

---

# PhantomWiki: On-Demand Datasets for Reasoning and Retrieval Evaluation

---

Albert Gong<sup>\*1</sup> Kamilė Stankevičiūtė<sup>\*12</sup> Chao Wan<sup>\*1</sup> Anmol Kabra<sup>1</sup>  
 Raphael Thesmar<sup>1</sup> Johann Lee<sup>1</sup> Julius Klenke<sup>1</sup> Carla P. Gomes<sup>1</sup> Kilian Q. Weinberger<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

High-quality benchmarks are essential for evaluating reasoning and retrieval capabilities of large language models (LLMs). However, curating datasets for this purpose is not a permanent solution as they are prone to data leakage and inflated performance results. To address these challenges, we propose PhantomWiki: a pipeline to generate unique, factually consistent document corpora with diverse question-answer pairs. Unlike prior work, PhantomWiki is neither a fixed dataset, nor is it based on any existing data. Instead, a new PhantomWiki instance is generated on demand for each evaluation. We vary the question difficulty and corpus size to disentangle reasoning and retrieval capabilities respectively, and find that PhantomWiki datasets are surprisingly challenging for frontier LLMs. Thus, we contribute a scalable and data leakage-resistant framework for disentangled evaluation of reasoning, retrieval, and tool-use abilities.

## 1. Introduction

Designing agents that can perform complex reasoning while interfacing with a large-scale, dynamic corpus—like Wikipedia—is a long-standing goal in the field of natural language processing (Feldman & El-Yaniv, 2019; Min et al., 2019). Such a goal may be within reach given the impressive capabilities of recent language models, which are all trained on internet-scale data. For example, the ability of LLMs to solve math problems on GSM8K (Cobbe et al., 2021) and mathematical olympiads (AlphaProof & AlphaGeometry, 2024) could bode well for agents to answer highly quantitative questions. On benchmarks like DROP (Dua et al., 2019) and MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2020), these LLMs

demonstrate advanced reading comprehension and general reasoning capabilities, both necessary for intelligent agents. When augmented with retrievers (Muennighoff et al., 2022) and tools (Patil et al., 2023), LLMs seem to already possess a strong ability for accessing external datastores and knowledge bases.

However, it is unclear to what extent these models rely on their internal knowledge, which can easily become outdated, versus their reasoning and retrieval abilities. Consider the example, “*What is the date of birth of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart?*”. Since this fact is contained within LLMs’ pre-training data, asking LLMs this question cannot provide reliable insight on whether the answer was deduced, retrieved or recalled. At the same time, existing approaches that perturb Wikipedia facts (Cohen et al., 2024; Meng et al., 2022; Elazar et al., 2021) to construct new question-answer pairs face challenges of ensuring factual consistency across articles. For example, changing Mozart’s date of birth to 2025 also requires modifying Beethoven’s article to erase the fact that Beethoven might have met Mozart in 1787!

One could hope to isolate reasoning from factual knowledge using mathematical or logical reasoning benchmarks. Unfortunately, such benchmarks are not entirely reliable as indicators of reasoning performance either. On GSM8K, a dataset of grade school math problems, Mirzadeh et al. (2024) report that frontier models perform significantly worse with minor or even meaningless alterations to the test data—indicating these models are vulnerable to overfitting at best and exact memorization at worst. To ensure fair comparison, LLMs need to be evaluated in a way that does not depend on any particular dataset instance.

Following this philosophy, we develop *PhantomWiki*. At the click of a button, PhantomWiki generates a fictional universe of characters along with a set of facts about them. We reflect these facts in a large-scale corpus, mimicking the style of fan-wiki websites. Then we generate question-answer pairs about the universe, encapsulating the types of multi-hop questions commonly considered in the question-answering (QA) literature.

We design PhantomWiki to decouple the testing of LLM reasoning and retrieval capabilities in a range of settings. In the first setting, the universe is small enough so that all relevant

---

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA <sup>2</sup>Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. Correspondence to: Albert Gong <agong@cs.cornell.edu>, Kamilė Stankevičiūtė <ks830@cam.ac.uk>, Chao Wan <cw862@cornell.edu>.




Figure 1. Evaluating LLM capabilities with PhantomWiki. We tune the reasoning and retrieval difficulty by the number of reasoning steps and documents, respectively. See main text for details.

information can fit within the LLM context window. Studies such as (Liu et al., 2024) show that LLMs perform poorly in “needle-in-a-haystack” scenarios, where a small but crucial piece of information is embedded within a long document. By adjusting the total context length—determined by PhantomWiki universe size—and the quantity of relevant information required for a given question, PhantomWiki provides a reliable benchmark for evaluating LLMs’ in-context retrieval capabilities.

In the second setting, when dealing with large-scale corpora, LLMs face inherent limitations in processing all available information within their fixed context window. Instead, they must rely on external retrieval methods to access relevant information (Lewis et al., 2020). This setup allows us to decouple and evaluate two key components: the effectiveness of the retriever in identifying and retrieving the most relevant content, and the LLMs’ ability to accurately interpret and utilize the retrieved information.

Last but not least, where LLMs are augmented with external tools, effectively integrating reasoning and tool-use capabilities becomes essential for solving complex tasks. By adjusting the size of the associated text corpus and modulating the reasoning difficulty, PhantomWiki serves as a foundation for future research on agents that can seamlessly combine reasoning and tool utilization.

Our evaluation on PhantomWiki confirms that the proposed tasks present significant challenges for all of the state-of-the-art LLMs that we used. In Figure 1, we plot F1 scores of Llama-3.3-70B prompted with 3 techniques on PhantomWiki-generated questions that require various number of reasoning steps and reference various document corpora (see Section 4 for details). The top-right regions of all 3 plots grow darker, indicating that the F1 score plummets as the both reasoning and retrieval complexity increases. Moreover, In-Context prompting has a sharp cutoff on the Y-axis, since ZEROSHOT and COT prompting are nonviable due to finite LLM context lengths. By breaking down challenges across different dimensions, PhantomWiki enables

researchers from various fields to evaluate and refine their methods. Beyond serving as a robust benchmark for LLM performance, PhantomWiki provides valuable insights that can guide improvements in retrieval, reasoning, and tool-use capabilities of LLMs for the research community. Code is publicly available at [github.com/kilian-group/phantom-wiki](https://github.com/kilian-group/phantom-wiki) and via `pip install phantom-wiki`.

