

---

# Iterative Tree Analysis for Medical Critics

---

Zenan Huang\* Mingwei Li\* Zheng Zhou Youxin Jiang  
Baichuan Inc.  
{huangzenan, limingwei}@baichuan-inc.com

## Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) have been widely adopted across various domains, yet their application in the medical field poses unique challenges, particularly concerning the generation of hallucinations. Hallucinations in open-ended long medical text manifest as misleading critical claims, which are difficult to verify due to two reasons. First, critical claims are often deeply entangled within the text and cannot be extracted based solely on surface-level presentation. Second, verifying these claims is challenging because surface-level token-based retrieval often lacks precise or specific evidence, leaving the claims unverifiable without deeper mechanism-based analysis. In this paper, we introduce a novel method termed **Iterative Tree Analysis (ITA)** for medical critics. ITA is designed to extract implicit claims from long medical texts and verify each claim through an iterative and adaptive tree-like reasoning process. This process involves a combination of top-down task decomposition and bottom-up evidence consolidation, enabling precise verification of complex medical claims through detailed mechanism-level reasoning. Our extensive experiments demonstrate that ITA significantly outperforms previous methods in detecting factual inaccuracies in complex medical text verification tasks by 10%. Additionally, we will release a comprehensive test set to the public, aiming to foster further advancements in research within this domain.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable proficiency across a wide range of tasks. However, in high-stake domains like evidence-based medicine, they face critical challenges that limit their practical reliability Djulbegovic and Guyatt [2017]. Although LLMs excel in standardized medical benchmarks Nori et al. [2024], such evaluations frequently overlook the nuanced and complex nature of real-world clinical scenarios. To address this gap, future assessments should extend beyond traditional multiple-choice formats, such as MedQA Jin et al. [2020], and incorporate open-ended, long-form evaluations. These evaluations should rigorously test the models' ability to verify complex and nuanced information Schmidgall et al. [2024], Fan et al. [2024]. Such assessments should incorporate intricate and implicit medical knowledge, challenging LLMs to demonstrate deeper understanding and reasoning. Accurate verification of response is particularly crucial in medical applications, as LLMs frequently generate hallucinations—erroneous or fabricated outputs Li et al. [2023], Cheng et al. [2023]. By emphasizing detailed factuality verification, researchers can better understand LLMs' strengths and limitations, guiding their improvement and enhancing their reliability in critical applications.

The rapid development of LLM-based QA system and LLM-as-a-Judge pipelines Zheng et al. [2023], Chen et al. [2024] has produced numerous solutions for generating accurate answers and assertions. However, factuality verification remains a significant challenge, particularly in domains like medicine. Current methods Min et al. [2023] typically divide factuality verification into two tasks:

---

\*Corresponding author.

(i) determining whether a claim is factually correct, and (ii) evaluating whether a claim is supported by evidence Tran et al. [2024]. These approaches often rely on surface-level input descriptions, which are insufficient for complex, long-form medical statements.

Medical factuality verification is especially challenging due to the intricate relationships among medical concepts, symptoms, and treatments etc., which often cannot be validated through simple queries. This process requires understanding implicit causal effects and constructing detailed chains of evidence. Existing automated methods, such as fact-checking Li et al. [2023] and knowledge-based systems Chen et al. [2023a], Vu et al. [2023], typically compare claims to static databases or predefined reference answers. While effective for simple claims, these methods struggle with the complexity and interconnectedness of long-form medical statements, highlighting the need for more advanced investigative processes and dynamic evaluation systems.

In this paper, we introduce a novel framework, **Iterative Tree Analysis (ITA)**, designed to identify and rectify factual inaccuracies within medical claims articulated in natural language. ITA innovatively tackles the primary task by implementing a verification process that systematically manages specific sub-claims. This process involves recursively verifying sub-claims and constructing a verification tree. The tree structure is developed based on the sub-claims and the currently available information retrieved for each sub-tree. By consolidating the verification tree from the bottom up, our approach achieves complex verification objectives. This divide-and-conquer strategy simplifies the task into manageable sub-claims and, by integrating more reliable external references, facilitates the progressive exploration of challenging verification tasks. In summary, our contributions include:

- We introduce **ITA**, a novel system designed to enhance medical factuality verification through the use of adaptive tree-of-thoughts reasoning. This approach efficiently extracts atomic claims from the original text and constructs a tree of evidence to support true or false judgments, thereby improving the accuracy and reliability of claim verification.
- **ITA** offers a unified and versatile framework for medical claim detection by spanning and consolidating sub-trees with retrieved external reference information. This capability allows for the comprehensive illustration and validation of distinct vital claims within the input query text, facilitating a more nuanced and detailed analysis of medical information.
- To support the evaluation of the medical verification task, we curate a dataset called **Med-Critics**, which includes a fine-grained checklist. This dataset facilitates a more explicit understanding of verification methods.

