷ Generate initial chain-of-thought
5: for  $i = 1$  to  $N$  do
6:   for each step  $s$  in  $CoT_{\text{old}}$  do
7:      $F_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \text{RetrieveFacts}(s, K)$  ▷ Retrieve new fact from memory
8:     if  $F$  exists then
9:        $F_{\text{new}} \leftarrow F[F_{\text{new}}]$  ▷ Map old fact to new fact if applicable
10:    end if
11:    if  $F_{\text{new}} \neq \emptyset$  then
12:      break
13:    end if
14:  end for
15:   $is\_Conflict \leftarrow \text{Verify}(M, q, CoT_{\text{old}}, F_{\text{new}})$  ▷ Verify conflict between CoT and new fact
16:  if not  $is\_Conflict$  then
17:    break
18:  end if
19:   $CoT_{\text{new}} \leftarrow \text{EditChain}(M_{\text{edit}}, q, CoT_{\text{old}}, F_{\text{new}})$  ▷ Edit chain-of-thought with new fact
20:   $CoT_{\text{old}} \leftarrow CoT_{\text{new}}$  ▷ Update old CoT with new one
21: end for
22:  $A_{\text{final}} \leftarrow \text{GenerateAnswer}(M, CoT_{\text{new}})$  ▷ Generate final answer based on edited CoT
23: return  $A_{\text{final}}$ 

```

B Details of Benchmarks

Table 6 shows the statistics of the three benchmarks, including the total number of edits and queries.

Dataset	Subset	Edits	Queries
MQuAKE-CF-3k	-	2785	3,000
	Scientific Reasoning	223	1508
DUNE	Arithmetic Reasoning	184	1065
	New Information	200	1000
	Debiasing Split I	144	919
	Debiasing Split II	200	1600
LeKUBE	MCQ of the Legal Scenario	180	180
	T/F Questions of Change in Statute	180	642

Table 6: Statistics on the number of edits and questions for the benchmarks

C Details of Baselines

We focus on In-Context Editing methods and also compare EditCoT with several traditional model editing techniques:

Fine-tuning (FT): A full-parameter fine-tuning approach. Since we evaluate Instruct Models, we train the model on question-answer pairs constructed from each dataset’s editing instances.

RAG [5, 15, 26, 27, 29, 32, 43]: Given an external knowledge base and a retriever [9, 16, 24, 25, 30], the Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) framework injects relevant knowledge into the model by concatenating retrieved documents into the context, effectively augmenting the language model’s ability to reason and reduce hallucinations [3, 31, 33, 34]. Following the settings from the original LeKUBE and DUNE papers, we use BM25[22] as the

retriever, a retrieval method based on lexical matching, and concatenate 3 and 1 retrieved documents, respectively. For the evaluation of MQuAKE-CF-3k, since the original paper does not test RAG, we still use RAG as the retriever, setting it to concatenate 5 retrieved documents.

KN[7]: This method updates knowledge by identifying and editing "knowledge neurons" in the model. In our experiments, we set the prompt number n for neuron identification to 10, the knowledge attribution threshold to 0.2, and the probability of retaining shared neurons to 0.4.

ROME[17]: A Rank-One Model Editing method that directly modifies key-value pairs in the FFN layers. For our experiments, we uniformly modify the fifth layer and calculate the loss at the final layer of the model. The weight decay is set to 1×10^{-3} .

Both KN and ROME methods are implemented using the EasyEdit[38] library, which integrates several model editing techniques for ease of use. It is important to note that both methods rely on knowledge triples for editing. In the *Scientific Reasoning* and *New Information* subsets of DUNE, the edits consist of longer natural language sequences. We use GPT-4o to extract the relevant knowledge triples. The two *Debiasing* subsets in DUNE involve opinion-based knowledge, making it impossible to extract knowledge triples, and thus the two methods are not tested on them.

Mello[46]: Mello performs in-context editing by decomposing the problem into sub-questions and utilizing retrieval. We follow the official setting with a maximum of 4 retrieval rounds and adapt the prompts to Instruct Models. In English datasets, we use Contriever[13] as the retriever, following the settings from the original paper. For the Chinese LeKUBE dataset, we translate the prompts into Chinese and use BM25 as the retriever.

PokeMQA[11]: Built on top of Mello, PokeMQA adds entity extraction and scope determination to refine the question understanding. We follow the official setting with a maximum of 5 rounds and use their pre-trained Scope-Detector. For DUNE and LeKUBE, where no pre-extracted entities are available, we instruct the model to extract entities in a similar format. Since the official Scope-Detector only supports English, we translate the input sentences for LeKUBE tasks into English before applying the detector.

During the GPT-4o evaluations, we observed difficulties in strictly following the prompt format. To mitigate this issue, we add the system prompt: "Follow the examples below."

Additionally, for Mello, PokeMQA and EditCoT, since LeKUBE evaluates changes in legal provisions, and other baselines can utilize both old and new laws, we concatenate the pre- and post-update legal texts and provide them to the model after retrieval for fair comparison.

RAE[23]: RAE constructs knowledge graphs for retrieval and leverages the model to assist in retrieving and pruning the graphs. However, for DUNE and LeKUBE, knowledge graphs similar to those in Wikipedia cannot be constructed, making RAE less generalizable to these tasks.




Figure 7: Performance with different max iterations. A full retrieval-generation cycle is defined as one iteration.