## 2. Related Work

Agent benchmarks, such as  $\tau$ -bench (Yao et al., 2024), ToolWoz (Lattimer et al., 2024), Alfworlworld (Shridhar et al., 2020) and WebArena (Zhou et al., 2023), focus on tasks where the agent is given a binary reward for successful completion of a task (e.g., booking a flight, making a purchase). In this work, we focus more on tasks where the agent is rewarded for responding to a question with a factually correct answer. (In Section 3, we concretize what we mean by a “fact” and “correctness”.) Zhou et al. (2023, Section 3.2) include a category of information-seeking tasks, however these tasks often require navigation across multiple pages or focus on user-centric content. Yao et al. (2024, Appendix. A) measure task difficulty based on the average success rate of frontier models (e.g., GPT-4). *Our work defines a model-agnostic measure of difficulty, which we show provides more meaningful insight into the reasoning and retrieval aspects of LLMs.*

In the QA domain, existing benchmarks are designed to test whether LLMs are able to reason and use tools. Closer to our work in the space of question-answering agents is the ToolQA benchmark of Zhuang et al. (2023). They introduce a framework to construct question-answer pairs from databases and documents by first generating question templates using LLMs, then filtering for high-quality templates, and finally deriving ground-truth answers by writing corresponding Python programs for each question template. Zhuang et al. (2023, Tab. 1) construct two pure-text datasets: SciREX with 438 documents and 5 question templates, and Agenda with 10k event entries and 10 question templates. *In contrast, PhantomWiki generates instances at much larger scale with 50 question templates and 1 million documents.*

For generating factually-grounded answers, retrieval augmented generation (RAG) has emerged as the predominant paradigm (Lewis et al., 2020; Karpukhin et al., 2020; Guu et al., 2020). However, evaluating RAG systems is notoriously difficult, leading to a flourishing of retrieval benchmarks (Petroni et al., 2020; Saad-Falcon et al., 2023; Jin et al., 2024; Hsia et al., 2024; Mao et al., 2024; Rau et al., 2024). A key pain-point of RAG is handling questions that involve multi-hop reasoning. This motivated Tang & Yang (2024) to design the MultiHop-RAG dataset with synthetically generated questions and Su et al. (2024) to curate a dataset of question-answer pairs that requires intensive




Figure 2. Overview of the PhantomWiki pipeline.

reasoning to retrieve relevant documents.

Importantly, none of these benchmarks create the underlying corpus, a limitation which we bridge in this work. Logical reasoning tasks have become central to LLM evaluation and have garnered significant attention in recent time (Zhu et al., 2023). Many existing benchmarks do not disentangle the evaluation on logical reasoning with other abilities such as natural language inference and commonsense reasoning (Sakaguchi et al., 2021; Zellers et al., 2019; Sprague et al., 2023). A line of works focuses on the synthesis of datasets containing a variety of logic reasoning tasks (Tafjord et al., 2020; Saparov & He, 2022; Liu et al., 2020; Han et al., 2022; Weston et al., 2015). Closer to our work, Sinha et al. (2019) construct short stories about individuals related through a family graph and ask questions about their kinship relationships to benchmark the inductive reasoning capabilities. However, theirs is distinct from our work in that all relevant information for a specific question is centralized in a single article; PhantomWiki requires that the relevant information first be retrieved from a large-scale corpus.

### 3. PhantomWiki Construction

PhantomWiki is at its core an on-demand random generator of fictional worlds. Similarly to the wiki hosting services popular in film, video games, and literature<sup>1</sup>, we represent these fictional worlds through Wikipedia-like biographical entries about their characters. We then test the model’s

<sup>1</sup>For example, see <https://stardewvalley.fandom.com> or <https://harrypotter.fandom.com>.

retrieval skills and its understanding of the fictional world through an accompanying set of automatically generated question-answer pairs.

#### 3.1. Generating a PhantomWiki Universe

The first stage of the PhantomWiki pipeline generates a random universe of  $n$  characters as well as the document corpus describing it, as illustrated in Figure 2, (1-2).

**Generating Characters.** Each character in a PhantomWiki universe is described through its *social relationships* and *personal facts* (Figure 2, (1)). For the social relationships, we first generate family trees, following the family tree generator of Hohenecker & Lukasiewicz (2020). We iteratively pick a person and generate their parent or child based on various constraints<sup>2</sup>, until the user-specified universe size of  $n$  people is reached. The user can also specify other hyperparameters like the number of trees, their maximal depth, and the maximal number of offspring for each person. In addition to the family trees, we generate a friendship graph using the Erdős–Rényi model (making two people friends with some fixed probability, typically controlled by the desired average number of friendships.)

**Generating Facts.** Next, we generate personal facts for each person in the PhantomWiki universe. Names are assigned during the family generation procedure, with the first name sampled based on the character’s gender and the sur-

<sup>2</sup>For example, the number of offspring of a person has to be smaller than some threshold, parents of the people at the maximal tree level will not be generated, etc.

name based on the family tree, resulting in 15M full names in total<sup>3</sup>. We also add dates of birth in a way that is consistent with the existing family relations, and assign each person a job and a hobby that we uniformly sample from over 300 and 600 options respectively.

**Generating Articles.** Given all relevant facts for each person, we convert them into articles using pre-defined templates, e.g. “The job of David is a farmer. The hobby of David is birdwatching.” (see Figure 2, (2)). This construction conveys the necessary information while keeping the articles short (about 160 tokens on average). While it is possible to extend the article generation process to LLM-based methods (see e.g. Shao et al. 2024), this poses the challenge of guaranteeing factual correctness without additional costs and external supervision. This has been supported by our preliminary experiments on article generation using Llama-3.3-70B, where we observed factual errors in the resulting articles; therefore we do not use LLMs and rely entirely on templates. The articles are the only component of PhantomWiki available to the model during its evaluation.

### 3.2. Generating Question-Answer Pairs

In the second half of the PhantomWiki pipeline, we generate a set of questions with verifiable answers, as shown in Figure 2, (3-4).

**Generating Questions.** We implement automatic question generation through a context-free grammar (CFG, Hopcroft et al. 2001) of *question templates*, which we then use to sample complete questions. For example, the question template “Who is the <relation> of <name>?” can be used to sample the question “Who is the friend of David?” (see Figure 2, (3)). The main advantage of using a CFG is that it efficiently and systematically obtains *all* possible compositions of questions for some recursion depth  $d$ . For instance, the following subset of our context-free grammar:

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow \text{Who is } R ? \\ R &\rightarrow \text{the } \langle \text{relation} \rangle \text{ of } R' \\ R' &\rightarrow R \mid \langle \text{name} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

can lead to questions ranging from “Who is the friend of David?” to “Who is the nephew of the friend of the brother of David?” as  $d$  increases. In addition to these nested compositions, our CFG also supports questions about personal attributes (e.g. “Who is the person whose hobby is birdwatching?”), aggregation questions (“How many brothers does David have?”), and combinations of all three (“How many friends does the brother of the person whose hobby is birdwatching have?”) (For the full CFG see Appendix B.)

