

Reliability Across Parametric and External Knowledge: Understanding Knowledge Handling in LLMs

Youna Kim¹, Minjoon Choi¹, Sungmin Cho¹, Huhng Joon Kim¹,
Sang-goo Lee^{1,2}, Taeuk Kim^{3*}

¹Seoul National University, ²IntelliSys, Korea, ³Hanyang University
{anna9812, sungsung718, heyjoonkim, sglee}@europa.snu.ac.kr
minjoonchoi08@snu.ac.kr, kimtaeuk@hanyang.ac.kr

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) enhance their problem-solving capability by leveraging both parametric and external knowledge. Beyond leveraging external knowledge to improve response accuracy, they require key capabilities for reliable knowledge-handling: resolving conflicts between knowledge sources, avoiding distraction from uninformative external knowledge, and abstaining when sufficient knowledge is unavailable. Prior studies have examined these scenarios in isolation or with limited scope. To systematically evaluate these capabilities, we introduce a comprehensive framework for analyzing knowledge-handling based on two key dimensions: the **presence of parametric knowledge** and the **informativeness of external knowledge**. Through analysis, we identify biases in knowledge utilization and examine how the ability to handle one scenario impacts performance in others. Furthermore, we demonstrate that training on data constructed based on the knowledge-handling scenarios improves LLMs' reliability in integrating and utilizing knowledge.

1 Introduction

Recent large language models (LLMs) acquire extensive parametric knowledge through large-scale pre-training, enabling them to perform a wide range of knowledge-intensive tasks (Grattafiori et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024). However, the parametric knowledge embedded within LLMs has inherent limitations, as it is constrained by the data used during pre-training (Zhang et al., 2025). Consequently, LLMs exhibit limitations in addressing updated facts, specialized domain knowledge, or private information, making it difficult to generate accurate or user-intended responses in these areas (Mallen et al., 2023; Kandpal et al., 2023; Liska et al., 2022).

*Corresponding author.




Figure 1: The taxonomy of parametric and external knowledge is visualized through four quadrants, categorizing questions by the model's knowledge status (known or unknown) and the informativeness of external knowledge. Each quadrant is exemplified with the given external context and the expected response.

Providing *informative* external knowledge can help mitigate these limitations by supplementing LLMs with key information necessary for deriving correct answers² (Chen et al., 2017; Asai et al., 2023). However, conflicts between parametric and external knowledge can still lead to incorrect responses, despite the informativeness of external knowledge (Longpre et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2023). This issue arises because LLMs tend to over-rely on pre-trained knowledge, which hinders adaptation to new information (Shi et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2024b). While both sources can be informative, external knowledge can be more aligned with user intent, temporal recency, and dynamically evol-

²This study assumes external knowledge is always factual to isolate its impact from the factors we consider.

ing information, whereas parametric knowledge remains fixed after pre-training. Given these differences, prioritizing external knowledge is more likely to align with response accuracy (Li et al., 2023).

However, in practice, there is no guarantee that the provided external knowledge will always be informative (Asai et al., 2024). This issue occurs more frequently in scenarios where informativeness depends on the performance of the retrieval mechanism and the quality of the database pool (Izacard et al., 2022; Guu et al., 2020). When external knowledge lacks informativeness, the model relies solely on its parametric knowledge, which can produce accurate responses if it contains the necessary information and remains unaffected by misleading cues (Yoran et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024; Park et al., 2024). Otherwise, when no sufficient knowledge is available, abstaining from answering prevents incorrect responses and enhances user trust (Wen et al., 2024b,a; Zhou et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024a).

To handle these challenges, *reliable* LLMs must dynamically assess whether to rely on parametric or external knowledge based on informativeness and abstain when neither is sufficient. However, existing studies have primarily examined these factors partially or individually, resulting in a lack of a framework for analyzing their combined impact (Su et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023). This fragmented perspective makes it difficult to systematically evaluate how different aspects of knowledge handling interact and influence LLM performance.

To provide a more comprehensive perspective, we introduce a framework that systematically captures how these factors jointly influence LLMs’ knowledge-handling behavior. Our framework is built on two key dimensions: **presence of parametric knowledge**, which reflects the model’s internal understanding of the question, and **informativeness of external knowledge**. As illustrated in Figure 1, this two-dimensional approach yields four knowledge-handling scenarios: **(a) Known-Informative (b) Unknown-Informative (c) Known-Uninformative (d) Unknown-Uninformative**.

To establish a well-structured knowledge handling framework, we precisely estimate parametric knowledge presence by considering model confidence (Kuhn et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2025) and response correctness. We also cover diverse types of informativeness, incorporating informative yet

conflicting knowledge and varied forms of uninformative knowledge.

Within the knowledge-handling framework, we evaluate the reliability of open-source LLMs through both inference-time and training-based approaches. Error analysis across knowledge-handling scenarios reveals that LLMs often exhibit biases toward either parametric or external knowledge, leading to incorrect responses. Furthermore, abstention decisions are predominantly influenced by external knowledge, while parametric knowledge is largely overlooked. To address these challenges, we show that training LLMs with data constructed based on parametric knowledge presence and diverse context types can enhance reliability in knowledge handling.

2 Related Works

2.1 Knowledge-Handling in LLMs

Prior work has explored different strategies to balance parametric and external knowledge when generating responses. For instance, Li et al. (2023) trains LLMs to generate context-based responses when external knowledge is informative and parametric-based responses when it is uninformative. Building on this approach, our framework incorporates parametric knowledge and integrates abstention as a key behavior to enhance reliability.

Similarly, Neeman et al. (2023) introduces an approach that allows LLMs to provide both context-based and parametric-based responses simultaneously. While their approach predicts two separate answers, we expect LLMs to internally select a single response based on the presence of parametric knowledge and the informativeness of external knowledge.

2.2 Knowledge Conflict

There have been efforts to resolve knowledge conflicts to improve the model’s ability to incorporate external information (Zhou et al., 2023; Park and Lee, 2024; Shi et al., 2024). Some studies indicate that LLMs tend to adhere to their parametric knowledge (Longpre et al., 2021; Jin et al., 2024a).

They have primarily viewed knowledge conflict through the lens of external knowledge, focusing on factors such as temporal shifts (Kasai et al., 2023; Dhingra et al., 2022), synthetically updated facts (Longpre et al., 2021), and contextual plausibility (Xie et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024). We extend perspective to the model’s parametric knowl-

edge by considering whether the model possesses the knowledge to answer a question, enabling a broader range of analyses beyond external knowledge alone.

2.3 Uninformative Context

Retrieval-augmented language models (RALMs) are prone to reduced performance due to distraction from uninformative external information (Yoran et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2024). To mitigate the performance drop, researchers have explored methods to encourage LLMs to rely on parametric knowledge when external information is uninformative at the inference-time (Yu et al., 2024b; Park et al., 2024; Baek et al., 2023) or through training (Yoran et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2024; Xia et al., 2024; Luo et al., 2023).