## 2 Related Works

**Factuality verification.** Factuality is a crucial attribute for LLMs, as controlling the generation of misleading information poses significant challenges. Cheng et al. [2023] utilize GPT-4 to automatically evaluate whether a model’s output is hallucinated. In dialogue contexts, Luo et al. [2024] develop HalluJudge, a specialized model for dialogue-level hallucination evaluation, based on a large-scale benchmark dataset. For long-form content, Min et al. [2023] propose FactScore, which assesses the factuality by breaking content into atomic sentences and retrieving relevant information from Wikipedia. Enhancing this approach, Wei et al. [2024] integrate a Google Search API to enable more flexible and robust factuality assessments. For multi-modal content, Jing et al. [2024] introduce FaithScore, offering fine-grained reliability evaluations. Despite these advancements, most existing methods focus on surface-level information and may fall short in addressing the complexity of real-world verification tasks.

**Adaptive retrieval.** Adaptive retrieval is a key criterion for addressing the challenges of external document search, focusing on when and how extensively to retrieve information. Shao et al. [2023] utilize iterative retrieval to generate more reliable outputs, an approach echoed by Trivedi et al. [2023], who refine external knowledge iteratively to consolidate final answers. Similarly, Jiang et al. [2024] enhance the completeness of QA by progressively improving retrieved information. Jeong et al. [2024] propose adaptive retrieval techniques that train a smaller language model to categorize queries into no retrieval, single-step retrieval or multi-step retrieval. Baek et al. [2024] rely on the LLMs’s internal knowledge to determine when retrieval is necessary. Ding et al. [2024] and Zhang et al. [2024] introduce the internal hallucination checks, triggering retrieval only when there is a risk of hallucination. Jiang et al. [2023] assess the necessity of retrieval based on next-token confidence.

Further advancements include Yue et al. [2024], who iteratively insert RAG QA exemplars to improve RAG utilization, and Xu et al. [2024] integrate a chain-of-query mechanism to dynamically expand knowledge verification from the initial claim.

**Knowledge verification.** Conflicting perspectives are inherent part in any field. While some conflicts can be resolved through source verification, others remain subjects of ongoing debate. LLMs often struggle to provide consistent outputs when presented with conflicting documents [Su et al., 2024]. LLMs typically prioritize coherence and persuasive narratives, which can lead to biased or incomplete conclusions. To address this, it is crucial to guide LLMs toward a formal reasoning framework that relies on internal logic and external references Wadden et al. [2022], Wei et al. [2023]. Building on prior findings, Bayat et al. [2024] propose categorizing information into three categories—supported, unsupported, and undecidable—by introducing an undecidable placeholder for cases where conclusive evidence is unavailable.

### 3 VITAL: Verification and Iterative Tree Analysis

Accurately evaluating the claims of long-form medical statements presents significant challenges due to the complexity of medical discourse, the interconnection of concepts, and the limitations of existing evaluation methods. Current approaches often rely on surface-level assessments or static databases, which fail to capture the nuanced relationships among medical concepts, symptoms, and treatments *etc.* First, we advocate for a fine-grained evaluation approach that focuses on individual medical concepts and evidential chains than entire statements or sentences. This granular method enables precise verification by independently assessing each concept and its supporting evidence, ensuring the evaluation reflects the intricacies of medical knowledge. Second, we propose leveraging dynamic, up-to-date medical databases and reference searches. By integrating these insights, we can enhance the reliability and accuracy of long-form medical text verification, ultimately improving the quality of medical applications.

As shown in Figure 1, the verification process involves extracting all verifiable claims from the input query and constructing a verification tree,  $\mathcal{T}$ , based on these claims. Medical claims under scrutiny often require complex reasoning chains that depend on fine-grained knowledge points to identify distinct claims accurately. In some cases, the verification process demands indicator computation or the consolidation of multi-level claims, particularly when the combination of medical concepts is absent from external references or challenging to retrieve. In such scenarios, it is crucial to gather sufficient evidence from external sources, such as recent research articles, to construct the implicit evidence chain necessary to determine whether the claim is supported.