**Generating Answers.** To ensure that the answers to

the sampled questions are verifiably correct, we represent our generated universe in Prolog, a logic programming language (Sterling & Shapiro, 1994). Each Prolog program consists of a set of facts known about the world such as `hobby("David", "birdwatching")`, and a set of rules defining how facts are related to each other, such as `nephew(X, Y) :- sibling(X, A), son(A, Y)`. The Prolog program uses these facts and rules to deduce the exhaustive set of answers to its *queries* (i.e., the CFG-generated questions). For example, a question “Who is the nephew of the friend of the person whose hobby is birdwatching?” corresponds to the three-statement Prolog query `?- nephew(X2, Y), friend(X1, X2), hobby(X1, "birdwatching")`, which returns all people satisfying these constraints in the PhantomWiki universe (see Figure 2 (4)).

To construct the Prolog queries automatically, we modify the CFG algorithm to generate both the question and query templates in parallel. We note, however, that the queries are separate from the final PhantomWiki corpus and question-answer pairs, and the answers returned by the Prolog program should be held out as part of the evaluation procedure.

### 3.3. PhantomWiki Complexity

The goal of PhantomWiki is to generate memorization-resistant evaluation datasets that are challenging in both reasoning and retrieval aspects. In this section, we discuss our conceptual and practical design choices that help us achieve this goal.

**Universe Space Complexity.** To ensure that our evaluation with PhantomWiki is memorization and data leakage-resistant,

we first show that the space of possible universes is sufficiently large to generate enough unique instances. Observe that the number of possible friendship assignments grows at the rate of  $\Theta(2^{n^2})$  (Flajolet & Sedgewick, 2009, Ex. II.5) as the number of individuals  $n$  in the universe increases. Similarly, assuming each individual is assigned one fact from each category (job, hobby, etc.), the number of possible fact assignments grows at the rate  $\Theta(c^n)$ , where  $c$  is the total number of choices across the categories. PhantomWiki thus samples a corpus from  $\Theta(2^{n^2} c^n)$  possible universes, which leads to diverse datasets optimal for data leakage-resistant evaluation. We note that as future work PhantomWiki could be extended to increase this diversity, e.g. by adding a temporal dimension of events.

**Reasoning Complexity.** The CFG enables us to recursively compose templates that lead to complex reasoning questions. Observe that our CFG in Appendix B produces  $\Theta(d)$  question templates as the recursion depth  $d$  increases. Moreover, we can increase the difficulty of each template by

<sup>3</sup>We use unique names in our experiments, but PhantomWiki also supports repeated names.

increasing the number of *reasoning steps*. For example, substituting  $\langle relation \rangle$  with *nephew* in a template adds two reasoning steps ( $nephew(X, Y) :- sibling(X, A), son(A, Y)$ ), since PhantomWiki articles only contain immediate family relationships like *sibling* and *son*. In contrast, substituting  $\langle relation \rangle$  with *second cousin* would lead to five reasoning steps. As we will show in Section 4, PhantomWiki questions are sufficiently complex to evaluate reasoning capabilities of state-of-the-art LLMs. We further note that PhantomWiki’s CFG can be easily extended to support more question types like comparison and multiple-constraint questions.

**Retrieval Complexity.** To assess a model’s retrieval capabilities, we increase the universe size  $n$  so that the document corpus exceeds the model’s context length—this makes a retriever necessary to answer questions correctly. For state-of-the-art LLMs with a context length of 128K, such as OpenAI’s GPT-4o and Meta’s Llama-3.3-70B, this corresponds to PhantomWiki universes of  $n \gtrsim 1K$ . This increases to  $n \gtrsim 3K$  for Google’s Gemini-1.5-Flash with context length 1M. Further scaling  $n$  leads to further increase in retrieval difficulty. In Table 1, we show that PhantomWiki is well-suited for generating universes of this size on standard CPU hardware: generating questions with recursion depth  $d = 10$  for size  $n = 100K$ —well beyond any existing LLM’s context length—takes just 6 minutes on 8 Intel Cascade Lake CPU cores. Moreover, we can conveniently generate instances of  $n = 1M$ , which is on the scale of Wikipedia’s corpus of 2 million biographical entries<sup>4</sup>.

Table 1. Runtime breakdown of generating a PhantomWiki instance for facts, articles and questions for universe sizes  $n$ .

$n$	Total Runtime	Facts	Articles	Questions
$10^2$	0.97 s	0.46 s	0.07 s	0.44 s
$10^3$	2.86 s	0.90 s	0.59 s	1.37 s
$10^4$	20.91 s	5.38 s	5.87 s	9.66 s
$10^5$	5.57 m	0.81 m	0.97 m	3.79 m
$10^6$	3.86 h	9.47 m	11.77 m	3.51 h

## 4. Experimental Validation

We evaluate reasoning and retrieval capabilities of several frontier LLMs using PhantomWiki, by decomposing their performance over questions of varying difficulty and universes of varying sizes.

### 4.1. Evaluation Setup

We generate PhantomWiki instances with  $n$  ranging from 50 to 10K—a universe size for which the total length of

<sup>4</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject\\_Biography](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject_Biography), as of January 30, 2025.

articles exceed the LLM context length. For the evaluation, only the articles (not the Prolog database or the generated graphs) will be provided to the LLMs. To ensure that our findings are not tied to any specific PhantomWiki instance, we use 3 random dataset seeds for each configuration. Creating PhantomWiki instances with different random seeds leads to entirely different combinations of names, relations, and personal facts. In each instance, we generate question templates with maximum recursion depth  $d = 20$ , for a total of 50 templates. We sample 10 questions for each template, yielding a **total of 500 questions per PhantomWiki instance**. As shown in Figures 5 and 6 (Appendix B), these questions have varying difficulty and number of answers. Accordingly, we prompt the LLMs to predict all answers as a comma-separated list and measure correctness with the answer-level F1 score.

### 4.2. Models and Prompting Techniques

We test both open- and closed-source LLMs, namely OpenAI’s GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024), Google’s Gemini-1.5-Flash (Gemini Team, Google, 2024), and the instruction-tuned version of Meta’s Llama-3.3-70B model (Dubey et al., 2024). We also evaluate DeepSeekAI’s DeepSeek-R1-32B (Guo et al., 2025) (distilled with Qwen-2.5-32B (Yang et al., 2024)), which is an open-weights LLM trained on reasoning trace datasets. We prompt each LLM with the following techniques, broadly grouped in three ways:

**In-Context Prompting.** This technique includes the whole document corpus as part of the prompt. We use this type of prompting in conjunction with two strategies: ZEROSHOT—where the document corpus is immediately followed by the question—and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2022), where we additionally include some examples on how step-by-step reasoning could lead to the correct answer. We include these prompts in Appendix C.2, as well as modifications to the ZEROSHOT strategy for DeepSeek-R1-32B.

**RAG Prompting.** This setting augments generation with a pre-trained neural retriever (Lewis et al., 2020). We implement this by first searching for the 4 most relevant documents to the posed question based on UAE-LARGE-V1 embeddings. Next, we incorporate these retrieved documents into the model’s prompt. Finally, we add in the same ZEROSHOT and CoT prompts as In-Context Prompting. We document details on our retrieval algorithm in Appendix C.3.