Another line of research handles abstention behavior when presented with uninformative contexts (Wen et al., 2024a). We extend this perspective to cases where LLMs lack correct or complete internal knowledge to address a query (Feng et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a; Wen et al., 2024b). Our work bridges these two abstention criteria by jointly considering both parametric and external knowledge in refusal decisions.

3 Problem Setting

3.1 Presence of Parametric Knowledge

The assessment of whether LLMs possess the knowledge to answer a specific question is based on two key criteria: factual *correctness* (Zhang et al., 2024a,b; Wang et al., 2024) and the model’s *confidence* in its knowledge (Kuhn et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2025; Amayuelas et al., 2024). Since knowledge varies across models, for each model, we classify a question as **known** if both criteria are met and **unknown** otherwise, forming the basis of our problem setting.

To ensure precise knowledge estimation, we assess whether the model consistently generates correct responses rather than producing correct answers by chance. For each question, we sample n ($n = 10$) responses using the question alone. Then, if the proportion of correct responses meets or exceeds the threshold τ ($\tau = 0.7$), the question is determined to be *known*. If none of the generated answers are correct, the question is determined to be *unknown*. Questions that fall between these conditions are classified as *undefined* and excluded

from scenario analysis. The correctness is measured by Exact Match.

3.2 Informativeness of External Knowledge

The informativeness of external knowledge determines whether it should be utilized or disregarded. **Informative knowledge** provides essential details that enable the model to refine its understanding even when it lacks direct knowledge of the question and, in some cases, update its existing knowledge.

We cover diverse forms of **uninformative knowledge** which may be entirely unrelated to the query, loosely related but lacking the necessary details to answer it (Figure 1 (c)), or thematically similar yet misleading, creating a false sense of relevance (Figure 1 (d)) (Wu et al., 2024).

To comprehensively cover informativeness, we incorporate four context types: original context paired with the question, conflicting context, randomly sampled uninformative context, and retrieved-uninformative context.

3.3 Knowledge-Handling Scenarios

The presence of parametric knowledge and the informativeness of external knowledge define four distinct knowledge-handling scenarios. **Known-Informative (K-I)** refers to the scenario where the model possesses parametric knowledge and is provided with informative external knowledge. In contrast, **Unknown-Informative (U-I)** occurs when the model lacks the knowledge to answer correctly and needs to incorporate informative external knowledge to refine its understanding.

In the K-I scenario, we exclude cases where external knowledge aligns with the model’s known parametric knowledge, as no refinement is needed. Instead, we focus on situations where the model’s knowledge conflicts with external knowledge, creating a contextual-parametric conflict (Xu et al., 2024b).

For LLMs to be reliable, they need to appropriately handle cases where external knowledge is uninformative, adapting their response based on the presence of parametric knowledge. In **Known-Uninformative (K-U)** scenario, the model should rely on its known parametric knowledge without being distracted by uninformative context. In **Unknown-Uninformative (U-U)**, the question should be treated as unanswerable (Wen et al., 2025). The key challenge lies in the model’s ability to recognize its unknown state and determine when to abstain.

Answer the following questions. The context may or may not be helpful. If the context is unhelpful and you are not knowledgeable about the question, it is appropriate to say, "<UNANSWERABLE>".

<few-shots>

Context: <context>

Question: <question>

Answer:

Table 1: Template for instructing LLMs to abstain if unanswerable (AbsInst).

4 Knowledge-Handling Approaches

To assess the reliability of existing open-source LLMs, we evaluate their ability to handle different knowledge-handling scenarios and investigate how training can improve their reliability. Specifically, we adopt two approaches: the **inference-time** approach to measure inherent knowledge-handling abilities and the **training-based** approach to examine the impact of incorporating knowledge-handling scenarios into training.

4.1 Inference-Time Approach

To evaluate LLMs’ inherent knowledge-handling ability, we instruct them to facilitate appropriate abstention (**AbsInst**). As specified in Template 1, it directs LLMs to answer the question while assessing the informativeness of the provided context and to abstain if the context is uninformative and they lack the necessary knowledge. It also includes two demonstration samples presented in random order: one demonstrating abstention in U-U and the other providing an answer.

Since the abstention instruction may introduce a bias on abstention that could affect the analysis of scenarios other than U-U, we also perform **Naïve** generation without abstention instruction. In Naïve generation, two randomly sampled demonstrations are used without considering abstention in the U-U scenario.

4.2 Training-Based Approach

We aim to explore whether training can enhance model alignment in knowledge handling by incorporating the presence of parametric knowledge and diverse context types into the learning process. To achieve this, we fine-tune the model to handle all knowledge-handling scenarios with the objective of reliability (M_a).

For training, we use open-domain question-answering datasets and sample a balanced set of known and unknown questions to help the model develop awareness of its parametric knowledge. The known status of each question is determined using the criterion outlined in Section 3.1. Then, each question is paired with the four types of contexts discussed in Section 3.2 to improve its ability to handle various types of external knowledge.

During training, the model is optimized to generate scenario-appropriate responses. In the U-U scenario, since none of the available knowledge is informative for answering the given question, the expected response is abstention ("unanswerable"). For the other three scenarios, the model is trained to generate the correct answer corresponding to each context type.

To account for the potential tradeoff between accuracy and abstention ability introduced by incorporating abstention, we perform the task-specific fine-tuning for open-book question answering without modeling abstention (M_t). The main objective of M_t is accuracy, as previous studies have primarily focused on (Li et al., 2023; Yoran et al., 2023). As a result, M_t always generates an answer, making the expected answer in U-U the ground-truth answer for each context type.

5 Experimental Setting

5.1 Datasets

We use question-answering (QA) datasets from various domains, including NaturalQuestionsShort (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), TriviaQA-web (TriviaQA) (Joshi et al., 2017), HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), BioASQ (Tsatsaronis et al., 2015), TextbookQA (Kembhavi et al., 2017), and RelationExtraction (RE) (Levy et al., 2017). These datasets are included in Machine Reading for Question Answering (MRQA) benchmark (Fisch et al., 2019), and we use each sample’s question, context, and answer triplets. Since the impact of context length is not within the scope of our study, we limit the context length to around 100 words to maintain experimental controllability. More details on design choices are in Appendix A.4.