#### 3.1 Problem Formalization and Overview

We introduce the following components of ITA: the large language model  $\mathcal{M}$ , claim variables  $\mathcal{V} := \{v_i\}$ , evidence relations  $\mathcal{E} := \{(v_i, v_j)\}$ , verification tree  $\mathcal{T} := \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$ , input query  $q$ , information source  $\mathcal{D}$ , and the retriever  $\mathcal{R}$ . The verification task  $\mathcal{Q}$  involves determining the factuality of a statement by constructing a logical sequence of the thoughts supported by external references. Given an input query  $q$ , our objective is to construct an optimal thought tree  $\mathcal{T}$  that adaptively generate verification sub-trees and retrieves relevant document sources  $\mathcal{D}$  as evidence. Specifically, for a given  $q$ , the LLM  $\mathcal{M}$  is prompted to iteratively expand the thought tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , ensuring each node and relation in tree is grounded in retrieved evidence:

$$\mathcal{A} = f_{\text{verify}}(q; \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{T}), \tag{1}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set of verified claims  $a_i$ , each annotated with a judgment flag STATE and REASON. The ultimate objective is to construct logical sequences that determine whether all claims in a query can be substantiated by evidence, adhering to specific references. These references encompass diverse sources, including Wikipedia, textbooks, expert explanations, and precise calculator. By embracing this broader definition, we establish a unified framework for addressing issues of factual accuracy.

While input content can be readily divided into sentences and short representations, identifying precise atomic claims requires a higher level of granularity. Often, information not immediately apparent is crucial for substantiating these claims. For instance, some claims necessitate multi-hop verification, while others may be susceptible to spurious relationships, requiring careful scrutiny to




Figure 1: Overview of the **ITA** framework. During the tree-**spanning** stage, individual claims are extracted from the medical text, ensuring each claim is self-contained by incorporating information from other parts of the text. Verification sub-tasks are distributed recursively down to the leaf nodes. In the **consolidating** stage, deeper knowledge insights for each individual claim are used to determine whether to accept or reject its parent claim. The framework outputs the verification status of each individual claim along with its supporting references.

avoid misleading confounders. In the context of a tree-based representation, these claims can be structured as a graph, with each node symbolizing an minimum claim and the edges represent the relationships between claims. Naively extracted claims often lack sufficient reasoning details for proper validation. By systematically refining claims with the support of external fact-checking tools and rigorously analyzing the entire tree, we can ensure both the accuracy of individual claims and the integrity of the expanded tree.

### 3.2 Verification with spanning tree

The ultimate concept is exploration when the answer is not sure and consolidation when external information is enough. After iteratively referring to external resources, the claims extracted from the initial query can be verified with an in-depth reasoning chain.

**Spanning.** The process of generating a verification tree begins by identifying critical claims from the initial statement, which serves as the foundation for both exploration and exploitation. Depending on the specific medical problem, a claim can take various forms, such as a few words (*e.g.*, the name of a drug), a line of an equation (*e.g.*, a biomedical indicator), or a sentence expressing a cause-effect relationship (*e.g.*, symptom inference).

Typically, a sub-claim should be “atomic” enough to enable language models to generate effective queries. Given a query containing task-specific information, the language model  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{generate}}$  is then prompted to produce the claims requiring verification:

$$\text{SUBTREE}(q, \text{CHILD}(q)) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{generate}}(q), \quad \text{CHILD}(q) = \{v'_1, v'_2, \dots\}. \quad (2)$$

Here,  $v'_i = \{\text{CLAIM}, \text{STATE}\}$  is initially set to “verifying”. To ensure comprehensive factual checking, we follow the guidelines established by Min et al. [2023], revising the proposed claims to be self-contained. Once the node  $v'_i$  is verified, it will be supplemented with reference information, a judgment reason, and an updated STATE. This updated node is denoted as  $v_i^* = \{\text{CLAIM}, \text{STATE}, \text{REASON}, \text{REF}\}$ .

Once the initial claims are generated, the verification tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is constructed by iteratively expanding the tree with new claims based on the information retrieved through the retriever  $\mathcal{R}$ :

$$\text{SUBTREE}(v'_{\text{cur}}, \text{CHILD}(v'_{\text{cur}})) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{span}}(v'_{\text{cur}}, \mathcal{R}(v'_{\text{cur}}), \delta), \quad \delta = \text{VERIFY}(\mathcal{R}(v'_{\text{cur}}), v'_{\text{cur}}). \quad (3)$$

Here,  $v'_{\text{cur}}$  is the root node of the current SUBTREE, and  $\delta$  indicates the flag for spanning termination (*e.g.*,  $\delta := \text{accept/reject}$  for termination,  $\delta := \text{unsubstantiated}$  for spanning). Once  $\mathcal{M}$  determines that further expansion is unnecessary or the maximum exploration condition is reached,

the generated SUBTREE will contain only the node  $v'_{\text{cur}}$ . This will then trigger the bottom-up node verification consolidation process.

We propose a spanning method that involves generating follow-up queries based on a sub-tree structure originating from the root node. The root node contains meta-information, such as the abstract of the input theme, and decomposes extracted entities into leaf nodes. Each node is evaluated to maintain and update the current meta-information, facilitating a thorough verification process.

**Consolidation.** The tree consolidation process proceeds in a bottom-up manner from the leaf nodes, gradually integrating verified claims with the aid of external information. Each spanning SUBTREE corresponds to a parent claim, accompanied by retrieved documents and associated child claims. The state evaluator,  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{cons}}$ , assesses progress toward solving the problem and serves as a claim consolidation mechanism. During the consolidation step, RAG-assisted verification begins at the leaf nodes, passing the processed claim’s STATE—indicating whether the claim is supported—and the REASON, which provides the judgment, to the parent node. This process modifies the parent node using reasoning results from its children:

$$v_{\text{cur}}^* \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{cons}}(v'_{\text{cur}}, \{v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots\}) \mid v_i^* \in \text{CHILD}(v'_{\text{cur}}), \quad (4)$$

where  $v'_{\text{cur}}$  is the root node of the current SUBTREE to be verified. A consolidation prompt reasons about the sub-tree to generate a scalar value for STATE (e.g., a score from 1 to 10) or a confidence level category (e.g., accept, reject, or unsubstantiated), which can be mapped to a numerical value. The specific categories may vary depending on the problem or the reasoning steps involved.

Intuitively, when  $v'_{\text{cur}}$  refers to symptoms and medication usage,  $\text{CHILD}(v'_{\text{cur}})$  maintains information pieces such as organs, tissues, and medication treatments. By delving into the CHILD of the CHILD, we can explore relationships between cellular, protein, and molecular mechanisms, as illustrated in Figure 1.

### 3.3 Individual Claims & Retrieval

Medical texts often contain critical claims embedded within the main narrative, much like intricate patterns woven into a complex textile. The surface presentation of these texts does not always transparently convey the underlying logical structure. To accurately identify and interpret key claims, we design a multi-hop claim refinement agent and distill its reasoning trace into LLM with fine-tuning. This process allows for the extraction of significant claims that may otherwise remain obscured within the broader context. As illustrated in Figure 2, long-form text often contains numerous pieces of information that can be both mixed and ambiguous. A critical component of successful verification is ensuring that each SUBTREE is self-contained. This requires that each SUBTREE includes explicit entity names rather than pronouns or vague references, which could impede the verification process. We construct self-consistent factual statements from the original text to facilitate a more fine-grained evaluation, as depicted in Figure 2. Each factual claim is a self-contained sentence that conveys information about diseases, conditions, medications, treatments, therapies, diagnoses, indicators, and side effects.

**Query Generation.** For a given claim  $v_i$ , the retriever  $\mathcal{R}$ , with the assistance of the LLM  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{query}}$ , identifies the appropriate external sources to consult. The retrieval space of  $\mathcal{R}$  initially comprises a set of pre-built tools  $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, R_2, \dots\}$ , where each tool  $R_i$  is tailored to retrieve specific types of information or to invoke an external calculator for evaluating indicator results. The selection process is guided by the following equation:

$$\{R_i, s\} \sim \mathcal{M}_{\text{query}}(v'_i, \text{PARENT}(v'_i)). \quad (5)$$




Figure 2: An example of verification

In this context,  $R_i$  is determined using the meta-claim of its parent node as context, while  $s$  represents the generated search query or coding task. This facilitates the distributed verification of claims  $v'_i$ , such as specific biomedical indicator computations that are contingent upon the parent node’s meta-claim. Furthermore, certain molecular mechanisms related to the parent node’s meta-claim may necessitate external information updates for accurate verification.

**Retrieval and Selection.** Once information is retrieved, the retriever  $\mathcal{R}$  processes it to select relevant documents and extract key information. The external sources utilized can range from general search engines and medical textbooks to specialized calculators. Despite the diversity of these sources, the retrieval process consistently aims to provide evidence that supports the claims. Consequently, the retrieved information is re-ranked and selected based on its relevance to the claims:

$$D \leftarrow \text{RERANK}(R_i(\epsilon)), \quad D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots\}. \quad (6)$$

Here,  $D$  represents the set of retrieved information, with each  $d_i$  denoting the preprocessed content extracted from the documents. The RERANK function can be either rule-based or learned. For instance, it can be configured to prioritize scientific resources over less reliable sources, such as advertising. This curated information is essential for verifying claims and providing robust evidence for the consolidation process.

## 4 Experiments

In this section, we present the results of our end-to-end factuality evaluation. Long-form factuality assessment is challenging due to the difficulty in defining a definitive set of facts. To address this, we developed a fine-grained benchmark with specific claim modifications to evaluate the performance of our method, ITA. We also assessed the reliability of baseline verification methods and human annotators in processing long-form medical texts, supported by extensive statistical analyses.