**Agentic Prompting.** REACT (Yao et al., 2022) is a prompting technique that enables LLMs to interleave reasoning steps with tool interactions, to solve complex tasks. For PhantomWiki QA task, the LLMs are provided with keyword-based tools `RetrieveArticle` and `Search` to retrieve relevant documents (see Appendix C.6 for tool

Table 2. **F1 scores (in %)** for various LLMs and prompting techniques. We report mean  $\pm$  standard error across 3 dataset generation seeds (except for GPT-4o due to cost constraints), and indicate the highest F1 score for each  $n$  in bold. In-Context prompting is infeasible for  $n = 5K$  as the corpus cannot be fully included in the context.

Universe Size	Model	In-Context		RAG		Agentic
		ZEROSHOT	CoT	ZEROSHOT-RAG	CoT-RAG	REACT
50	DeepSeek-R1-32B	<b>42.42 <math>\pm</math> 1.69</b>	<b>52.42 <math>\pm</math> 2.64</b>	16.87 $\pm$ 0.98	16.10 $\pm$ 1.10	5.47 $\pm$ 1.36
50	GPT-4o	27.20 $\pm$ 0.76	50.66	<b>20.54</b>	14.14	<b>38.70</b>
50	Gemini-1.5-Flash	28.49 $\pm$ 1.15	34.61 $\pm$ 2.41	19.88 $\pm$ 2.05	13.35 $\pm$ 0.66	30.92 $\pm$ 1.41
50	Llama-3.3-70B	25.64 $\pm$ 0.56	48.37 $\pm$ 1.75	17.55 $\pm$ 2.20	<b>20.01 <math>\pm</math> 1.81</b>	35.83 $\pm$ 1.00
500	DeepSeek-R1-32B	<b>18.33 <math>\pm</math> 2.33</b>	19.65 $\pm$ 3.00	12.08 $\pm$ 1.07	9.64 $\pm$ 0.46	3.57 $\pm$ 0.01
500	GPT-4o	16.76 $\pm$ 0.87	<b>41.02</b>	<b>13.56</b>	7.25	<b>37.39</b>
500	Gemini-1.5-Flash	17.39 $\pm$ 1.45	25.17 $\pm$ 1.77	11.66 $\pm$ 0.34	7.94 $\pm$ 0.19	26.99 $\pm$ 1.84
500	Llama-3.3-70B	11.59 $\pm$ 1.19	25.99 $\pm$ 2.09	10.89 $\pm$ 0.58	<b>11.54 <math>\pm</math> 1.05</b>	35.56 $\pm$ 0.49
5000	DeepSeek-R1-32B	Max context exceeded		8.29 $\pm$ 0.18	7.96 $\pm$ 0.38	4.74 $\pm$ 0.04
5000	GPT-4o			<b>10.12</b>	6.96	<b>36.85</b>
5000	Gemini-1.5-Flash			8.60 $\pm$ 0.31	5.26 $\pm$ 0.36	23.47 $\pm$ 1.53
5000	Llama-3.3-70B			7.57 $\pm$ 0.52	<b>8.67 <math>\pm</math> 0.18</b>	30.89 $\pm$ 2.24

details). These settings materialize the limitations of in-context prompting and necessitate the use of advanced RAG prompting and agentic prompting approaches.

In the CoT and REACT prompts, we include 10 QA exemplars and hand-written reasoning traces. We choose these exemplars from a dataset instance of size 25 that is not used for evaluation. In REACT, we limit LLMs to interact with the text corpus for up to 50 steps, which is sufficient to answer almost all questions in PhantomWiki instances.

We cap all LLM outputs to 4096 tokens and use greedy decoding (temperature = 0). For DeepSeek-R1-32B, we use temperature = 0.6 and top-p = 0.95 in accordance with the evaluation setup in Guo et al. (2025, Sec. 3). We refer the reader to Appendix C for full prompt templates and implementation details.

### 4.3. Discussion

In Table 2, we report the mean F1 score across various universe sizes, LLMs, and prompting techniques. We first average F1 scores over all questions in a PhantomWiki instance, then compute the mean and standard error across the dataset generation seeds.

We first consider the small-universe setting ( $n = 50$ ) in Table 2, which corresponds to roughly 16K tokens for the LLMs we test. In-Context prompting techniques outperform other techniques: CoT with GPT-4o attains the highest performance, followed by ZEROSHOT with DeepSeek-R1-32B. Next, we consider the setting of medium universes ( $n = 500$ ). Here the full document corpus can still be included in all LLMs’ contexts, but we find that ZEROSHOT performs poorly for all LLMs, and DeepSeek-R1-32B es-

pecially struggles. F1 scores of CoT for all LLMs degrade as well compared to  $n = 50$ , but not worse than REACT. Finally, in the setting of large universes ( $n = 5000$ ), none of the LLMs we evaluate can accommodate the full document corpus. In-context techniques are no longer viable, and we must rely on RAG prompting and agentic prompting. RAG prompting attain poor F1 scores because the retriever fails to retrieve documents relevant for answering complex questions. On the other hand, agentic prompting technique shines in comparison to other techniques, indicating that LLMs are better suited to dynamically retrieve documents while reasoning on a question. We attribute the poor performance of DeepSeek-R1-32B in agentic prompting technique to its inferior tool-calling abilities compared to the other LLMs.

## 5. Evaluating Reasoning

To isolate LLM reasoning capabilities with PhantomWiki, we investigate model performance on small universes ( $n = 50$ ) in Figure 3. Note that contexts of all LLMs can fully include small universe document corpora. Each PhantomWiki dataset contains questions covering a wide range of difficulty. We evaluate three approaches: in-context prompting, RAG prompting, and agentic prompting. For each we plot the F1 scores as a function of question difficulty, as measured by the number of *reasoning steps* necessary to answer the question. As mentioned in Section 3.3, this is determined by the type of question templates and the sampled relationships. For all LLMs and prompting techniques, we verify empirically that **questions with larger reasoning steps are indeed more challenging to answer**. By allowing question difficulty to be adjusted, PhantomWiki serves as a founda-




Figure 3. F1 scores as a function of question difficulty, measured by *reasoning steps*. We plot LLM performance on universe size  $n = 50$ , and report F1 scores averaged over 3 generation seeds. Increasing question difficulty in PhantomWiki reveals a clear decline across all state-of-the-art LLMs and prompting techniques, showing their struggle with reasoning.

tional benchmark for evaluating reasoning capabilities in language models.

ZEROSHOT performance declines sharply as the number of reasoning steps increases for all LLMs, except for DeepSeek-R1-32B, which deteriorates more gradually. LLMs perform better with CoT than with ZEROSHOT, but each additional reasoning step remains increasingly challenging. This suggests that even in the absence of retrieval constraints, LLMs struggle to navigate logical reasoning sequences.

RAG prompting techniques (ZEROSHOT-RAG and CoT-RAG) stunt reasoning performance across the board—F1 scores are near zero on questions with 5 or more reasoning steps as opposed to 15 steps for in-context prompting. We attribute this to a core problem with RAG prompting: retrieving documents in the initial prompt before starting to answer the question, as opposed to reasoning through the question and retrieving documents dynamically.

We find that RAG prompting techniques can only answer questions that require a single reasoning step, like *Who is the friend of David?*. On the other hand, answering questions that require information from *multiple* reasoning steps is extremely challenging for ZEROSHOT-RAG and CoT-RAG. To illustrate, consider the question *Who is the nephew of the friend of David?* Answering this question requires retrieving David’s document first and then retrieving their friend’s document to find the nephew. Since RAG prompting techniques retrieve documents *only once* by matching vector embeddings of questions and documents, they are unlikely to retrieve all necessary documents required to answer such questions.

Finally, the agentic prompting technique REACT allows LLMs to avoid the steep performance drop as seen in RAG prompting. On given a question, REACT prompting requires LLMs to retrieve documents dynamically in a conversation and justify why they are relevant. Concretely, before using a tool (RetrieveArticle or Search) in a conversation turn, the LLM is asked to describe how the tool will help using a “Thought” step (Yao et al., 2022), analogous to the CoT prompting approach. This approach shows promise in answering questions correctly. Even so, REACT struggles as the question difficulty increases.

Figure 3 thus decomposes LLM performance along the lines of reasoning capabilities. It reveals that all in-context prompting and agentic prompting achieve near-perfect F1 scores on low-difficulty questions. Therefore, the stratification between them in Table 2 can be attributed to varying performance on high difficulty questions. To further isolate the impact of question difficulty, in Figure 7 we plot F1 scores as a function of reasoning steps for questions with only one solution.

## 6. Evaluating Retrieval

Next, to evaluate LLM retrieval capabilities, we use PhantomWiki to contrast two settings: (1) small universes where the document corpus can comfortably fit in LLM context, and (2) large universes where the full corpus exceeds context lengths. To this end, we increase the universe size up to  $n = 10K$ , which corresponds to document corpora well beyond the context lengths of state-of-the-art LLMs, and display the results in Figure 4.

For very small universes, CoT usually outperforms ZE-




Figure 4. **F1 scores as a function of universe size  $n$ .** We evaluate LLM performance on questions with  $\leq 10$  reasoning steps, and report F1 scores averaged over 3 dataset generation seeds. As we increase universe size in PhantomWiki, F1 scores for all LLMs and prompting techniques deteriorate, highlighting that they struggle at retrieving relevant documents.

ROSHOT for all LLMs except DeepSeek-R1-32B. However, F1 scores noticeably worsen as more documents are included in models’ contexts, with DeepSeek-R1-32B suffering a dramatic performance drop. This analysis regime indicates that **state-of-the-art LLMs struggle at in-context retrieval** for complex question-answering tasks.

At the large universe scale, in-context prompting techniques become nonviable as the document corpus exceeds model context lengths. Therefore the use of out-of-context retrieval, such as RAG prompting and agentic prompting techniques, is necessary for obtaining the answers. Here we observe that RAG prompting techniques, which select relevant documents for the question using vector embeddings, deliver poor F1 scores for all universe sizes—the performance only deteriorates with increasing universe size. Agentic prompting techniques like REACT show immense promise by avoiding a steep downward trend. This suggests that **agentic workflows can be effective in dynamically retrieving documents at scale.**

## 7. Conclusion and Future Work

We introduce PhantomWiki—a benchmarking framework to evaluate reasoning and retrieval capabilities of language models. As we increase the question complexity and universe size, we observe that current state-of-the-art LLMs struggle in both aspects. PhantomWiki is scalable and memorization-resistant, hence well-suited to evaluate future generations of language models.

Our work brings forth several research directions. Noting how we generate document corpora and questions, PhantomWiki is resistant to data contamination. We leave to

future work to empirically test this claim, and to develop theory to formally prove that our benchmark is memorization-resistant. In this work we focus on question-answering over text corpora. We hope to extend PhantomWiki to other knowledge bases and modalities such as vision and audio, enabling analogous test suites for multimodal models.

## Acknowledgements

KS gratefully acknowledges support from AstraZeneca. CW is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) OAC-2118310 and NSF-1934714 grant. This work was partially supported by funding from NewYork-Presbyterian for the NYP-Cornell Cardiovascular AI Collaboration, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA/NIFA), the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR), and a Schmidt AI2050 Senior Fellowship, a Schmidt Sciences program.

## Impact Statement

By leveraging context-free grammars and Prolog, PhantomWiki is able to generate large, durable and challenging datasets without using LLMs. The datasets have low computational, monetary, and environmental cost and our open-source framework is accessible to any user.

Since PhantomWiki randomly generates datasets that do not reference any existing data, the evaluation benchmark is resistant to data leakage and memorization while training. The approach of publishing a dataset generation *procedure* rather than a fixed dataset also encourages better research practices (by using fresh datasets instead of overfitting to a single instance), and enables a more accurate evaluation of



model performance. Since we do not use any personal data, use of PhantomWiki does not have any privacy concerns.