5.2 Context Construction

Informative External Knowledge In addition to the original context from MRQA benchmark, we construct conflicting contexts that capture




Figure 2: Reliability (Left) and accuracy (Right) of LLMs across varying sizes, averaged over datasets. The results compare two inference-based approaches, Naïve and AbsInst.

contextual-parametric conflicts. To construct conflicting contexts, we instruct an LLM (LLAMA 3 70B INSTRUCT, Grattafiori et al., 2024) to generate an answer that is different from the original answer. The original context containing the answer span is provided, and the model is instructed to consider the part of speech of the original answer residing in the context. Then, we replace the original answer in the original context with the generated conflicting answer.

Uninformative External Knowledge We construct uninformative contexts through random sampling and retrieval. For retrieved-uninformative contexts, we first retrieve the top-100 contexts from the Wikipedia context pool³ using CONTRIEVER-MSMARCO (Izacard et al., 2022). Among them, we choose the highest-scoring context that does not contain the answer span.

5.3 Training Details

For efficient training, we employ QLoRA (Dettmers et al., 2023). We use two open-domain QA datasets, NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), both grounded in world knowledge. We randomly sample 250 known and 250 unknown questions from each dataset. Since each question is paired with four context types, we obtain 4,000 question-context pairs for training.

5.4 Models

We use open-source auto-regressive language models, including LLAMA2 (Touvron et al., 2023), LLAMA3 (Grattafiori et al., 2024), MISTRAL 7B V0.3 (Jiang et al., 2023), and QWEN 2.5 (Yang et al., 2024), covering all available model sizes for each.

³Wikipedia dump from Dec. 2018, with context chunked into 100 words.

5.5 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate whether the model prioritizes generating correct responses and chooses to abstain rather than provide incorrect answers, we use **accuracy (Acc)**, **truthfulness (Truth)**, and **reliability (Rely)** metrics proposed by Xu et al. (2024a). These metrics are computed based on the number of correct (N_c), incorrect (N_i), and abstained (N_a) responses. Abstention is determined by checking whether the response contains predefined abstain words (Amayuelas et al., 2024).

Acc is assessed by checking whether the answer span is present in the response. **Truth** measures the proportion of correct and rejected responses, ensuring that the model minimizes the generation of incorrect outputs. It is defined as: $1 - \frac{N_i}{N} = \frac{N_c + N_a}{N}$. A higher Truth score indicates that the model either answers correctly or abstains, thereby reducing misinformation.

Rely provides a more comprehensive assessment by balancing Acc and Truth. It incorporates the answer rate ($Ans = \frac{N_c + N_i}{N}$) as a weighting factor to prevent excessive refusals. Rely is computed as follows: $Ans \cdot Truth + (1 - Ans) \cdot Acc$. This ensures the model balances answering correctly and abstaining appropriately, avoiding both excessive refusals and incorrect responses.

6 Analysis on Inference-time Approach

6.1 Reliability of LLMs

Figure 2 presents Rely and Acc of models across different sizes. Note that for Naïve, Rely and Acc are identical because the model provides an answer in most cases instead of abstaining.

Trade-off between Acc and Rely is evident across all model sizes and types under AbsInst. For AbsInst, Acc is always lower than Naïve, indicating an abstention bias where LLMs tend to




Figure 3: Distribution of accuracy (Acc), abstention (Abs), and error types (C, P, O) across four knowledge-handling scenarios using Llama-3 70B under inference-based approaches. The values are averaged over datasets.

provide incorrect answers or abstain even when they have the necessary knowledge.

Reliability increases as model scales. Most LLMs with different sizes exhibit similar Acc for AbsInst, except for Llama-2 70B. However, Rely shows a clear upward trend, suggesting that scaling enhances the model’s reliability despite false abstention limiting Acc gains.

Overall, instructing LLMs to abstain appropriately lowers Acc while improving Rely, highlighting the challenge of balancing these two goals. Minimizing this trade-off is essential to avoid incorrect responses or excessive abstention.

6.2 Analysis on Knowledge-Handling Scenarios

A reliability score alone is insufficient for precisely identifying the specific capabilities the model lacks. For an in-depth analysis, we assess model responses based on several key criteria beyond Acc under the four knowledge-handling scenarios.

Incorrect responses are categorized into three types. Contextual errors (C) occur when the model incorrectly responds using non-answer information from external knowledge. Parametric errors (P) arise when the model generates a response relying on its incorrect parametric knowledge. Errors that

do not fit into either of the above categories are classified as Other errors (O). Abstention (Abs) is considered an error in the three scenarios other than U-U. Figure 3 presents the error distribution for Llama 3 70B in each knowledge-handling scenario.

Abstention depends on external cues, even when parametric knowledge is sufficient. In AbsInst approach, abstention occurs far more frequently in uninformative scenarios. The instruction is effective in encouraging the model to recognize when it lacks sufficient external information to produce a reliable answer. However, in the K-U scenario, abstention error occurs at a high rate (43.3%), despite the model possessing the necessary parametric knowledge to provide a valid response.

The model is not able to reliably assess whether it possesses the required knowledge, leading to an over-reliance on external cues. Thus, its abstention behavior appears to depend more on external information, highlighting a fundamental limitation in its self-assessment capability.

Over-reliance on parametric knowledge depends on its known state. The results indicate that in both Naïve and AbsInst approaches, the K-I scenario exhibits a significantly higher proportion of P error compared to other error types. This suggests that when external knowledge conflicts with

Models	Datasets → Method ↓	TriviaQA			NQ			HotpotQA			BioASQ		
		Acc	Truth	Rely	Acc	Truth	Rely	Acc	Truth	Rely	Acc	Truth	Rely
Llama-2 7B	Naïve	0.6194	0.6194	0.6194	0.4177	0.4177	0.4177	0.4342	0.4342	0.4342	0.5402	0.5402	0.5402
	AbsInst	0.5425	0.7015	0.6762	0.3309	0.7112	0.5665	0.3591	0.4828	0.4675	0.3849	0.6456	0.5776
	M_t	0.7243	0.7243	0.7243	0.5742	0.5746	0.5746	0.4619	0.4621	0.4621	0.5811	0.5818	0.5818
	M_a	0.5968	0.8943	0.8058	0.4889	0.7908	0.6996	0.3767	0.8359	0.6251	0.3999	0.8723	0.6492
Llama-3 8B	Naïve	0.6218	0.6218	0.6218	0.4443	0.4444	0.4444	0.4529	0.4529	0.4529	0.5656	0.5656	0.5656
	AbsInst	0.5312	0.7643	0.7100	0.4200	0.7322	0.6347	0.3590	0.5193	0.4936	0.4914	0.6815	0.6454
	M_t	0.7549	0.7550	0.7550	0.6013	0.6013	0.6013	0.4712	0.4712	0.4712	0.6313	0.6313	0.6313
	M_a	0.6792	0.8471	0.8189	0.5141	0.7931	0.7153	0.4367	0.7015	0.6314	0.5563	0.7679	0.7232
Mistral 7B	Naïve	0.6270	0.6270	0.6270	0.4444	0.4444	0.4444	0.4586	0.4586	0.4586	0.5911	0.5911	0.5911
	AbsInst	0.6149	0.7123	0.7028	0.3304	0.6929	0.5615	0.3459	0.6251	0.5471	0.4634	0.7496	0.6677
	M_t	0.7546	0.7547	0.7547	0.6104	0.6105	0.6105	0.4736	0.4736	0.4736	0.6499	0.6499	0.6499
	M_a	0.5940	0.8954	0.8045	0.4899	0.8311	0.7147	0.3611	0.8390	0.6106	0.4372	0.8788	0.6838
Qwen 2.5 7B	Naïve	0.5870	0.5901	0.5900	0.4523	0.4529	0.4529	0.4413	0.4451	0.4450	0.5735	0.5742	0.5742
	AbsInst	0.4672	0.8261	0.6973	0.3788	0.8023	0.6230	0.3759	0.7932	0.6191	0.4487	0.8361	0.6860
	M_t	0.6250	0.6251	0.6251	0.5023	0.5028	0.5028	0.4222	0.4222	0.4222	0.5197	0.5204	0.5204
	M_a	0.5174	0.7747	0.7085	0.4467	0.7144	0.6427	0.3730	0.7095	0.5963	0.4415	0.7898	0.6685

Table 2: Accuracy (Acc), truthfulness (Truth), and reliability (Rely) scores across in-domain (TriviaQA and NQ) and out-of-domain (HotpotQA and BioASQ) datasets. Bold values indicate the highest scores.

the model’s parametric knowledge, the model tends to prioritize its known knowledge, even when the external knowledge is informative. This behavior implies that the model is not fully receptive to conflicting external knowledge if it already possesses knowledge confidently.

Conversely, in the U-I scenario, parametric errors constitute the smallest proportion of errors. It implies that when the required knowledge is not present in the model’s parametric memory, it does not exhibit the same bias toward its own knowledge.

In the uninformative scenarios, the most frequent error type is C error. This suggests that when the given context lacks informativeness, the model struggles to determine an appropriate response, leading to distraction from irrelevant information. The absence of an effective abstention mechanism in Naïve approach further exacerbates this issue, as the model attempts to generate a response despite the lack of meaningful knowledge.

7 Analysis on Training-based Approach

7.1 Overall Performance

Table 2 presents the performance on the in-domain (ID) and out-of-domain (OOD) datasets. For OOD datasets, we include HotpotQA, a multi-hop QA dataset, and BioASQ, which belongs to the biomedical scientific domain.

In most cases, M_a achieves the highest Rely, while its Acc remains comparable to Naïve. This suggests that through alignment, the model effectively minimizes incorrect responses via abstention




Figure 4: Accuracy (Acc) versus reliability (Rely) averaged over in-domain datasets. The dotted line connects the approaches applied to the same model. The diagonal dotted line represents equal accuracy and reliability.

while developing adaptability to various context types. Additionally, M_a demonstrates strong generalization to OOD datasets, exhibiting similar trends to ID datasets, except in the case of Qwen 2.5.

M_t , which is trained without considering abstention, achieves the highest Acc but does not perform as well in terms of Rely. In some cases, AbsInst exhibits a lower Rely than M_t , implying that an approach that generates abstention words does not necessarily guarantee a higher Rely than one that always provides answers.

Figure 4 visualizes the performance gains




Figure 5: Comparison of accuracy (Acc), abstention (Abs), and error types (C, P, O) across four knowledge-handling scenarios using Llama-3 8B. The bars extending upward represent desired performance, while the downward extensions indicate errors.

achieved by M_a in terms of Rely and Acc. M_a , trained with diverse context types based on parametric knowledge awareness, demonstrates a well-balanced improvement in both Acc and Rely, even outperforming larger models of the same type.

7.2 Analysis on Knowledge-Handling Scenarios

Using the same setup as Section 6.2, we analyze three different approaches—AbsInst, M_t , and M_a —across four knowledge-handling scenarios. We mainly assess the impact of abstention learning and knowledge utilization. Figure 5 shows the performance averaged separately over ID and OOD datasets.

M_a demonstrates the most balanced performance across all knowledge-handling scenarios. M_a outperforms AbsInst in both Acc and Abs across all scenarios within the ID datasets. It also shows a significant improvement in informative scenarios, alleviating Abs error. In terms of Acc, M_t achieves the highest performance. However, since M_t does not learn to handle U-U scenario, it fails to abstain when necessary. In the U-U scenario, M_t instead generates incorrect responses, either by relying on incorrect parametric knowledge or by producing incorrect answers in most error cases.

M_a matches M_t in accuracy for informative

scenarios, despite being trained for abstention.

It remains unbiased toward parametric knowledge or abstention, effectively leveraging external knowledge to answer questions. Notably, when external knowledge is informative, M_a rarely makes abstention errors, outperforming AbsInst.

While P errors dominate in the K-I scenario for inference-based approach, training has significantly reduced them. This does not imply that the models are trained to disregard parametric knowledge entirely, as evidenced by their accuracy in the K-U scenario. This suggests that they learn to moderate their reliance on parametric knowledge, leveraging it when necessary while incorporating external knowledge in informative scenarios.

In U-U, M_a achieves superior performance by effectively handling uninformative context without being misled by it. It learns to determine whether the information is known or unknown, aligning more effectively with comprehensive knowledge handling. However, M_a experiences an accuracy drop in K-U, especially in OOD datasets. This occurs because its ability to robustly generate parametric responses in K-U does not generalize well. The decline in Acc is directly offset by a proportional increase in Abs errors. This suggests that when the knowledge domain shifts, the model struggles to assess the presence of its parametric knowledge effectively.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce the knowledge handling framework with four scenarios, K-I, U-I, K-U, and U-U, based on the presence of parametric knowledge and the informativeness of external knowledge. The experimental findings within this framework reveal that LLMs face challenges in resolving knowledge conflicts, particularly when they possess question-relevant parametric knowledge, and exhibit false abstention that degrades accuracy. Training on a dataset designed for these scenarios improves reliability and reduces biases in knowledge utilization. Still, domain generalization remains a challenge in terms of accuracy, as models struggle to assess the presence of their knowledge in out-of-domain data. Our findings provide a foundation for comprehensive knowledge handling, offering insights into building more reliable and knowledge-aware LLMs.

Limitations

Factuality of External knowledge This study assumes external knowledge is always factually accurate, considering scenarios involving changed or newly emerging facts (Longpre et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2023). The research field of factuality verification on external knowledge using LLMs runs parallel to our work on external knowledge handling (Yu et al., 2024a; Fatahi Bayat et al., 2023). Investigating this aspect, alongside the factors addressed in this paper, could provide valuable insights into enhancing the model’s understanding and represent a promising direction for future work.

Training Strategies for Alignment Our study focuses on aligning knowledge handling through supervised fine-tuning, leveraging the two key aspects of knowledge defined in our framework. While this approach effectively improves the model’s reliability, future work could apply diverse alignment approaches (Rafailov et al., 2023; Tian et al., 2024) to further enhance the overall knowledge-handling ability. Expanding the range of training strategies may provide deeper insights into optimizing knowledge utilization across different scenarios and improve the robustness of model behavior in diverse settings.

References

- Alfonso Amayuelas, Kyle Wong, Liangming Pan, Wenhu Chen, and William Yang Wang. 2024. **Knowledge of knowledge: Exploring known-unknowns uncertainty with large language models**. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 6416–6432, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Akari Asai, Sewon Min, Zexuan Zhong, and Danqi Chen. 2023. **Retrieval-based language models and applications**. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 6: Tutorial Abstracts)*, pages 41–46, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. **Self-RAG: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection**. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jinheon Baek, Soyeong Jeong, Minki Kang, Jong Park, and Sung Hwang. 2023. **Knowledge-augmented language model verification**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1720–1736, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. **Reading Wikipedia to answer open-domain questions**. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1870–1879, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. **QLoRA: Efficient finetuning of quantized LLMs**. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Jeremy R. Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W. Cohen. 2022. **Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases**. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:257–273.
- Farima Fatahi Bayat, Kun Qian, Benjamin Han, Yisi Sang, Anton Belyy, Samira Khorshidi, Fei Wu, Ihab Ilyas, and Yunyao Li. 2023. **FLEEK: Factual error detection and correction with evidence retrieved from external knowledge**. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 124–130, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shangbin Feng, Weijia Shi, Yike Wang, Wenxuan Ding, Vidhisha Balachandran, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2024. **Don’t hallucinate, abstain: Identifying LLM knowledge gaps via multi-LLM collaboration**. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14664–14690, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adam Fisch, Alon Talmor, Robin Jia, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Danqi Chen. 2019. **Mrqa 2019 shared task: Evaluating generalization in reading comprehension**. *Preprint*, arXiv:1910.09753.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, and 542 others. 2024. **The llama 3 herd of models**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. **Retrieval augmented language model pre-training**. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR.
- Yuheng Huang, Jiayang Song, Zhijie Wang, Shengming Zhao, Huaming Chen, Felix Juefei-Xu, and Lei Ma. 2025. **Look before you leap: An exploratory study of uncertainty analysis for large language models**. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 51(2):413–429.

- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. [Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2112.09118.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L  lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth  e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Zhuoran Jin, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, Xiaojian Jiang, Jiexin Xu, Li Qiuxia, and Jun Zhao. 2024a. [Tug-of-war between knowledge: Exploring and resolving knowledge conflicts in retrieval-augmented language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 16867–16878, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Zhuoran Jin, Pengfei Cao, Hongbang Yuan, Yubo Chen, Jiexin Xu, Huaijun Li, Xiaojian Jiang, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2024b. [Cutting off the head ends the conflict: A mechanism for interpreting and mitigating knowledge conflicts in language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 1193–1215, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S. Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1705.03551.
- Nikhil Kandpal, Haikang Deng, Adam Roberts, Eric Wallace, and Colin Raffel. 2023. [Large language models struggle to learn long-tail knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 15696–15707. PMLR.
- Jungo Kasai, Keisuke Sakaguchi, yoichi takahashi, Ronan Le Bras, Akari Asai, Xinyan Yu, Dragomir Radev, Noah A Smith, Yejin Choi, and Kentaro Inui. 2023. [Realtime qa: What's the answer right now?](#) In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 49025–49043. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Aniruddha Kembhavi, Minjoon Seo, Dustin Schwenk, Jonghyun Choi, Ali Farhadi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2017. Are you smarter than a sixth grader? textbook question answering for multimodal machine comprehension. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- Youna Kim, Hyuhng Joon Kim, Cheonbok Park, Choonghyun Park, Hyunsoo Cho, Junyeob Kim, Kang Min Yoo, Sang-goo Lee, and Taeuk Kim. 2024. [Adaptive contrastive decoding in retrieval-augmented generation for handling noisy contexts](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 2421–2431, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. 2023. [Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Omer Levy, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [Zero-shot relation extraction via reading comprehension](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1706.04115.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daliang Li, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Xin Wang, Michal Lukasik, Andreas Veit, Felix Yu, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2023. [Large language models with controllable working memory](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1774–1793, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Adam Liska, Tomas Kocisky, Elena Gribovskaya, Tayfun Terzi, Eren Sezener, Devang Agrawal, Cyprien De Masson D’Autume, Tim Scholtes, Manzil Zaheer, Susannah Young, Ellen Gilsonan-Mcmahon, Sophia Austin, Phil Blunsom, and Angeliki Lazaridou. 2022. [StreamingQA: A benchmark for adaptation to new knowledge over time in question answering models](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 13604–13622. PMLR.
- Shayne Longpre, Kartik Perisetla, Anthony Chen, Nikhil Ramesh, Chris DuBois, and Sameer Singh. 2021. [Entity-based knowledge conflicts in question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7052–7063, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter. 2017. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hongyin Luo, Tianhua Zhang, Yung-Sung Chuang, Yuan Gong, Yoon Kim, Xixin Wu, Helen Meng, and James Glass. 2023. Search augmented instruction learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3717–3729, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9802–9822, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ella Neeman, Roei Aharoni, Or Honovich, Leshem Choshen, Idan Szpektor, and Omri Abend. 2023. DisentQA: Disentangling parametric and contextual knowledge with counterfactual question answering. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10056–10070, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seong-II Park, Seung-Woo Choi, Na-Hyun Kim, and Jay-Yoon Lee. 2024. Enhancing robustness of retrieval-augmented language models with in-context learning. *KNOWLEDGENLP*.
- Seong-II Park and Jay-Yoon Lee. 2024. Toward robust realms: Revealing the impact of imperfect retrieval on retrieval-augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2410.15107*.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *Preprint*, arXiv:1606.05250.
- Xiaoyu Shen, Rexhina Blloshmi, Dawei Zhu, Jiahuan Pei, and Wei Zhang. 2024. Assessing “implicit” retrieval robustness of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8988–9003, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weijia Shi, Xiaochuang Han, Mike Lewis, Yulia Tsvetkov, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2024. Trusting your evidence: Hallucinate less with context-aware decoding. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 783–791, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zhaochen Su, Jun Zhang, Xiaoye Qu, Tong Zhu, Yanshu Li, Jiashuo Sun, Juntao Li, Min Zhang, and Yu Cheng. 2024. `ConflictBank`: A benchmark for evaluating the influence of knowledge conflicts in LLMs. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Hexiang Tan, Fei Sun, Wanli Yang, Yuanzhuo Wang, Qi Cao, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. Blinded by generated contexts: How language models merge generated and retrieved contexts when knowledge conflicts? In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6207–6227, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Katherine Tian, Eric Mitchell, Huaxiu Yao, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Fine-tuning language models for factuality. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, and 49 others. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- George Tsatsaronis, Georgios Balikas, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Ioannis Partalas, Matthias Zschunke, Michael R Alvers, Dirk Weissenborn, Anastasia Krithara, Sergios Petridis, Dimitris Polychronopoulos, and 1 others. 2015. An overview of the bioasq large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC bioinformatics*, 16:1–28.
- Yuxia Wang, Minghan Wang, Muhammad Arslan Manzoor, Fei Liu, Georgi Nenkov Georgiev, Rocktim Jyoti Das, and Preslav Nakov. 2024. Factuality of large language models: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 19519–19529, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bingbing Wen, Bill Howe, and Lucy Lu Wang. 2024a. Characterizing LLM abstention behavior in science QA with context perturbations. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 3437–3450, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bingbing Wen, Jihan Yao, Shangbin Feng, Chenjun Xu, Yulia Tsvetkov, Bill Howe, and Lucy Lu Wang. 2024b. Know your limits: A survey of abstention in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2407.18418*.