### 4.1 Med-Critics Curation

Inspired by previous works Scirè et al. [2024], Ness et al. [2024], VITAL-Med is constructed by systematically extracting claims from medical texts, falsifying a subset of these claims, and generating paired factual and non-factual texts. For this purpose, We utilize a subset of the **MedQuAD** dataset [Ben Abacha and Demner-Fushman, 2019], focusing on 20-30 sentence segments from medical texts. MedQuAD, sourced from various National Institutes of Health websites, contains real-world medical QA pairs covering 37 question types, addressing topics such as treatments, diagnoses, and side effects. The construction of Med-Critics involves the following steps:

1. **Claim Extraction:** Given a passage from a medical text, a LLM extracts a list of atomic claims breaking the content into its fundamental factual components.
2. **Claim Falsification:** To introduce controlled inaccuracies, one of the extracted claims is deliberately falsified. This involves adding a random error, such as a misleading viewpoint or distortion of critical information, to simulate realistic misinformation scenarios.
3. **Text Paraphrasing:** Using the two sets of claims (factual and falsified), the LLM generates a paraphrase of the original text that maintains the factual integrity of the claims.
4. **Alternative Text Generation:** An alternative version of the text is created by incorporating the falsified claim, resulting in a non-factual narrative for evaluation purposes.

This pipeline supports the creation of a comprehensive dataset aimed at evaluating models’ ability to distinguish between factual and non-factual information within medical texts. To enable the benchmark to effectively identify factual inaccuracies across multiple dimensions, we classify the test data into 6 primary categories:

- **Pathophysiology:** Covers the biological and physiological processes underlying diseases or injuries, providing a framework for understanding disease mechanisms.
- **Medication:** Focuses on pharmacological treatments, including drug interactions, side effects, and therapeutic efficacy.
- **Diagnosis:** Involves the identification and classification of diseases, with an emphasis on diagnostic criteria and methodologies.

- **Symptom:** Describes the clinical manifestations of diseases, detailing symptoms and their relevance to specific medical conditions.
- **Treatment:** Addresses therapeutic interventions, both medical and surgical, aimed at managing or curing diseases.
- **Prevention:** Explores strategies and measures to prevent disease onset or recurrence, including lifestyle modifications and prophylactic treatments.

Table 1: The statistics of Med-Critics benchmark. The average length is measured based on the text, while the positive rate is defined by the proportion of claims that are factually correct.

Statistics	Open-Ended QA						Avg.
	pathophy.	medication	diagnosis	symptom	treatment	prevention	
Num. Texts	330	39	86	334	143	48	163.3
Num. Claims	1435	65	195	4066	426	127	1052.3
Avg. Tokens	243.2	204.6	232.7	514.7	198.3	217.4	268.5
Postive Rate	22.3%	60.0%	44.1%	8.1%	33.5%	37.8%	34.3%

## 4.2 Evaluation setups

We concur with the notion that long-form input text should be evaluated at the granularity of individual facts Min et al. [2023]. To this end, we adopt a fine-grained evaluation approach to assess the factuality of long-form medical texts. This approach involves evaluating the factuality of each individual fact within the input text and reporting the overall performance of the method on the dataset.

**Baselines.** We evaluate the performance of our proposed method, ITA, against several state-of-the-art factual consistency evaluation baselines. FActScore Min et al. [2023] breaks texts into a series of atomic facts and then assigns a binary label to each fact individually. FELM Chen et al. [2023b] segments the text into granular textual spans and evaluates the factual consistency of all spans collectively. RefChecker Hu et al. [2024] extracts knowledge triplets from the text and evaluates each triplet independently. LongFact Wei et al. [2024], integrate a Google Search API to enable more flexible and iterative retrieval for assessing atomic facts.

**Model performance.** We also evaluate the performance of standard baseline LLMs in terms of their reliability accuracy when processing long-form medical texts. Our evaluation encompasses experiments conducted on subsets of Med-Critics open-ended medical QA challenges. These datasets are specifically designed to test the models’ ability to process complex medical information, handle nuanced reasoning, and generate accurate, contextually relevant responses.

**Metrics.** To evaluate our method’s performance in assessing the factuality of long-form medical texts, we employ several key metrics. The accuracy measures the discrepancy between the ground truth and the factual verifications, providing a basic accuracy assessment. We also use the  $F_1@K$  metric Wei et al. [2024], which evaluates both precision and recall. This metric offers a comprehensive view of the model’s factual accuracy.

## 4.3 Main Results

To highlight the faithfulness of our proposed model, ITA, we focus on two critical aspects: accurately identifying all fault claims and correctly evaluating each claim. However, the inherent unpredictability of generative models, combined with the absence of definitive rules for determining the number and nature of claims, makes this task particularly challenging. This ambiguity complicates the assessment of whether a judging system operates fairly. To address this, we utilize the checklist score with LLM-as-a-Judge to systematically evaluate claims. Additionally, we tackle these challenges by introducing the Med-Critics benchmark, which provides a diverse set of predefined faulty claims with varying quantities for rigorous evaluation.