## References

- AlphaProof & AlphaGeometry. AI achieves silver-medal standard solving International Mathematical Olympiad problems. <https://deepmind.google/discover/blog/ai-solves-imo-problems-at-silver-medal-level/>, 2024. Accessed: 2025-01-25.
- Cobbe, K., Kosaraju, V., Bavarian, M., Chen, M., Jun, H., Kaiser, L., Plappert, M., Tworek, J., Hilton, J., Nakano, R., et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021.
- Cohen, R., Biran, E., Yoran, O., Globerson, A., and Geva, M. Evaluating the ripple effects of knowledge editing in language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:283–298, 2024.
- Dua, D., Wang, Y., Dasigi, P., Stanovsky, G., Singh, S., and Gardner, M. DROP: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00161*, 2019.
- Dubey, A., Jauhri, A., Pandey, A., Kadian, A., Al-Dahle, A., Letman, A., Mathur, A., Schelten, A., Yang, A., Fan, A., et al. The Llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Elazar, Y., Kassner, N., Ravfogel, S., Ravichander, A., Hovy, E., Schütze, H., and Goldberg, Y. Measuring and improving consistency in pretrained language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9: 1012–1031, 2021.
- Feldman, Y. and El-Yaniv, R. Multi-hop paragraph retrieval for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06606*, 2019.
- Flajolet, P. and Sedgewick, R. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN 9781139477161. URL <https://books.google.com/books?id=0h-4QcAlc1QC>.
- Gemini Team, Google. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- Guo, D., Yang, D., Zhang, H., Song, J., Zhang, R., Xu, R., Zhu, Q., Ma, S., Wang, P., Bi, X., et al. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in LLMs via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- Guu, K., Lee, K., Tung, Z., Pasupat, P., and Chang, M. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 3929–3938. PMLR, 2020.
- Han, S., Schoelkopf, H., Zhao, Y., Qi, Z., Riddell, M., Zhou, W., Coady, J., Peng, D., Qiao, Y., Benson, L., et al. Folio: Natural language reasoning with first-order logic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.00840*, 2022.
- Hendrycks, D., Burns, C., Basart, S., Zou, A., Mazeika, M., Song, D., and Steinhardt, J. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020.
- Hohenecker, P. and Lukasiewicz, T. Ontology reasoning with deep neural networks. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 68:503–540, 2020.
- Hopcroft, J. E., Motwani, R., and Ullman, J. D. Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation. *Acm Sigact News*, 32(1):60–65, 2001.
- Hsia, J., Shaikh, A., Wang, Z., and Neubig, G. RAGGED: Towards informed design of retrieval augmented generation systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09040*, 2024.
- Hurst, A., Lerer, A., Goucher, A. P., Perelman, A., Ramesh, A., Clark, A., Ostrow, A., Welihinda, A., Hayes, A., Radford, A., et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.
- Jin, J., Zhu, Y., Yang, X., Zhang, C., and Dou, Z. FlashRAG: A modular toolkit for efficient retrieval-augmented generation research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13576*, 2024.
- Karpukhin, V., Oğuz, B., Min, S., Lewis, P., Wu, L., Edunov, S., Chen, D., and Yih, W.-t. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906*, 2020.
- Lattimer, B. M., Gangal, V., McDonald, R., and Yang, Y. Sparse rewards can self-train dialogue agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04617*, 2024.
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-t., Rocktäschel, T., et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- Liu, J., Cui, L., Liu, H., Huang, D., Wang, Y., and Zhang, Y. Logiqa: A challenge dataset for machine reading comprehension with logical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.08124*, 2020.
- Liu, N. F., Lin, K., Hewitt, J., Paranjape, A., Bevilacqua, M., Petroni, F., and Liang, P. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024.

- Mao, Q., Luo, Y., Zhang, J., Hao, H., Cao, Z., Wang, X., Guan, X., Huang, Z., Jiang, W., Guo, S., et al. XRAG: eXamining the core-benchmarking foundational components in advanced retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15529*, 2024.
- Meng, K., Bau, D., Andonian, A., and Belinkov, Y. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17359–17372, 2022.
- Min, S., Chen, D., Hajishirzi, H., and Zettlemoyer, L. A discrete hard em approach for weakly supervised question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04849*, 2019.
- Mirzadeh, I., Alizadeh, K., Shahrokhi, H., Tuzel, O., Bengio, S., and Farajtabar, M. GSM-Symbolic: Understanding the limitations of mathematical reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05229*, 2024.
- Muennighoff, N., Tazi, N., Magne, L., and Reimers, N. MTEB: Massive text embedding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07316*, 2022.
- Patil, S. G., Zhang, T., Wang, X., and Gonzalez, J. E. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive APIs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15334*, 2023.
- Petroni, F., Piktus, A., Fan, A., Lewis, P., Yazdani, M., De Cao, N., Thorne, J., Jernite, Y., Karpukhin, V., Mail-lard, J., et al. Kilt: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02252*, 2020.
- Rau, D., Déjean, H., Chirkova, N., Formal, T., Wang, S., Nikoulina, V., and Clinchant, S. BERGEN: A benchmarking library for retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01102*, 2024.
- Saad-Falcon, J., Khattab, O., Potts, C., and Zaharia, M. ARES: An automated evaluation framework for retrieval-augmented generation systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09476*, 2023.
- Sakaguchi, K., Bras, R. L., Bhagavatula, C., and Choi, Y. Winogrande: An adversarial Winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9):99–106, 2021.
- Saparov, A. and He, H. Language models are greedy reasoners: A systematic formal analysis of chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01240*, 2022.
- Shao, Y., Jiang, Y., Kanell, T. A., Xu, P., Khattab, O., and Lam, M. S. Assisting in writing Wikipedia-like articles from scratch with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14207*, 2024.
- Shinn, N., Cassano, F., Gopinath, A., Narasimhan, K., and Yao, S. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Shridhar, M., Yuan, X., Côté, M.-A., Bisk, Y., Trischler, A., and Hausknecht, M. Alfworld: Aligning text and embodied environments for interactive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03768*, 2020.
- Sinha, K., Sodhani, S., Dong, J., Pineau, J., and Hamilton, W. L. CLUTRR: A diagnostic benchmark for inductive reasoning from text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.06177*, 2019.
- Sprague, Z., Ye, X., Bostrom, K., Chaudhuri, S., and Durrett, G. MuSR: Testing the limits of chain-of-thought with multistep soft reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16049*, 2023.
- Sterling, L. and Shapiro, E. Y. *The art of Prolog: advanced programming techniques*. MIT press, 1994.
- Su, H., Yen, H., Xia, M., Shi, W., Muennighoff, N., Wang, H.-y., Liu, H., Shi, Q., Siegel, Z. S., Tang, M., et al. BRIGHT: A realistic and challenging benchmark for reasoning-intensive retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12883*, 2024.
- Tafjord, O., Mishra, B. D., and Clark, P. Proofwriter: Generating implications, proofs, and abductive statements over natural language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.13048*, 2020.
- Tang, Y. and Yang, Y. MultiHop-RAG: Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for multi-hop queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15391*, 2024.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Weston, J., Bordes, A., Chopra, S., Rush, A. M., Van Merriënboer, B., Joulin, A., and Mikolov, T. Towards AI-complete question answering: A set of prerequisite toy tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.05698*, 2015.
- Yang, A., Yang, B., Zhang, B., Hui, B., Zheng, B., Yu, B., Li, C., Liu, D., Huang, F., Wei, H., et al. Qwen 2.5 Technical Report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K., and Cao, Y. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.

Yao, S., Shinn, N., Razavi, P., and Narasimhan, K.  $\tau$ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12045*, 2024.

Zellers, R., Holtzman, A., Bisk, Y., Farhadi, A., and Choi, Y. HellaSwag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830*, 2019.

Zhou, S., Xu, F. F., Zhu, H., Zhou, X., Lo, R., Sridhar, A., Cheng, X., Ou, T., Bisk, Y., Fried, D., et al. WebArena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13854*, 2023.

Zhu, Z., Xue, Y., Chen, X., Zhou, D., Tang, J., Schuurmans, D., and Dai, H. Large language models can learn rules. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07064*, 2023.

Zhuang, Y., Yu, Y., Wang, K., Sun, H., and Zhang, C. ToolQA: A dataset for LLM question answering with external tools. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:50117–50143, 2023.