D Performance with different max iterations

We explore how varying the maximum number of iterations affects their performance. Figure 7 shows the results. PokeMQA and Mello require more iterations to reach optimal performance, with relatively low accuracy in early iterations. On the other hand, EditCoT outputs a complete chain-of-thought in each iteration, achieving decent performance after the first iteration.

E Prompt Templates

Since the models we are working with are all Instruct Models, the following prompt template uses "system", "user", and "assistant" to represent different roles.

E.1 Prompt Templates of Dataset Construction

First, we use RAG to generate CoT and the answer. The prompt template is as follows:

Dataset Construction - RAG Prompt

User: {*Top-5 relevant paragraphs from Wikipedia*}

Instruction: You have access to background information that may assist in answering the question. Focus on reasoning through the problem step by step, keeping the explanation concise. Use the token [STEP] to start each thought step and the token [ANSWER] to indicate the final answer. Avoid mentioning or referencing the background information directly in your reasoning.

Template:
 [STEP] ...
 [STEP] ...
 ...
 [ANSWER] ...

Question: {*A question from HotpotQA*}

Second, we conduct prefix-guided CoT generation. The prompt template is as follows:

Dataset Construction - Prompt of prefix-guided CoT generation

User: Please answer the following question using a chain-of-thought. Use the token [STEP] to start each thought step, and the token [ANSWER] to indicate the final answer. Keep each step brief and to the point and keep the final answer concise.

Template:
 [STEP] ...
 [STEP] ...
 ...
 [ANSWER] ...

Question: {*A question from HotpotQA*}

Assistant: [STEP] {*The first (k-1) steps of the CoT from RAG*}

{...}

Then, we detect if there is a conflict in the final answers:

Dataset Construction - Prompt of Answer Conflict Detection

User: For the given question Q , and the two provided answers (Answer 1 and Answer 2), determine if the answers are semantically consistent. Choose the most appropriate option from the following:

- A. Yes, they convey similar ideas or information.
- B. No, they are different or contradictory.

Question Q : {*A question from HotpotQA*}
 Answer 1: {*The answer generated by RAG*}
 Answer 2: {*The answer generated by prefix-guided CoT generation*}

Your choice:

And detect if there is a conflict at the first diverging step between the two CoTs:

Dataset Construction - Prompt of CoT Step Conflict Detection

User: Evaluate the relationship between the following two sentences based on their factual content. Choose the most appropriate option from the following:

- A. The two sentences contain conflicting knowledge.
- B. The two sentences support or complement each other.
- C. The two sentences are unrelated (no conflict, but no connection).

Sentence 1: {*CoT Step k* }
 Sentence 2: {*CoT Step k^** }

Your choice:

Finally, we let the model rewrite the key step:

Dataset Construction - Rewriting Prompt

User: Rewrite the following sentence in the style of a Wikipedia data, using formal and objective language. Only express the factual knowledge present in the sentence, without adding any extra information or inventing details. Your output must be one or more sentences, only needs to include direct results without extra words.

Input:

Sentence: {*A CoT step that needs to rewrite*}

Output:

E.2 Prompt Templates of EditCoT

The prompt template for CoT editor is as follows. Note that the template is the same during both the training and inference phases.

EditCoT Framework - Prompt for CoT editor

System: You can edit the following chains of thought based on the new knowledge.

User: Question: {*A user question*}

Old Thoughts: {*A old CoT*}

New knowledge: {*A sentence containing new knowledge*}

Please give me the new chain-of-thought based on the new knowledge.

Assistant: New Thoughts:

The prompt template of conflict detection is as follows. We use 5-shot examples and apply a scenario similar to CoT editor.

EditCoT Framework - Prompt of Conflict Detection

System: You can edit the following chains of thought based on the new knowledge.

User: Question: Which country is the author of Moneyball a citizen of?

Old Thoughts: The author of Moneyball is Michael Lewis. Michael Lewis is a citizen of United States of America.

New knowledge: The author of Our Mutual Friend is Charles Dickens

Please give me the new chain-of-thought based on the new knowledge.

Assistant: Relevance of knowledge and chain-of-thought: Unrelated.

{*Another 4 examples...*}

User: Question: {*A user question*}

Old Thoughts: {*A old CoT*}

New knowledge: {*A sentence containing new knowledge*}

Please give me the new chain-of-thought based on the new knowledge.

Assistant: Relevance of knowledge and chain-of-thought:

The prompt of getting final answer is as follows. We instruct the original LLM to pay more attention to the new CoT.

EditCoT Framework - Prompt of Getting Final Answer

System: Suppose the world knowledge has been updated. Answer the question based on the [New Thoughts] rather than your own knowledge. Don't analyze whether the reasoning of [New Thoughts] is correct. Output the most concise answer directly.

User: Question: In which location are the headquarters of the developer of Android Jelly Bean situated?

[New Thoughts]: Android Jelly Bean was developed by Google.

The headquarters of Google is located in the city of Googleplex.

Assistant: Answer from [New Thoughts]: Googleplex

{Another 4 examples...}

User: Question: {A question}

[New Thoughts]: {A CoT}

Assistant: Answer from [New Thoughts]: