

STAYKATE: Hybrid In-Context Example Selection Combining Representativeness Sampling and Retrieval-based Approach - A Case Study on Science Domains

Chencheng Zhu

Kyushu Institute of Technology
zhu.chencheng822@mail.kyutech.jp

Kazutaka Shimada

Kyushu Institute of Technology
shimada@ai.kyutech.ac.jp

Tomoki Taniguchi

Asahi Kasei
taniguchi.tcr@om.asahi-kasei.co.jp

Tomoko Ohkuma

Asahi Kasei
okuma.td@om.asahi-kasei.co.jp

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) demonstrate the ability to learn in-context, offering a potential solution for scientific information extraction, which often contends with challenges such as insufficient training data and the high cost of annotation processes. Given that the selection of in-context examples can significantly impact performance, it is crucial to design a proper method to sample the efficient ones. In this paper, we propose STAYKATE, a static-dynamic hybrid selection method that combines the principles of representativeness sampling from active learning with the prevalent retrieval-based approach. The results across three domain-specific datasets indicate that STAYKATE outperforms both the traditional supervised methods and existing selection methods. The enhancement in performance is particularly pronounced for entity types that other methods pose challenges.

1 Introduction

The number of published scientific research has increased exponentially over the past several decades. However, valuable data are often buried deep in extensive publications, making it challenging for researchers to retrieve relevant information efficiently (Hong et al., 2021). In this situation, Named Entity Recognition (NER) plays a crucial role by identifying specific elements such as names of materials, genes, and diseases within vast unstructured text (Weston et al., 2019). Recent advancements in pre-trained language models (PLMs), encompassing both general-domain and scientific-specific ones, have demonstrated considerable abilities in scientific NER (Devlin et al., 2019; Beltagy et al., 2019; Alsentzer et al., 2019; Trewartha et al., 2022; Tanishq et al., 2022). In addition, the rise of large language models (LLMs), such as GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020) and Llama 3 (Dubey et al., 2024), has shown their impressive performance on various NLP tasks

(Laskar et al., 2023). Some studies have reported that automatic annotation using LLMs achieves nearly human-level accuracy (Ding et al., 2023; Gilardi et al., 2023). Pretrained-based approaches generally require a large amount of high-quality labeled data. Moreover, LLMs can adapt to new tasks and domains through limited demonstrations without updating their parameters. This paradigm, termed in-context learning (ICL) and initially introduced by (Brown et al., 2020), has garnered attention due to its potential for substantial reductions in data annotation requirements. However, ICL is sensitive to the provided in-context examples. Substantial performance variance has been observed when different randomly selected demonstrations are provided in the prompt (Liu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Liu and Wang, 2023). Therefore, a series of in-context example selection strategies have been proposed to bring out the full potential of ICL.

One approach is to select some examples from unlabeled data and to annotate them by human annotators. Since these examples remain constant and unchanged across the test set, we refer to this approach as “static” in this paper. In this situation, we need to select efficient examples adequately represent the entire dataset (Nori et al., 2023). In addition, the annotation process requires domain experts for the scientific domain (Singhal et al., 2022) and is costly. Therefore, we need to select fewer representative examples for the annotation process. As a result, this approach has the drawback of limiting the number of selected examples for ICL due to the cost.

Another approach is to select some examples similar to the test examples. This approach is called “dynamic” in this paper because the selected examples vary with the test examples. Some researchers have reported approaches for retrieving semantically similar samples for each test input from the training set (Liu et al., 2022; Rubin et al., 2022).




Figure 1: The overall process of STAYKATE. The right side of the figure shows the entire prompt structure.

Liu et al. (2022) proposed a dynamic example selection strategy follows one of the most prevalent retrieval-based methods, KATE (Knn-Augmented in-conText Example selection). Here, we consider the problems specific to scientific domains. On the one hand, the size of data in scientific domains is not always abundant, namely low-resource setting. KATE selects the nearest example to the test cases. In the low-resource setting, it is not always similar to the test example, even if the example is the closest to the test example. In other words, there may not be any similar examples due to limited resources for the retrieval process. On the other hand, the prevalence of multiple synonyms and abbreviations for entities in scientific literature exacerbates the challenge of recognition. Moreover, scientific NER is more context-sensitive (Monajatipoor et al., 2024). As a result, those similar demonstrations may mislead LLMs to derive shallow clues from surface representations (Wan et al., 2023b), while the entities may possess different interpretations under subtle nuances. Therefore, relying solely on this approach is insufficient.

To resolve the issues from each approach, in this paper, we integrate the two approaches. The static example selection strategy is inspired by conventional active learning frameworks. The objective of active learning is to direct the resource-intensive labeling process toward the most informative and representative instances from a large unlabeled data pool (Ein-Dor et al., 2020). This strategy minimizes the cost of annotation while maximizing the utility of unlabeled data. The dynamic example selection strategy is KATE. We name the hybrid method STAYKATE (STAtic&dYnamic Knn-

Augmented in-conText Example selection). Figure 1 shows the overall workflow of STAYKATE. In our experiment, we conduct evaluations across three entity extraction datasets from different scientific subdomains: MSPT (Mysore et al., 2019) as materials science, WLP (Kulkarni et al., 2018) as biology, and BC5CDR (Li et al., 2016) as biomedicine. The experimental results show that STAYKATE performs best among the in-context example selection methods examined. Additionally, our error analysis reveals that STAYKATE not only mitigates common errors such as overpredicting but also enhances the model’s ability to discern subtle nuances in the data.

2 Related work

2.1 NER for scientific literature

In recent years, research on information extraction in the scientific domain has focused on the attributes of textual data. One notable issue in scientific literature is the inconsistency in the notation of compounds. Handling the partial structures of compounds and the unique variations in their notation as they are presented proves to be challenging. In response to this challenge, Watanabe et al. (2019) proposed a multi-task learning approach utilizing a NER model combined with a paraphrasing model. Language models tailored specifically for the science domain, such as SciBERT (Beltagy et al., 2019), BioBERT (Lee et al., 2019), and MatSciBERT (Tanishq et al., 2022), have also been proposed. These models showed high performance in tasks related to the science domain but require fine-tuning with highly specialized datasets. Song

et al. (2023) indicated that the performance of these models dramatically decreases in low-resource settings.

2.2 In-context learning

A novel paradigm known as in-context learning (ICL) (Brown et al., 2020) has emerged as a substantial advancement in large language models (LLMs). Compared with the traditional fine-tuned base models that need task-specific supervised data and parameter updates, ICL enables LLMs to perform various tasks using a limited set of “input-output” pairs as demonstrations, without necessitating any retraining. However, prior studies (Liu et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Liu and Wang, 2023) have shown that the ICL performance is highly sensitive to the given in-context examples. To enhance the ICL, a series of strategies have been proposed, including optimizing the order of examples (Lu et al., 2022), utilizing the most confident model outputs (Wan et al., 2023a), and selecting the most informative data (Liu and Wang, 2023). Another commonly applied solution involved dynamically selecting demonstrations through retrieval modules. Liu et al. (2022) have proposed KATE, employed the kNN to retrieve the semantically similar data point in the training set to serve as the in-context examples.

2.3 In-context learning for NER

Several studies have indicated that LLMs may not be optimally suited to NER tasks. Compared with tasks like classification and question-answering which align more closely with the pre-training objective of generating natural text, NER presents additional challenges due to its need for intricate span extraction and precise type classification (Chen et al., 2023). This issue is exacerbated in the context of scientific NER. Jimenez Gutierrez et al. (2022) have indicated that GPT-3 significantly underperforms small PLMs, even when techniques such as contextual calibration and dynamic in-context example retrieval are employed.

3 Proposed method: STAYKATE

In the following, we first introduce our prompt construction. Then, we elaborate on both the static and dynamic example selection.

3.1 Prompt Construction

As illustrated in the right side in Figure 1, the prompt is composed of four components: system

role, task instructions, in-context examples, and test input.

Peng et al. (2023) demonstrated that specifying system roles for GPT models results in enhanced performance on specific tasks. In this research, we adopt a template such as “You are a/an [domain] expert.” to define the system role. The task instructions provide a description of NER task, brief definitions for each target entity, and the required output format. Where available, entity definitions are taken from the dataset’s annotation manual; otherwise, we ask GPT-3.5 to generate definitions based on its own understanding. In regard to the output format, GPT-3.5 is instructed to produce responses in JSON format. In-context examples combine static and dynamic examples. The static examples are fixed. They are unchanged across the test set. In contrast, the dynamic examples are different for each test input. They are selected based on their similarity to the test input. Finally, the test input is provided to GPT-3.5 for generating the response.

3.2 Static Example Selection

3.2.1 Problem Setting

For static example selection, the goal is to select the most representative examples from a large pool of unlabeled data D_{unlab} . Given the close resemblance between this problem setting and the active learning (AL) framework, we introduce one of the most prevalent AL strategies, representativeness sampling, to select k_s data points as static samples. It is assumed that the selected k_s unlabeled samples will subsequently be annotated by domain experts. The cost of human annotation is minimal, given that the number of samples selected is typically limited to a small number (from 2 to 8 in our experiment).

3.2.2 Representativeness Sampling

Predictive Entropy is a metric for quantifying the uncertainty inherent in the model’s predictions. By measuring the dispersion of predicted probabilities across all possible label classes for each token, predictive entropy offers insight into the model’s confidence in its prediction. In our context, predictive entropy is employed for the purpose of assessing the representativeness of the example candidates in unlabeled data pool. We first fine-tuned a BERT model under the low-resource setting, denoted as M to obtain the probability $p(y_i|x_i) = M(x_i)$ for each token x_i of a candidate sentence x . Then, we

define the token level predictive entropy $PE(x_i)$ as:

$$PE(x_i) = - \sum_{j=1}^C p(y_i = c_j | x_i) \log p(y_i = c_j | x_i) \quad (1)$$

where c_1, c_2, \dots, c_C are the class labels.

Subsequently, the predictive entropy of each candidate sentence can be defined as:

$$H(x) = \frac{1}{N_x} \sum_{i=1}^{N_x} PE(x_i) \quad (2)$$

where N_x is the number of tokens in the candidate sentence x . Selecting sentences with exceedingly low $H(x)$ is unreasonable as they can be very simple samples. Moreover, sentences with exceedingly high $H(x)$ can be either noise or out-of-domain data. Such sentences may prove detrimental to in-context learning. Inspired by (Kumar et al., 2022) work, we define a representativeness score, denoted as R_{Score} , for selecting the k_s most representative sentences. Specifically,

$$R_{Score} = |H(x) - (\mu_H + \lambda * \sigma_H)| \quad (3)$$

where μ_H is mean and σ_H is standard deviation of the predictive entropy of all sentences in the unlabeled data pool. It is assumed that the selection around μ_H can represent the overall patterns of the corpus. Additionally, σ_H is introduced to reduce the possible bias caused by the characteristics of the corpus. Therefore, λ is introduced to control the distance of the preferred selection zone from μ_H . We select k_s candidates which have the lowest R_{Score} as the static in-context examples.

3.3 Dynamic example selection

Many studies have indicated that retrieving semantically similar examples for a test input can significantly enhance the in-context learning performance of GPT-3.5. In this research, we follow one of the retrieval-based methods, KATE (Knn-Augmented in-conText Example selection), to select the examples dynamically for each test input.

It should be noted that unlike static example selection, which samples from a large pool of unlabeled data D_{unlab} , dynamic selection samples from a limited pool of labeled data D_{lab} . We utilize the OpenAI embedding model to convert both labeled data and test data into embeddings. Subsequently, for each test input s , the nearest k_d neighbors, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{k_d} , are retrieved from the $D_{lab} =$

$\{d_i\}_{i=1}^{N_i}$ based on their distances in the embedding space. Given a pre-defined similarity measure sim such as cosine similarity, the neighbors are ranked in order such that $sim(d_i, s) \leq sim(d_j, s)$ when $i < j$.

4 Experiment

4.1 Datasets

We evaluate on three scientific literature corpora for NER tasks from different subdomains. Due to the running cost of GPT-3.5 usage, we sampled approximately 200 sentences from the original test sets for WLP and BC5CDR. The distributions of the datasets are provided in Appendix A.

MSPT The Material Science Procedural Text corpus (Mysore et al., 2019) consists of 230 synthesis procedures annotated by domain experts. Although it contains 21 entity types, we focus on the three most important for evaluation: Material, Operation, and Property¹ for evaluation.

WLP The Wet Lab Protocol corpus (Kulkarni et al., 2018) contains 622 protocols for biology and chemistry experiments annotated by 10 annotators. There are 18 entity types in total. We evaluate on Actions and 4 types of Object Based Entities: Reagent, Location, Device, and Seal.

BC5CDR The BioCreative V Chemical-Disease Relation corpus (Li et al., 2016) comprises 1,500 PubMed abstracts. Chemical (Drug) and Disease entities are annotated with the annotators who had a medical training background and curation experience. We evaluate both types of entities.

4.2 Baseline Methods

Fine-tuned BERT To compare GPT-3.5 with conventional supervised learning, we trained a NER model under a low-resource scenario using BERT (Devlin et al., 2019). These fine-tuned BERT models were also utilized in the static example selection strategy to obtain the predicted probabilities for unlabeled example candidates.

Zero-shot In the zero-shot setup, we keep the system role, task instructions, and test input in the prompt.

¹In MSPT, the distinctions between material-descriptor and property-misc are too subtle to discern without the full context of the article. Since GPT-3.5 responses at the sentence level, we merge the Material-descriptor and Property-misc into a Property label.




Figure 2: Our experimental setting about data pool.

Random Sampling We randomly selected k in-context examples from the labeled data pool.

4.3 Experimental Setup

For each dataset, we divided the original training set (D_{train}) into a labeled data pool and a unlabeled data pool. We set the labeled data pool consisting of 170 to 200 sentences randomly extracted from the D_{train} . In a real-world situation, this range can be considered as a reasonable estimate of annotated data for scientific literature. This labeled data pool is employed for fine-tuning BERT models. While the in-context examples selected by KATE are retrieved from the same pool, the static in-context examples are selected from the unlabeled data pool, which is the rest of training set, with labels removed. In other words, although the static selection in Figure 1 uses unlabeled data, we use the rest of training data that were not used by the dynamic selection in the experiment (See Figure 2). We run all experiments using three distinct data pools and report the mean to mitigate the impact of data variability.

All BERT models were fine-tuned using the HuggingFace² Transformers library. The hyperparameters we used are given in Appendix B. On account of low-resource setting, we only used 170 to 200 annotated sentences for training. For validation data, we used GPT-3.5 to generate the pseudo labels for approximately 200 sentences randomly extracted from the original validation sets. The prompts provided to the GPT-3.5 include six random in-context examples.

The GPT model employed in this research was gpt3.5-turbo-16k-0613³. The temperature is set to 0. For dynamic example selection, we used OpenAI embedding model, text-embedding-3-small⁴,

²<https://huggingface.co/google-bert/bert-base-uncased>

³<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5-turbo>

⁴<https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/embeddings>

Method	MSPT	WLP	BC5CDR
<i>Baseline Methods</i>			
BERT (Low-resource)	0.55	0.37	0.53
Zero-shot	0.42	0.50	0.62
Random Sampling	0.57	0.65	0.69
<i>In-context example selecting methods</i>			
Representative ($\lambda = 0$)	0.57	0.66	0.69
Representative ($\lambda = 1$)	0.54	0.65	0.69
KATE	0.60	0.68	0.70
<i>Ours</i>			
STAYKATE ($\lambda = 0$)	0.61	0.69	0.70
STAYKATE ($\lambda = 1$)	0.60	0.66	0.72

Table 1: Overall results for baseline methods and in-context example selecting methods. The best results are given in **bold**. We run all experiments three times with different data pool and report the mean of micro average F1.

to embed labeled data and test input. The embedding dimension is 1536.

In our evaluation, we utilize $k = 2, 6, 8$ in-context examples. In the case of STAYKATE, we allocate k_s for static and k_d for dynamic respectively, where $k = k_s + k_d$. Specifically, for $k = 2$, we set $k_s = k_d = 1$; for $k = 6$ and 8 , $k_s = 2$ and $k_d = 4$ or 6 , respectively.

When calculating the R_{Score} used in the static example selection method, we try either the parameter $\lambda = 0$, or $\lambda = 1$. We utilize entity-level F1 scores for individual entity types and micro F1 scores for overall evaluation.

5 Results & Discuss

5.1 Main Results

The main experimental results are given in Table 1, Table 2, and Table 4. Besides the baseline methods and our proposed method, we also report the results using only static examples (Representativeness) and only dynamic examples (KATE).

Table 1 shows the micro F1 score across datasets when $k = 8$ for those methods with in-context examples. First, it is notable that most GPT-based methods outperformed the fine-tuned BERT baseline. This indicates that GPT-3.5 may be a better choice when only a limited quantity of annotated data is available.

Drilling down into the in-context example selecting methods results, it reveals that representativeness sampling cannot outperform random sampling. In contrast, KATE achieved improvements across datasets. This suggests that dynamic examples are more effective than static ones for in-context learn-

		Baseline Methods			In-context Example Selecting Methods						
		BERT	Zero-shot	Random	Representative $\lambda = 0$ $\lambda = 1$		KATE	Random + KATE	STAYKATE $\lambda = 0$ $\lambda = 1$		
Dataset	Entity (support)										
	MSPT	Material (338)	0.51	0.49	0.56	0.58	0.54	0.60	0.59	0.62	0.60
		Operation (242)	0.75	0.51	0.76	0.74	0.75	0.77	0.77	0.76	0.77
		Property (105)	0.14	0.05	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.21	0.25	0.20
		micro avg	0.55	0.42	0.57	0.57	0.54	0.60	0.60	0.61	0.60
WLP	Action (275)	0.57	0.76	0.79	0.80	0.81	0.82	0.80	0.81	0.80	
	Device (45)	0.00	0.10	0.24	0.21	0.25	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.22	
	Location (122)	0.00	0.39	0.54	0.57	0.51	0.57	0.54	0.55	0.52	
	Reagent (178)	0.22	0.39	0.62	0.64	0.61	0.66	0.65	0.67	0.63	
	Seal (20)	0.00	0.26	0.54	0.43	0.56	0.40	0.40	0.48	0.41	
	micro avg	0.37	0.50	0.65	0.66	0.65	0.68	0.67	0.69	0.66	
BC5CDR	Chemical (291)	0.64	0.63	0.71	0.70	0.71	0.72	0.71	0.72	0.74	
	Disease (185)	0.36	0.62	0.65	0.66	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.67	0.70	
	micro avg	0.53	0.62	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.70	0.72	

Table 2: Experimental results on entity-level for each dataset. The best results are given in **bold**. The value of micro average for each dataset can be found the same in Table 1.




Figure 3: The distribution of predictive entropy for each dataset.

ing. Our proposed method, STAYKATE, which combined two types of examples, achieved the best performance.

Table 2 provides a more detailed, entity-level breakdown of the results shown in Table 1. Although the overall performance gap between KATE and STAYKATE in Table 1 is relatively narrow, significant performance gaps can be observed among entity types within individual datasets on entity-level. In MSPT, Operation entities achieved a peak F1 score of 0.77, while Property entities only reached 0.25. Similarly, in WLP, Action entities attained a maximum F1 score of 0.82, contrasting with Device entities at 0.29. These disparities may be attributed to the entity frequency within the corpus and the inherent complexity of entity types. Since Operation and Action entities are usually verbs, GPT-3.5 can easily extract them. In contrast, entities like Materials, Property, Device require more domain knowledge or context to accurately identify, increasing the difficulty. While most of the methods struggle with these domain-specific entities, the proposed

Dataset	avg	avg	Ratio
	# token	# non-entity token	
MSPT	34.87	26.66	76%
WLP	15.87	11.91	75%
BC5CDR	25.39	22.39	88%

Table 3: The ratio of non-entity tokens.

STAYKATE method shows promising results. Furthermore, STAYKATE demonstrated more consistent performance across different entity types in comparison to some other methods, particularly in the WLP dataset. Additionally, the performance declined when combining random examples with KATE (Random + KATE) instead of combining examples from representativeness sampling, especially for the domain-specific entities. This highlights the essential role of representativeness sampling in selecting static examples.

Another interesting point is that the performance of STAYKATE varied with different λ values. We consider that the choice of λ value depends on the characteristics of the dataset. Specifically, the ratio

Dataset	Entity (support)	Random			KATE			STAYKATE		
		$k = 2$	$k = 6$	$k = 8$	$k = 2$	$k = 6$	$k = 8$	$k = 2$	$k = 6$	$k = 8$
MSPT	Material (338)	0.53	0.55	0.56	0.58	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.62
	Operation (242)	0.74	0.76	0.76	0.75	0.76	0.77	0.75	0.76	0.76
	Property (105)	0.07	0.14	0.15	0.17	0.22	0.22	0.19	0.22	0.25
	micro avg	0.52	0.56	0.57	0.57	0.60	0.60	0.58	0.59	0.61
WLP	Action (275)	0.77	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.81	0.82	0.79	0.80	0.81
	Device (45)	0.22	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.19	0.25	0.29
	Location (122)	0.46	0.55	0.54	0.53	0.55	0.57	0.56	0.55	0.55
	Reagent (178)	0.52	0.62	0.62	0.63	0.64	0.66	0.62	0.66	0.67
	Seal (20)	0.35	0.48	0.54	0.32	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.48	0.48
micro avg	0.59	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.67	0.68	0.65	0.68	0.69	
BC5CDR	Chemical (291)	0.70	0.70	0.71	0.70	0.71	0.72	0.72	0.73	0.74
	Disease (185)	0.63	0.64	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.67	0.66	0.68	0.70
	micro avg	0.67	0.68	0.69	0.68	0.69	0.70	0.70	0.71	0.72

Table 4: Experimental results with various k in-context examples for each dataset.

of non-entity tokens in the data pool. As shown in Table 3, the proportion of non-entity tokens for BC5CDR is higher than MSPT and WLP. Figure 3 illustrates how this affects the distribution of predictive entropy for each dataset. For those datasets with lower non-entity token proportions, the distributions of predictive entropy were closer to normal distribution. However, for BC5CDR, the values were more concentrated in the low-value area. This is because the model typically has high confidence when predicting labels for non-entity tokens. Therefore, we suggest adjusting the selection zone using the parameter λ when the proportion of non-entity tokens is high.

The experiment results with various k in-context examples are given in Table 4. These results demonstrates that the extraction performance improved as k increases. Comparing STAYKATE ($k = 8$, namely $k_s = 2$ and $k_d = 6$) with KATE ($k = 6$), STAYKATE outperformed KATE across most of the entities. This proves the effectiveness of the representativeness sampling that we combined in STAYKATE.

6 Analysis

6.1 Error Analysis

This section presents a comprehensive error analysis of GPT-3.5 outputs when $k = 8$. The errors are broadly categorized into three types: overpredicting, oversight, and wrong entity type.

Overpredicting As shown in Figure 4, overpredicting emerges as the most frequent issue in our experimental findings. This reveals that GPT-3.5 demonstrates a strong propensity to incorrectly assign pre-defined labels to non-entity tokens. This phenomenon also observed in other studies (Wan




Figure 4: Statistics on the percentage of various error types.




Figure 5: Statistics of errors across different selection methods for MSPT.

et al., 2023b; Blevins et al., 2022). In our context, we found that the overpredicting occurred more frequently in Property, Reagent, and Chemical. The trend of these entity types to be overpredicted can be attributed to their context-dependent nature.

Oversight In contrast to overpredicting, oversight occurred when GPT-3.5 treats a pre-defined label as a non-entity token. This error type was more frequently observed in entity types with low occurrence rates across the three datasets, such as Device and Seal. Due to the infrequent appearance of these entities, they are usually excluded from the selected examples, thus potentially mis-




Figure 6: A case study comparing KATE with STAYKATE.

leading the models. Additionally, we observed that GPT-3.5 tends to ignore the abbreviations in Material and Chemical entities (e.g., original text: Fetal bovine serum (FBS); gold: Fetal bovine serum, FBS; predicted: Fetal bovine serum).

Wrong entity type When GPT-3.5 misidentifies entity type A to entity type B, we call this wrong entity type. This error typically manifested in entities with the same surface representation but divergent contextual meanings. For example, in MSPT, Property and Material are usually misclassified. The words like “powder”, “solution”, and “suspension” are easy to be confused since they can either be a physical substance or a descriptor of the characteristics of material.

6.2 Why STAYKATE performs better?

We checked the errors associated with different selection methods for MSPT. The analysis for WLP and BC5CDR can be found in Appendix C. Figure 5 illustrates the statistics of three error types for Random Sampling, Representativeness Sampling, KATE, and STAYKATE. Notably, STAYKATE demonstrated a significant reduction in overpredicting errors. While there was a trade-off observed in the oversight errors, STAYKATE still exhibited comparable performance. Furthermore, regarding the wrong entity type errors, an issue that other selection methods struggled with, STAYKATE shows a lower rate.

Additionally, we show one instance to highlight the benefits of hybrid in-context examples. As shown in Figure 6, the gold label for “solution”

in the test input is Material. The semantically similar examples retrieved by KATE offered some insights for identifying entities. However, in the context of the first example, “solution” referred to Property, misleading GPT-3.5 to produce an incorrect response. In contrast, the two static representative examples provided by STAYKATE clarified the varying meanings of “solution” across contexts, encouraging GPT-3.5 to better consider the nuance.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a static-dynamic hybrid method, STAYKATE (STATIC&DYNAMIC Knn-Augmented in-conTEXT Example selection) to select the efficient in-context examples for scientific NER. The experimental results indicated that under the low-resource setting, GPT-3.5 with ICL can surpass the fine-tuned base models. Additionally, STAYKATE outperformed other existing selection methods. The enhancement was more significant in domain-specific entities. The detailed analysis also showed the capability of STAYKATE to mitigate typical errors like overpredicting.

8 Limitations

There are several limitations to consider in this paper. We just evaluated STAYKATE on three datasets from the scientific domain. Moreover, we just reported results with GPT-3.5. Therefore we need to evaluate STAYKATE with other LLMs. Experiments with a larger number of examples are also necessary.