- Bingbing Wen, Jihan Yao, Shangbin Feng, Chenjun Xu, Yulia Tsvetkov, Bill Howe, and Lucy Lu Wang. 2025. [Know your limits: A survey of abstention in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.18418.
- Siye Wu, Jian Xie, Jiangjie Chen, Tinghui Zhu, Kai Zhang, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. [How easily do irrelevant inputs skew the responses of large language models?](#) In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Yuan Xia, Jingbo Zhou, Zhenhui Shi, Jun Chen, and Haifeng Huang. 2024. Improving retrieval augmented language model with self-reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2407.19813*.
- Jian Xie, Kai Zhang, Jiangjie Chen, Renze Lou, and Yu Su. 2023. Adaptive chameleon or stubborn sloth: Revealing the behavior of large language models in knowledge conflicts. *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hongshen Xu, Zichen Zhu, Situo Zhang, Da Ma, Shuai Fan, Lu Chen, and Kai Yu. 2024a. [Rejection improves reliability: Training LLMs to refuse unknown questions using RL from knowledge feedback](#). In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.
- Rongwu Xu, Zehan Qi, Zhijiang Guo, Cunxiang Wang, Hongru Wang, Yue Zhang, and Wei Xu. 2024b. [Knowledge conflicts for LLMs: A survey](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8541–8565, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, and 22 others. 2024. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. [Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1809.09600.
- Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. [Making retrieval-augmented language models robust to irrelevant context](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.01558.
- Tian Yu, Shaolei Zhang, and Yang Feng. 2024a. [Truth-aware context selection: Mitigating hallucinations of large language models being misled by untruthful contexts](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 10862–10884, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenhao Yu, Hongming Zhang, Xiaoman Pan, Peixin Cao, Kaixin Ma, Jian Li, Hongwei Wang, and Dong Yu. 2024b. [Chain-of-note: Enhancing robustness in retrieval-augmented language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14672–14685, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hanning Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Yong Lin, Yi Fung, Qing Lian, Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Heng Ji, and Tong Zhang. 2024a. [R-tuning: Instructing large language models to say ‘I don’t know’](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7113–7139, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jingyang Zhang, Jingwei Sun, Eric Yeats, Yang Ouyang, Martin Kuo, Jianyi Zhang, Hao Frank Yang, and Hai Li. 2025. [Min-k%++: Improved baseline for pre-training data detection from large language models](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Xiaoying Zhang, Baolin Peng, Ye Tian, Jingyan Zhou, Lifeng Jin, Linfeng Song, Haitao Mi, and Helen Meng. 2024b. [Self-alignment for factuality: Mitigating hallucinations in LLMs via self-evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1946–1965, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wenxuan Zhou, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Muhao Chen. 2023. [Context-faithful prompting for large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 14544–14556, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Appendix

A Additional Implementaion Details

A.1 Datasets

Total number of samples for each dataset is in Table 3. Each sample includes a question, original answer, conflicting answer, and four types of context: original, conflicting, random-irrelevant, and retrieved-irrelevant.

NaturalQuestionsShort (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) Questions consist of real queries issued to the Google search engine. From a Wikipedia page from the top 5 search results, annotators select a long answer containing enough information to completely infer the answer to the question, and a short answer that comprises the actual answer. The long answer becomes the context matched with the question, while the short answer being used as the answer.

TriviaQA-web (Joshi et al., 2017) Question-answer pairs are authored by trivia enthusiasts and independently gathered evidence documents that provide high quality supervision for answering the questions. The web version of TriviaQA is used, where the contexts are retrieved from the results of a Bing search query.

HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018) Questions are diverse and not constrained to any pre-existing knowledge base. Multi-hop reasoning is required to solve the questions. Paragraphs that provide supporting facts required for reasoning, are given along with the question. In the original setting, additional distractor paragraphs are augmented in order to increase the difficulty of inference. However, these distractor paragraphs are not used in this setting.

SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) Paragraphs from Wikipedia are presented to crowdworkers, and they are asked to write questions that entail extractive answers. The answer to each question is a segment of text from the corresponding reading passage. To remove the uncertainty that excessively long paragraphs bring, QA pairs that do not align with the first 800 tokens are discarded in this setting.

BioASQ (Tsatsaronis et al., 2015) BioASQ is a challenge that assesses the ability of systems to semantically index large numbers of biomedical scientific articles and return concise answers to given natural language questions. Each question is linked to multiple related science articles. The full abstract of each linked article is used as an individual context. Abstracts that do not exactly contain the answer, are discarded.

TextbookQA (Kembhavi et al., 2017) TextbookQA aims at answering multimodal questions when given a context in formats of text, diagrams and images. This dataset is collected from lessons from middle school Life Science, Earth Science, and Physical Science textbooks. Questions that are accompanied with a diagram and "True or False" questions are not used in this setting.

RelationExtraction (Levy et al., 2017) Given labeled slot-filling examples, relations between entities are transformed into QA pairs using templates. Multiple templates for each type of relation are utilized. The zero-shot benchmark split of this dataset, which showed that generalization to unseen relations is possible at lower accuracy levels, is used.

Dataset	Train	Test
NQ	83,787	3,994
TriviaQA	61,177	7,712
HotpotQA	-	4,811
SquAD	-	7,966
Bioasq	-	1,169
TextbookQA	-	1,067
RelationExtraction	-	2,024
Total	144,964	28,743

Table 3: Number of samples for each dataset.

Answer the following questions:

<few-shots>

Question: <question>

Answer:

Table 4: Template used in closed-book generation.

A.2 Templates

Template 4 is used to perform closed-book generation for estimating the presence of parametric knowledge. For Naïve generation, Template 5 is used. Template 6 is employed to generate conflicting answers.

A.3 Abstention Words

The predefined abstain words used in evaluations are: ['unanswerable', 'unknown', 'no known', 'not known', 'do not know', 'uncertain', 'unclear', 'no scientific evidence', 'no definitive answer', 'no right answer', 'no concrete answer', 'no public information', 'debate', 'impossible to know', 'impossible to answer', 'difficult to predict', 'not sure', 'irrelevant', 'not relevant']

A.4 Context Construction

To ensure context informativeness and maintain experimental controllability, we have processed the original contexts from the MRQA benchmark by limiting their length and ensuring that the ground-truth answer span is always included. For each occurrence span of the ground-truth answer in the raw context, we take a 100-word portion surrounding that span and consider it a candidate context. We then compute the NLI (BART-LARGE, Lewis

Answer the following questions:

<few-shots>

Context: <context>

Question: <question>

Answer:

Table 5: Template used in the Naïve open-book generation.

Answer an entity of the same type as the given keyword. Please note that the keyword is from the given context, and consider the part of speech of the keyword inside the context. You should not give a synonym or alias of the given keyword. The entity and given keyword must have different meanings. Only answer the entity itself without any extra phrases.

<few-shots>

Keyword: <original-answer>

Context: <context>

Answer:

Table 6: Template used when instructing the model to generate a conflicting answer, given the original answer and context.

et al., 2020) score between the question-answer pair and each candidate context, and select the context with the highest NLI score as the original context.

To obtain retrieved-uninformative contexts, CONTRIEVER-MSMARCO (Izacard et al., 2022) is utilized as a retriever model.

A.5 Hyperparameters for Training

We train the model for three epochs using the AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017) optimizer with a learning rate of 0.0001 and a batch size of 16. For efficient fine-tuning, we employ QLoRA (Dettmers et al., 2023) with rank $r=4$ and $\alpha=16$. Training is conducted on a single NVIDIA RTX A6000.

B Additional Results

Table 7 presents the exact reliability scores for each dataset, which are averaged in Figure 2. Table

8 reports the reliability scores of chat or instruct LLMs. They exhibit similar or lower reliability scores compared to the base models.

The exact values visualized in Figure 5 are provided in Table 9 and Table 10.

Table 11 presents the overall performance on out-of-domain datasets, which are not included in Table 2.

Base		TriviaQA	NQ	HotpotQA	BioASQ	Squad	TextbookQA	RE
Llama-2	7B	0.6194 / 0.6762	0.4177 / 0.5665	0.4342 / 0.4675	0.5402 / 0.5776	0.4859 / 0.5134	0.5604 / 0.6318	0.5313 / 0.5944
	13B	0.6556 / 0.7067	0.4475 / 0.5357	0.4503 / 0.4528	0.5674 / 0.5487	0.5064 / 0.6083	0.5691 / 0.6164	0.5415 / 0.6471
	70B	0.6718 / 0.7181	0.5006 / 0.6008	0.4790 / 0.5139	0.6205 / 0.6515	0.5384 / 0.6392	0.5937 / 0.6162	0.5622 / 0.6920
Llama-3	8B	0.6218 / 0.7100	0.4444 / 0.6347	0.4529 / 0.4936	0.5656 / 0.6454	0.4944 / 0.6063	0.5627 / 0.6173	0.5447 / 0.6613
	70B	0.7120 / 0.7478	0.4849 / 0.5824	0.5099 / 0.5916	0.6625 / 0.6887	0.5588 / 0.6780	0.6148 / 0.6770	0.6006 / 0.7179
Mistral	7B	0.6270 / 0.7028	0.4444 / 0.5615	0.4586 / 0.5471	0.5911 / 0.6677	0.5111 / 0.6145	0.5658 / 0.6244	0.5386 / 0.6786
Qwen-2.5	0.5B	0.4355 / 0.4680	0.3645 / 0.4557	0.3614 / 0.3496	0.4042 / 0.4778	0.4034 / 0.4260	0.3923 / 0.4390	0.4723 / 0.5390
	1.5B	0.5014 / 0.6333	0.4306 / 0.5683	0.4057 / 0.5370	0.4738 / 0.6465	0.4622 / 0.5830	0.5194 / 0.6174	0.5037 / 0.6714
	3B	0.5145 / 0.6608	0.4393 / 0.6106	0.4194 / 0.5903	0.4996 / 0.6577	0.4688 / 0.6460	0.5116 / 0.6241	0.5086 / 0.6825
	7B	0.5900 / 0.6973	0.4529 / 0.6230	0.4450 / 0.6191	0.5742 / 0.6860	0.4929 / 0.6798	0.5578 / 0.6659	0.5147 / 0.7010
	14B	0.6523 / 0.7240	0.4746 / 0.6470	0.4616 / 0.6293	0.6385 / 0.7220	0.5063 / 0.6888	0.5663 / 0.6681	0.5285 / 0.7035
	32B	0.6364 / 0.7190	0.4862 / 0.6484	0.4571 / 0.6267	0.6435 / 0.7102	0.5058 / 0.6891	0.5542 / 0.6876	0.5334 / 0.7064
	72B	0.6826 / 0.6984	0.4865 / 0.5873	0.4753 / 0.6188	0.6385 / 0.6467	0.5364 / 0.6940	0.5476 / 0.6567	0.5559 / 0.6836

Table 7: Reliability scores of base LLMs across datasets. Each entry presents two inference-time approaches, separated by '/' (**Naïve / AbsInst**).