## A. Background

### A.1. Context-Free Grammars

Context-free grammar (CFG) is a type of formal grammar where the productions rules govern how to generate text from non-terminals and terminals. A context-free grammar is defined by  $G = (V, \Sigma, R, S)$  where  $V$  and  $\Sigma$  denotes nonterminal and terminal respectively.  $R$  is a finite relation in  $V \times (V \cup \Sigma)^*$  which specifies the production rules of the grammar.  $S \in V$  is the start symbol. A production rule in  $R$  has the form

$$\alpha \rightarrow \beta \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha \in V$ ,  $\beta \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ . It is conventional to list all rules with the same left-hand side on the same line and separate the right-hand side with “|” like  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta_1 | \beta_2$ .

## B. Question template generation

### B.1. Context-Free Grammar

We use the following CFG to generate question templates:

```
S -> Who is R? | What is A ? | How many RN_p does R_c have ?
R -> the RN of R_c | the person whose AN is AV
R_c -> R | N
A -> the AN of R
RN -> <relation>
RN_p -> <relation_plural>
AN -> <attribute_name>
AV -> <attribute_value>
N -> <name>
```

### B.2. CFG-generated question templates

Our CFG produces the following 50 question templates at recursion depth  $d = 20$ . Note how the recursive production rule  $R_c \rightarrow R | N$  leads to chained productions.

1. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the <relation>\_13 of the <relation>\_15 of the <relation>\_17 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_19 is <attribute\_value>\_19?
2. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the <relation>\_13 of the <relation>\_15 of the <relation>\_17 of <name>\_18?
3. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the <relation>\_13 of the <relation>\_15 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_17 is <attribute\_value>\_17?
4. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the <relation>\_13 of the <relation>\_15 of <name>\_16?
5. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the <relation>\_13 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_15 is <attribute\_value>\_15?
6. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the <relation>\_13 of <name>\_14?
7. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_13 is <attribute\_value>\_13?
8. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the <relation>\_11 of <name>\_12?

9. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_11 is <attribute\_value>\_11?
10. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the <relation>\_9 of <name>\_10?
11. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_9 is <attribute\_value>\_9?
12. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the <relation>\_7 of <name>\_8?
13. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_7 is <attribute\_value>\_7?
14. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the <relation>\_5 of <name>\_6?
15. Who is the <relation>\_3 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_5 is <attribute\_value>\_5?
16. Who is the <relation>\_3 of <name>\_4?
17. Who is the person whose <attribute\_name>\_3 is <attribute\_value>\_3?
18. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the <relation>\_16 of the <relation>\_18 of <name>\_19?
19. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the <relation>\_16 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_18 is <attribute\_value>\_18?
20. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the <relation>\_16 of <name>\_17?
21. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_16 is <attribute\_value>\_16?
22. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of <name>\_15?
23. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_14 is <attribute\_value>\_14?
24. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of <name>\_13?
25. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_12 is <attribute\_value>\_12?
26. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of <name>\_11?
27. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_10 is <attribute\_value>\_10?
28. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of <name>\_9?
29. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_8 is <attribute\_value>\_8?
30. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of <name>\_7?
31. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_6 is <attribute\_value>\_6?
32. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the <relation>\_4 of <name>\_5?
33. What is the <attribute\_name>\_3 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_4 is <attribute\_value>\_4?

34. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the <relation>\_16 of the <relation>\_18 of <name>\_19 have?
35. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the <relation>\_16 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_18 is <attribute\_value>\_18 have?
36. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the <relation>\_16 of <name>\_17 have?
37. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_16 is <attribute\_value>\_16 have?
38. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the <relation>\_14 of <name>\_15 have?
39. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_14 is <attribute\_value>\_14 have?
40. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the <relation>\_12 of <name>\_13 have?
41. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_12 is <attribute\_value>\_12 have?
42. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the <relation>\_10 of <name>\_11 have?
43. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_10 is <attribute\_value>\_10 have?
44. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the <relation>\_8 of <name>\_9 have?
45. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_8 is <attribute\_value>\_8 have?
46. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the <relation>\_6 of <name>\_7 have?
47. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of the person whose <attribute\_name>\_6 is <attribute\_value>\_6 have?
48. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the <relation>\_4 of <name>\_5 have?
49. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does the person whose <attribute\_name>\_4 is <attribute\_value>\_4 have?
50. How many <relation\_plural>\_2 does <name>\_3 have?

### B.3. Question-Answer Characteristics

## C. Baseline Details

### C.1. LLM SAMPLING HYPERPARAMETERS

	Temperature	Top-k	Top-p	Repetition Penalty	Sampling Seed	Max number of output Tokens
Values	0	50	0.7	1.0	0	4096

Table 3. Default Hyperparameters values for LLM Sampling

We used the above default hyperparameters values for all models, but DeepSeek-R1-32B, where we used temperature = 0.6 and top-p = 0.95.




Figure 5. Histogram of question difficulties (measured by reasoning steps) for universe size  $n = 50$  at two CFG recursion depths  $d \in \{10, 20\}$ . We average the frequencies across 3 dataset generation seeds.




Figure 6. Distribution of number of answers across sizes  $n \in \{50, 500, 5000\}$ , seeds  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , and CFG depth 20.

### C.2. ZEROSHOT-SIMPLE

We use the following prompt for all models, where *evidence* is the concatenation of all documents in the PhantomWiki instance.

```
You are given the following evidence:
(BEGIN EVIDENCE)
{{evidence}}
(END EVIDENCE)
```

You will be provided a question. Your task is to provide an answer according to these instructions:

- The output must be one of the following: a name (if there is only one correct answer); or a list of names separated by '`{constants.answer_sep}`' (if there are multiple correct answers).
- DO NOT include any additional information in your answer.

```
Question: {{question}}
Answer:
```

For DeepSeek-R1-32B, we additionally parse the output to separate the model’s reasoning process from its final answer using the `</think>` tag.

### C.3. ZEROSHOT-RAG

The prompt is exactly the same as ZEROSHOT, except we replace evidence with 4 documents retrieved using the UAE-LARGE-V1. We pre-compute an index the document corpus using an FAISS vector store of UAE-LARGE-V1 embeddings. Upon generation, we search for similar documents for question according to maximum inner product search on document and question embeddings.

### C.4. CHAIN-OF-THOUGHT-SIMPLE

We use the following prompt for all models, where evidence is replaced with a list of all documents. We use a regular expression to parse the output.

```
You are given the following evidence:  
(BEGIN EVIDENCE)  
{{evidence}}  
(END EVIDENCE)
```

You will be provided a question. Your response must end in the following sentence  
: The answer is `<answer>`.

Here, `<answer>` must be one of the following:

- a name (if there is only one correct answer); or
- a list of names separated by `'{constants.answer_sep}'` (if there are multiple correct answers).

Here are some examples:

```
(START OF EXAMPLES)
```

Example 1:

Question: Who is the brother of Dino Beltran?