Table 2: Performance comparison of factual verification on the Med-Critics

Method	Correct.	Falsified samples						Avg.
		pathophy.	medication	diagnosis	symptom	treatment	prevention	
FActScore (GPT-3.5)	70.1	65.8	63.1	60.6	69.4	67.3	81.9	68.3
FActScore (GPT-4)	73.2	67.3	65.2	63.5	70.1	69.2	82.3	70.1
FELM	69.7	50.8	60.3	60.6	70.5	73.2	80.4	66.5
RefChecker	78.4	73.6	66.7	65.2	74.3	74.4	85.2	73.9
Long-Fact	90.3	77.4	71.2	69.5	77.1	73.2	86.5	77.8
ITA	<b>93.4</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>87.9</b>	<b>95.8</b>	<b>87.8</b>

**ITA consistency with predefined factual ground-truth.** In Table 2, we report the factual verification accuracy across different categories of facts. The results demonstrate that ITA achieves the highest accuracy across all categories. The key performance gaps can be attributed to two primary factors: ITA’s ability to extract self-contained claims and its capacity to verify these claims through comprehensive analysis. Baseline methods often focus on breaking claims into atomic units for verification. However, the results show that many failures arise from a lack of sufficient contextual information. In the medical domain, facts taken out of context may appear accurate when they are not. ITA’s key strength lies in striking a balance between contextual grounding and atomicity. During claim verification, ITA emphasizes the context of a complete SUBTREE, enabling a balanced granularity and deeper analysis of external scientific knowledge. This approach allows the evaluator to determine whether any sub-claim is false and assess whether the original claim can still be supported. By maintaining this balance, ITA significantly improves the overall performance in factual verification.

**The impacts of claims extraction.** To rigorously evaluate the influence of initial claim extraction on the ITA verification process, we conducted a series of controlled experiments. In these experiments, we fixed the extracted claims while rerunning the ITA subtree verification. This setup allowed us to isolate and analyze the specific impact of claim extraction on the overall performance and accuracy of the system. As shown in Table 3, we tested three

Table 3: Claim extraction ablation

Extract Method	Precision	Recall	F1
ATOMIC	74.3	72.2	73.2
DECONTEXT	82.1	80.7	81.4
MED-DECONTEXT	88.2	87.6	87.8
ITA	<b>89.4</b>	<b>87.9</b>	<b>88.6</b>

baseline claim extraction methods: ATOMIC: Extracts atomic claims based on the method proposed in Min et al. [2023]. DECONTEXT: Extends ATOMIC by applying a decontextualization operation, prompting the model with each fact and its associated context for improved disambiguation Wei et al. [2023]. MED-DECONTEXT: Builds on DECONTEXT but adapts the LLM prompts to emphasize medical information completion for domain-specific optimization. The results indicate that the fine-tuned claim extractor in ITA consistently outperforms these baselines when verifying target medical texts.




Figure 3: Human evaluation


**ITA consistency with human evaluation.** To assess the reliability of ITA in processing long-form medical texts, we conducted a human evaluation study involving three medical experts. The experts evaluated the reliability of claims verification labeled by ITA on the Med-Critics benchmark. A random sample of 100 claims, categorized as either “accept” or “reject” by ITA, was selected for evaluation. Each expert assessed the factuality of the claims and was permitted to conduct internet searches to verify their accuracy. As shown in Figure 3, the results indicate a high level of agreement between the experts’ evaluations and the ITA verification records. While some claims were not fully verifiable due to the vague nature of the medical information or the lack of consensus within the academic community, unsubstantiated claims were minimal. These findings underscore the robustness of ITA in accurately evaluating factuality in complex medical texts.

**LLMs performance on long-form medical texts.** While prior research has attempted to benchmark long-form factuality across LLMs Min et al. [2023], Wei et al. [2024], our works presents a more-



Table 4: Performance comparison of facts verification on the Med-Critics open-ended QA, Accept/Reject/Unsubstantiated are count in fact level, where the precision is average precision of all samples, and Reall@5 and Reall@10 are the recall at top-5 and top-10.

Model	Long-form reply					
	Accept	Reject	Unsubstantiated	Precision	Reall@5	Reall@10
GPT-3.5	1314	223	2	85.73	84.69	56.33
GPT-4o	2264	202	5	90.44	95.71	83.17
Claude-3-opus	1867	254	8	87.59	94.84	76.49
Qwen2.5-72b-Inst	2710	378	5	79.92	91.02	78.54



(a) Verified as support ratio on multiple dimensions

(b) Response  $F_1@K$  metrics on different models

Figure 4: Model performance on long-form medical text

comprehensive evaluation suitcase, and fine-grained medical dimensions of medical texts as show in Table 1. For these reasons, we benchmark across four model families—GPT-3, GPT-4o, Claude and Qwen models. We evaluate each model on the same random subset of 240 prompts from the Med-Critics benchmark, and report the verification results statistics in Table 4. The results show that GPT-4o and Claude tend to say more and with with higher precision.