Instruct		TriviaQA	NQ	HotpotQA	BioASQ	Squad	TextbookQA	RE
Llama-2	7B	0.6100 / 0.6741	0.4133 / 0.5425	0.4044 / 0.5568	0.5018 / 0.5978	0.4643 / 0.6096	0.4986 / 0.5701	0.5048 / 0.6452
	13B	0.6171 / 0.6555	0.4092 / 0.5205	0.4007 / 0.5044	0.4674 / 0.5251	0.4555 / 0.6039	0.5040 / 0.5759	0.4593 / 0.4464
	70B	0.6637 / 0.7121	0.4555 / 0.6010	0.4248 / 0.5851	0.5203 / 0.6314	0.4710 / 0.6351	0.5312 / 0.6159	0.5099 / 0.6898
Llama-3	8B	0.5489 / 0.6869	0.4004 / 0.6086	0.3921 / 0.5733	0.4921 / 0.6609	0.4629 / 0.6744	0.4429 / 0.6354	0.4718 / 0.6779
	70B	0.6260 / 0.7287	0.4185 / 0.6319	0.4100 / 0.5961	0.4878 / 0.6563	0.4628 / 0.6801	0.4268 / 0.6283	0.4840 / 0.7091
Mistral	7B	0.5940 / 0.7172	0.4182 / 0.6280	0.4216 / 0.5955	0.5316 / 0.6903	0.4722 / 0.6695	0.5012 / 0.6406	0.5135 / 0.7049
Qwen-2.5	0.5B	0.3797 / 0.5288	0.3571 / 0.4961	0.3379 / 0.4582	0.3612 / 0.5078	0.3973 / 0.5425	0.3492 / 0.4875	0.4686 / 0.6122
	1.5B	0.5170 / 0.6436	0.4146 / 0.5788	0.3933 / 0.5698	0.4645 / 0.6276	0.4595 / 0.6429	0.5078 / 0.6180	0.4783 / 0.6632
	3B	0.4732 / 0.6081	0.3830 / 0.5623	0.3257 / 0.4486	0.4674 / 0.5868	0.4553 / 0.6667	0.4590 / 0.6129	0.4715 / 0.6471
	7B	0.5427 / 0.6685	0.4217 / 0.6038	0.3684 / 0.5345	0.5291 / 0.6894	0.4682 / 0.6800	0.5196 / 0.6703	0.4856 / 0.7088
	14B	0.5306 / 0.5935	0.3987 / 0.4295	0.3194 / 0.4327	0.4867 / 0.5654	0.4571 / 0.5229	0.4839 / 0.5480	0.4762 / 0.6098
	32B	0.5754 / 0.7097	0.4184 / 0.5974	0.3453 / 0.5470	0.5362 / 0.7029	0.4646 / 0.6756	0.5019 / 0.6648	0.4899 / 0.7040
	72B	0.6189 / 0.7096	0.4407 / 0.6172	0.3972 / 0.5854	0.5423 / 0.6870	0.4798 / 0.6934	0.5234 / 0.6642	0.5037 / 0.7059

Table 8: Reliability scores of chat or instruct LLMs across datasets. Each entry presents two inference-time approaches, separated by '/' (**Naïve / AbsInst**).

Methods	Acc	Abs	C	P	O
Known-Info					
AbsInst	45.38	11.65	2.93	38.95	1.09
M_t	82.52	0.00	0.62	13.30	3.57
M_a	84.87	0.54	0.86	11.22	2.52
Unknown-Info					
AbsInst	55.50	20.97	7.90	4.76	10.87
M_t	77.13	0.00	3.96	7.05	11.86
M_a	77.25	2.89	5.99	5.16	8.71
Known-Uninfo					
AbsInst	67.28	22.17	8.00	0.23	2.34
M_t	94.53	0.00	0.69	0.03	4.76
M_a	76.70	18.16	0.98	0.03	4.13
Unknown-Uninfo					
AbsInst	7.39	49.70	14.84	13.04	15.02
M_t	15.01	0.01	2.84	34.96	47.18
M_a	7.01	59.73	2.71	15.99	14.55

Table 9: The percentage of instances of accuracy (Acc), abstention (Abs), and error types (C, P, O) across four knowledge-handling scenarios using Llama 3 8B, averaged over in-domain datasets.

Methods	Acc	Abs	C	P	O
Known-Info					
AbsInst	53.31	6.03	4.44	33.14	3.07
M_t	80.17	0.00	1.35	15.08	3.39
M_a	85.18	1.01	1.78	10.33	1.71
Unknown-Info					
AbsInst	60.61	10.50	13.51	2.82	12.55
M_t	76.27	0.00	6.50	4.32	12.92
M_a	76.82	3.12	6.59	3.78	9.67
Known-Uninfo					
AbsInst	75.39	12.39	6.95	0.99	4.27
M_t	86.63	0.00	0.93	0.00	12.44
M_a	67.22	21.25	1.45	0.11	9.97
Unknown-Uninfo					
AbsInst	4.85	36.62	19.26	15.27	24.00
M_t	11.08	0.01	4.89	23.24	60.78
M_a	5.27	56.04	4.02	12.07	22.59

Table 10: The percentage of instances of accuracy (Acc), abstention (Abs), and error types (C, P, O) across four knowledge-handling scenarios using Llama 3 8B, averaged over out-of-domain datasets.

Models	Datasets → Method ↓	RE			SQuAD			TextbookQA		
		Acc	Truth	Rely	Acc	Truth	Rely	Acc	Truth	Rely
Llama-2 7B	Naive	0.5313	0.5313	0.5313	0.4856	0.4859	0.4859	0.5604	0.5604	0.5604
	AbsInst	0.5067	0.6039	0.5944	0.3748	0.5410	0.5134	0.4799	0.6667	0.6318
	M_t	0.5995	0.5995	0.5995	0.5151	0.5158	0.5158	0.6622	0.6622	0.6622
	M_a	0.4814	0.9100	0.7263	0.4033	0.8716	0.6523	0.5395	0.8343	0.7474
Llama-3 8B	Naive	0.5447	0.5447	0.5447	0.4943	0.4944	0.4944	0.5627	0.5627	0.5627
	AbsInst	0.4994	0.7026	0.6613	0.4209	0.6667	0.6063	0.4934	0.6383	0.6173
	M_t	0.6116	0.6116	0.6116	0.5412	0.5416	0.5416	0.6982	0.6982	0.6982
	M_a	0.5228	0.8319	0.7364	0.4979	0.7633	0.6929	0.6255	0.7775	0.7544
Mistral 7B	Naive	0.5386	0.5386	0.5386	0.5109	0.5111	0.5111	0.5658	0.5658	0.5658
	AbsInst	0.4695	0.7672	0.6786	0.3806	0.7537	0.6145	0.4761	0.6572	0.6244
	M_t	0.5944	0.5944	0.5944	0.5465	0.5471	0.5471	0.6937	0.6937	0.6937
	M_a	0.4426	0.8528	0.6846	0.4058	0.8688	0.6544	0.4986	0.8598	0.7293
Qwen 2.5 7B	Naive	0.5132	0.5147	0.5147	0.4905	0.4929	0.4929	0.5573	0.5578	0.5578
	AbsInst	0.4639	0.8504	0.7010	0.4493	0.8095	0.6798	0.4422	0.7801	0.6659
	M_t	0.5286	0.5286	0.5286	0.5007	0.5009	0.5009	0.5878	0.5878	0.5878
	M_a	0.4653	0.8066	0.6901	0.4525	0.7472	0.6604	0.5395	0.6290	0.6210

Table 11: Accuracy (Acc), truthfulness (Truth), and reliability (Rely) scores across three out-of-domain datasets. Bold values indicate the highest scores.