References

- Emily Alsentzer, John Murphy, William Boag, Wei-Hung Weng, Di Jindi, Tristan Naumann, and Matthew McDermott. 2019. [Publicly available clinical BERT embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*, pages 72–78.
- Iz Beltagy, Kyle Lo, and Arman Cohan. 2019. [SciBERT: A pretrained language model for scientific text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3615–3620.
- Terra Blevins, Hila Gonen, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. [Prompting language models for linguistic structure](#). Preprint, arXiv:2211.07830.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Nee-lakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, and Amanda et al Askell. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901.
- Jiawei Chen, Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Jie Lou, Wei Jia, Dai Dai, Hua Wu, Boxi Cao, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. 2023. [Learning in-context learning for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13661–13675.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186.
- Bosheng Ding, Chengwei Qin, Linlin Liu, Yew Ken Chia, Shafiq Joty, Boyang Li, and Lidong Bing. 2023. [Is GPT-3 a good data annotator?](#) In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11173–11195.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, and Angela Fan et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). Preprint, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Liat Ein-Dor, Alon Halfon, Ariel Gera, Eyal Shnarch, Lena Dankin, Leshem Choshen, Marina Danilevsky, Ranit Aharonov, Yoav Katz, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [Active Learning for BERT: An Empirical Study](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7949–7962, Online.
- Fabrizio Gilardi, Meysam Alizadeh, and Maël Kubli. 2023. [Chatgpt outperforms crowd workers for text-annotation tasks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(30):e2305016120.
- Zhi Hong, Logan Ward, Kyle Chard, Ben Blaiszik, and Ian Foster. 2021. [Challenges and advances in information extraction from scientific literature: a review](#). *JOM*, 73(11):3383–3400.
- Bernal Jimenez Gutierrez, Nikolas McNeal, Clayton Washington, You Chen, Lang Li, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. 2022. [Thinking about GPT-3 in-context learning for biomedical IE? think again](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 4497–4512.
- Chaitanya Kulkarni, Wei Xu, Alan Ritter, and Raghu Machiraju. 2018. [An annotated corpus for machine reading of instructions in wet lab protocols](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 97–106.
- Shanu Kumar, Sandipan Dandapat, and Monojit Choudhury. 2022. ["diversity and uncertainty in moderation" are the key to data selection for multilingual few-shot transfer](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 1042–1055.
- Md Tahmid Rahman Laskar, M Saiful Bari, Mizanur Rahman, Md Amran Hossen Bhuiyan, Shafiq Joty, and Jimmy Huang. 2023. [A systematic study and comprehensive evaluation of ChatGPT on benchmark datasets](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 431–469.
- Jinhyuk Lee, Wonjin Yoon, Sungdong Kim, Donghyeon Kim, Sunkyu Kim, Chan Ho So, and Jaewoo Kang. 2019. [BioBERT: a pre-trained biomedical language representation model for biomedical text mining](#). *Bioinformatics*, 36(4):1234–1240.
- Jiao Li, Yueping Sun, Robin J Johnson, Daniela Sciaky, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Robert Leaman, Allan Peter Davis, Carolyn J Mattingly, Thomas C Wieggers, and Zhiyong Lu. 2016. [BioCreative V CDR task corpus: a resource for chemical disease relation extraction](#). *Database (Oxford)*, 2016:baw068.
- Hongfu Liu and Ye Wang. 2023. [Towards informative few-shot prompt with maximum information gain for in-context learning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15825–15838, Singapore.
- Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [What makes good in-context examples for GPT-3?](#) In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out (DeeLIO 2022): The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*, pages 100–114, Dublin, Ireland and Online.

- Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. 2022. [Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8086–8098.
- Masoud Monajatipoor, Jiaxin Yang, Joel Stremmel, Melika Emami, Fazlollah Mohaghegh, Mozhddeh Rouhsedaghat, and Kai-Wei Chang. 2024. [Llms in biomedicine: A study on clinical named entity recognition](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.07376.
- Sheshera Mysore, Zachary Jensen, Edward Kim, Kevin Huang, Haw-Shiuan Chang, Emma Strubell, Jeffrey Flanigan, Andrew McCallum, and Elsa Olivetti. 2019. [The materials science procedural text corpus: Annotating materials synthesis procedures with shallow semantic structures](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Linguistic Annotation Workshop*, pages 56–64.
- Harsha Nori, Yin Tat Lee, Sheng Zhang, Dean Carignan, Richard Edgar, Nicolo Fusi, Nicholas King, Jonathan Larson, Yuanzhi Li, and Weishung Liu et al. 2023. [Can generalist foundation models outcompete special-purpose tuning? case study in medicine](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.16452.
- Keqin Peng, Liang Ding, Qihuang Zhong, Li Shen, Xuebo Liu, Min Zhang, Yuanxin Ouyang, and Dacheng Tao. 2023. [Towards making the most of ChatGPT for machine translation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5622–5633.
- Ohad Rubin, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2022. [Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2655–2671.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, and Stephen Pfohl et al. 2022. [Large language models encode clinical knowledge](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.13138.
- Yu Song, Santiago Miret, and Bang Liu. 2023. [MatSci-NLP: Evaluating scientific language models on materials science language tasks using text-to-schema modeling](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3621–3639.
- Gupta Tanishq, Zaki Mohd, and N. M. Krishnan. 2022. [Matscibert: A materials domain language model for text mining and information extraction](#). *Npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):1–11.
- Amalie Trewartha, Nicholas Walker, Haoyan Huo, Sanghoon Lee, Kevin Cruse, John Dagdelen, Alexander Dunn, Kristin A. Persson, Gerbrand Ceder, and Anubhav Jain. 2022. [Quantifying the advantage of domain-specific pre-training on named entity recognition tasks in materials science](#). *Patterns*, 3(4):100488.
- Xingchen Wan, Ruoxi Sun, Hanjun Dai, Sercan Arik, and Tomas Pfister. 2023a. [Better zero-shot reasoning with self-adaptive prompting](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 3493–3514.
- Zhen Wan, Fei Cheng, Zhuoyuan Mao, Qianying Liu, Haiyue Song, Jiwei Li, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2023b. [GPT-RE: In-context learning for relation extraction using large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3534–3547.
- Taiki Watanabe, Akihiro Tamura, Takashi Ninomiya, Takuya Makino, and Tomoya Iwakura. 2019. [Multi-task learning for chemical named entity recognition with chemical compound paraphrasing](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 6244–6249.
- Leigh Weston, Vahe Tshitoyan, John Dagdelen, Olga Vitalievna Kononova, Amalie Trewartha, Kristin A. Persson, Gerbrand Ceder, and Anubhav Jain. 2019. [Named entity recognition and normalization applied to large-scale information extraction from the materials science literature](#). *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 59(9):3692–3702.
- Yiming Zhang, Shi Feng, and Chenhao Tan. 2022. [Active example selection for in-context learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9134–9148, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.

A Data Statistics

Table 5 shows the statistical details of datasets. We also give the size of the subsets we used in our experiments.

	Train (subset)	Dev (subset)	Test (subset)
MSPT	1,758 (175)	105	157
WLP	8,581 (176)	2,859 (199)	2,861 (194)
BCSCDR	4,288 (184)	4,299 (198)	4,600 (197)

Table 5: Statistical details of datasets. The size of subsets for training sets refer to the labeled data we used for KATE and BERT’s fine-tuning.

B Hyperparameters of BERT

The hyperparameters used are the max length of 350, the batch size of 32, the learning rate of $2e-5$, and 20 epochs of training. We apply the EarlyStopping mechanism to prevent overfitting.




Figure 7: Sentence pair with inconsistent annotation in WLP.




Figure 8: Statistics of errors across different selection methods for WLP.




Figure 9: Statistics of errors across different selection methods for BC5CDR.

C Statistics of errors for WLP and BC5CDR

Figure 8 shows the statistics of errors associated with different selection methods for WLP. Compared to the static-based methods (Random Sampling and Representativeness Sampling), both KATE and STAYKATE exhibit significantly higher overpredicting rate. We consider this can be attributed to the characteristics of the dataset. Since WLP consists of the instructions for biology and chemistry experiments, it contains more repetitive or extremely similar sentences. Moreover, we find that identical sentences in WLP can sometimes have varying annotations (See Figure 7). The similarity-based retrieve model is likely to extract such sentence pairs. When a word in the same sentence is inconsistently labeled as an entity or non-entity, GPT-3.5 tends to assume it is an entity, leading to overpredicting.

In the case of BC5CDR, similar trends are observed as in the MSPT dataset: STAYKATE demonstrates a reduction in both overpredicting errors and incorrect entity type classifications (Figure 9). We consider that the mitigation in overpredicting owing to the STAYKATE provides examples that exclude entities. The wrong entity type errors often arise when a word is an abbreviation, making it challenging for the model to distinguish between

chemical and disease entities. The in-context examples selected by STAYKATE also contain abbreviations, which offer crucial disambiguation cues.