As shown in Figure 4b, the  $F_1@K$  metrics of the GPT-4o on the Med-Critics benchmark are consistently outperform the other models. The radar chart in Figure 4a provides a visual comparison of the models’ performance across different dimensions of medical text. The results indicate that GPT-4o exhibits the highest precision and recall, followed by Claude, Qwen, and GPT-3.5, especially in symptom, diagnosis dimensions.

## 5 Discussion and Future Work

In this paper, we tackled the challenge of verifying complex, long-form medical texts that often contain implicit claims. We proposed **Iterative Tree Analysis**, a framework that extracts self-contained facts from these texts and leverages retrieved information to perform adaptive, in-depth analyses starting from the initial claims. To evaluate its effectiveness, we curated Med-Critics, a fine-grained dataset designed to assess factual verification by falsifying individual facts in long-form medical texts. Our experiments on Med-Critics show that ITA outperforms existing methods in factual verification tasks. This improvement stems from its ability to extract medical facts from implicit claims and its detailed, mechanism-level reasoning process, structured as a tree that consolidates retrieved knowledge. Looking ahead, we aim to further refine the claim extraction and retrieval components to enhance the accuracy and coverage of verifying complex medical texts. Additionally, by traversing

the reasoning tree, ITA can generate long-form chains of thought, enabling comprehensive responses to medical problems and demonstrating a deep understanding of underlying reasoning processes.

## References

- Ingeol Baek, Hwan Chang, Byeongjeong Kim, Jimin Lee, and Hwanhee Lee. Probing-RAG: Self-Probing to Guide Language Models in Selective Document Retrieval, October 2024.
- Farima Fatahi Bayat, Lechen Zhang, Sheza Munir, and Lu Wang. FactBench: A Dynamic Benchmark for In-the-Wild Language Model Factuality Evaluation, October 2024.
- Asma Ben Abacha and Dina Demner-Fushman. A question-entailment approach to question answering. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 20(1):511, October 2019. ISSN 1471-2105. doi: 10.1186/s12859-019-3119-4.
- Dongping Chen, Ruoxi Chen, Shilin Zhang, Yaochen Wang, Yinuo Liu, Huichi Zhou, Qihui Zhang, Yao Wan, Pan Zhou, and Lichao Sun. MLLM-as-a-Judge: Assessing Multimodal LLM-as-a-Judge with Vision-Language Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6562–6595. PMLR, July 2024.
- Shiqi Chen, Yiran Zhao, Jinghan Zhang, I.-Chun Chern, Siyang Gao, Pengfei Liu, and Junxian He. FELM: Benchmarking Factuality Evaluation of Large Language Models, November 2023a.
- Shiqi Chen, Yiran Zhao, Jinghan Zhang, I.-Chun Chern, Siyang Gao, Pengfei Liu, and Junxian He. FELM: Benchmarking Factuality Evaluation of Large Language Models, November 2023b.
- Qinyuan Cheng, Tianxiang Sun, Wenwei Zhang, Siyin Wang, Xiangyang Liu, Mozhi Zhang, Junliang He, Mianqiu Huang, Zhangyue Yin, Kai Chen, and Xipeng Qiu. Evaluating Hallucinations in Chinese Large Language Models, October 2023.
- Hanxing Ding, Liang Pang, Zihao Wei, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. Retrieve Only When It Needs: Adaptive Retrieval Augmentation for Hallucination Mitigation in Large Language Models, September 2024.
- Benjamin Djulbegovic and Gordon H. Guyatt. Progress in evidence-based medicine: A quarter century on. *The Lancet*, 390(10092):415–423, July 2017. ISSN 0140-6736, 1474-547X. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31592-6.
- Zhihao Fan, Jialong Tang, Wei Chen, Siyuan Wang, Zhongyu Wei, Jun Xi, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. AI Hospital: Benchmarking Large Language Models in a Multi-agent Medical Interaction Simulator, June 2024.
- Xiangkun Hu, Dongyu Ru, Lin Qiu, Qipeng Guo, Tianhang Zhang, Yang Xu, Yun Luo, Pengfei Liu, Yue Zhang, and Zheng Zhang. RefChecker: Reference-based Fine-grained Hallucination Checker and Benchmark for Large Language Models, May 2024.
- Soyeong Jeong, Jinheon Baek, Sukmin Cho, Sung Ju Hwang, and Jong Park. Adaptive-RAG: Learning to Adapt Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models through Question Complexity. In Kevin Duh, Helena Gomez, and Steven Bethard, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7036–7050, Mexico City, Mexico, June 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.389.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Frank Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. Active Retrieval Augmented Generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7969–7992, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.495.
- Zhouyu Jiang, Mengshu Sun, Lei Liang, and Zhiqiang Zhang. Retrieve, Summarize, Plan: Advancing Multi-hop Question Answering with an Iterative Approach, July 2024.

- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. What Disease does this Patient Have? A Large-scale Open Domain Question Answering Dataset from Medical Exams, September 2020.
- Liqiang Jing, Ruosen Li, Yunmo Chen, and Xinya Du. FaithScore: Fine-grained Evaluations of Hallucinations in Large Vision-Language Models. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 5042–5063, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.290.
- Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. HaluEval: A Large-Scale Hallucination Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models, October 2023.
- Wen Luo, Tianshu Shen, Wei Li, Guangyue Peng, Richeng Xuan, Houfeng Wang, and Xi Yang. HalluDial: A Large-Scale Benchmark for Automatic Dialogue-Level Hallucination Evaluation, June 2024.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxu Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. FActScore: Fine-grained Atomic Evaluation of Factual Precision in Long Form Text Generation, October 2023.
- Robert Osazuwa Ness, Katie Matton, Hayden Helm, Sheng Zhang, Junaid Bajwa, Carey E. Priebe, and Eric Horvitz. MedFuzz: Exploring the Robustness of Large Language Models in Medical Question Answering, September 2024.
- Harsha Nori, Naoto Usuyama, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Xavier Fernandes, Sheng Zhang, and Eric Horvitz. From Medprompt to o1: Exploration of Run-Time Strategies for Medical Challenge Problems and Beyond, November 2024.
- Samuel Schmidgall, Rojin Ziaei, Carl Harris, Eduardo Reis, Jeffrey Jopling, and Michael Moor. AgentClinic: A multimodal agent benchmark to evaluate AI in simulated clinical environments, May 2024.
- Alessandro Scirè, Andrei Stefan Bejgu, Simone Tedeschi, Karim Ghonim, Federico Martelli, and Roberto Navigli. Truth or Mirage? Towards End-to-End Factuality Evaluation with LLM-OASIS, November 2024.
- Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Enhancing Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models with Iterative Retrieval-Generation Synergy. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 9248–9274, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.620.
- Weihang Su, Yichen Tang, Qingyao Ai, Zhijing Wu, and Yiqun Liu. DRAGIN: Dynamic Retrieval Augmented Generation based on the Real-time Information Needs of Large Language Models. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12991–13013, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.702.
- Hieu Tran, Zonghai Yao, Junda Wang, Yifan Zhang, Zhichao Yang, and Hong Yu. RARE: Retrieval-Augmented Reasoning Enhancement for Large Language Models, December 2024.
- Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. Interleaving Retrieval with Chain-of-Thought Reasoning for Knowledge-Intensive Multi-Step Questions. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10014–10037, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.557.
- Tu Vu, Mohit Iyyer, Xuezhi Wang, Noah Constant, Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Chris Tar, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Denny Zhou, Quoc Le, and Thang Luong. FreshLLMs: Refreshing Large Language Models with Search Engine Augmentation, November 2023.

- David Wadden, Kyle Lo, Bailey Kuehl, Arman Cohan, Iz Beltagy, Lucy Lu Wang, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. SciFact-Open: Towards open-domain scientific claim verification, October 2022.
- Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, and Tengyu Ma. Larger language models do in-context learning differently, March 2023.
- Jerry Wei, Chengrun Yang, Xinying Song, Yifeng Lu, Nathan Hu, Jie Huang, Dustin Tran, Daiyi Peng, Ruibo Liu, Da Huang, Cosmo Du, and Quoc V. Le. Long-form factuality in large language models, April 2024.
- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Tat-Seng Chua. Search-in-the-Chain: Interactively Enhancing Large Language Models with Search for Knowledge-intensive Tasks. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, WWW '24, pages 1362–1373, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400701719. doi: 10.1145/3589334.3645363.
- Zhenrui Yue, Honglei Zhuang, Aijun Bai, Kai Hui, Rolf Jagerman, Hansi Zeng, Zhen Qin, Dong Wang, Xuanhui Wang, and Michael Bendersky. Inference Scaling for Long-Context Retrieval Augmented Generation, October 2024.
- Zihan Zhang, Meng Fang, and Ling Chen. RetrievalQA: Assessing Adaptive Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Short-form Open-Domain Question Answering. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 6963–6975, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.415.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging LLM-as-a-Judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena, December 2023.