Answer: Based on the evidence, the brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran.  
The answer is Orlando Beltran.

Example 2:

Question: Who is the sibling of Barabara Beltran?

Answer: Based on the evidence, the siblings of Barabara Beltran are Aida Wang,  
Vicki Hackworth. The answer is Aida Wang{constants.answer\_sep}Vicki Hackworth

.

Example 3:

Question: Who is the child of the sibling of Stacia Toombs?

Answer: First I need to find the sibling of Stacia Toombs. Based on the evidence,  
the sibling of Stacia Toombs is Shelli Beltran. Now I need to find the child  
of Shelli Beltran. Based on the evidence, the children of Shelli Beltran are  
Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The answer is Aida Wang{  
constants.answer\_sep}Barabara Beltran{constants.answer\_sep}Vicki Hackworth.

Example 4:

Question: Who is the uncle of William Smock?

Answer: An uncle is the brother of a parent. Based on the evidence, the parents  
of William Smock are Dominique Smock, Gene Smock. To find the uncle of  
William Smock, I need to find the brother of Dominique Smock and Gene Smock.  
Based on the evidence, Dominique Smock has no brother, and the brother of  
Gene Smock is Eli Smock. So the uncle of William Smock is Eli Smock. The



answer is Eli Smock.

Example 5:

Question: What is the occupation of the sister of the grandmother of Virgil Hackworth?

Answer: A grandmother is the mother of a parent. Based on the evidence, the parents of Virgil Hackworth are Ricardo Hackworth, Vicki Hackworth. To find the grandmother of Virgil Hackworth, I need to find the mother of Ricardo Hackworth and Vicki Hackworth. Based on the evidence, Ricardo Hackworth has no mother, and the mother of Vicki Hackworth is Shelli Beltran. Now I need to find the sister of Shelli Beltran. Based on the evidence, the sister of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. Based on the evidence, the occupation of Stacia Toombs is actuary. The answer is actuary.

Example 6:

Question: Who is the brother of the person whose occupation is associate professor?

Answer: I need to search for people whose occupation is associate professor. Based on the evidence, the person whose occupation is associate professor is Dino Beltran. And the brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran. The answer is Orlando Beltran.

Example 7:

Question: What is the date of birth of the person whose hobby is meteorology?

Answer: I need to search for people whose hobby is meteorology. Based on the evidence, the people whose hobby is meteorology are Alison Smock, Barabara Beltran. The date of birth of Alison Smock is 0929-10-28, and the date of birth of Barabara Beltran is 0989-06-11. The answer is 0929-10-28{constants.answer\_sep}0989-06-11.

Example 8:

Question: Who is the cousin of the person whose occupation is broadcast engineer?

Answer: I need to search for people whose occupation is broadcast engineer. Based on the evidence, the person whose occupation is broadcast engineer is Barabara Beltran. A cousin is the child of the sibling of the parent. Based on the evidence, the parents of Barabara Beltran are Dino Beltran, Shelli Beltran. The sibling of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran, and the sibling of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. Based on the evidence, Orlando Beltran has no child, and the child of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. So the cousin of Barabara Beltran is Leslee Toombs. The answer is Leslee Toombs.

Example 9:

Question: Who is the great-granddaughter of the person whose hobby is biology?

Answer: I need to search for people whose hobby is biology. Based on the evidence, the person whose hobby is biology is Alvaro Smock. To find the great-granddaughter of Alvaro Smock, I need to find the daughter of the child of the child of Alvaro Smock. Based on the evidence, the children of Alvaro Smock are Eli Smock, Gene Smock. Eli Smock has no child, and the child of Gene Smock is Williams Smock. The daughters of Williams Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. So the great-granddaughters of Alvaro Smock, whose hobby is biology, are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The answer is Shelli Beltran{constants.answer\_sep}Stacia Toombs.

(END OF EXAMPLES)

Question: {{question}}

Answer:

### C.5. CHAIN-OF-THOUGHT-RAG

The prompt is exactly the same as COT, except we replace evidence with 4 documents retrieved using the UAE-LARGE-V1. We use the same retriever setup as described in Appendix C.3.

### C.6. REACT

We modify the ReAct agent implementation of Shinn et al. (2024), which can be found at <https://github.com/noahshinn/reflexion>, to support our keyword-based search tools `RetrieveArticle` and `Search`. As seen in the following examples, the `RetrieveArticle` tool fetches the documents by title, and the `Search` tool fetches all document titles whose bodies contain the argument. We instruct the LLM to output predict the answer using a third tool `Finish`.

Solve a question answering task with interleaving Thought, Action, Observation steps.

Thought can reason about the current situation, and Action can be 3 types:

- (1) `RetrieveArticle[{{entity}}]`. This action retrieves the article about `{{entity}}` if it exists. If the article does not exist, the action will say so.
- (2) `Search[{{attribute}}]`. This action searches the database for `{{attribute}}` and retrieves all articles that contain `{{attribute}}`. If no article contains `{{attribute}}`, the action will say so.
- (3) `Finish[{{answer}}]`. This action answers the question with `{{answer}}`. If you cannot find the answer, output the empty answer like: `Finish[]`. If there are multiple answers A,B,C, answer with a list like: `Finish[A{constants.answer_sep}B{constants.answer_sep}C]`.

You may take as many steps as necessary.

Here are some examples:

(START OF EXAMPLES)

Example 1:

Question: Who is the brother of Dino Beltran?

Thought 1: I need to retrieve article about Dino Beltran and find who his brother is.

Action 1: `RetrieveArticle[Dino Beltran]`.

Observation 1: # Dino Beltran ## Family The parents of Dino Beltran are Brian Beltran, Daisy Beltran. Dino Beltran's sibling is Orlando Beltran. The brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran. The mother of Dino Beltran is Daisy Beltran. The father of Dino Beltran is Brian Beltran. The children of Dino Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The daughters of Dino Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The wife of Dino Beltran is Shelli Beltran. ## Friends The friend of Dino Beltran is Alvaro Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Dino Beltran is 0958-08-09. The occupation of Dino Beltran is associate professor. The hobby of Dino Beltran is shogi.

Thought 2: The brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran, so the answer is Orlando Beltran.

Action 2: `Finish[Orlando Beltran]`.

Example 2:

Question: Who is the mother of Ivana Smith?

Thought 1: I need to retrieve article about Ivana Smith and find who her mother is.

Action 1: RetrieveArticle[Ivana Smith].

Observation 1: No article exists for the requested entity. Please try retrieving article for another entity.

Thought 2: Article about Ivana Smith does not exist, so I cannot find the mother of Ivana Smith. I will output empty answer.

Action 2: Finish[[]].

Example 3:

Question: Who is the sibling of Barabara Beltran?

Thought 1: I need to retrieve article about Barabara Beltran and find who her sibling is.

Action 1: RetrieveArticle[Barabara Beltran].

Observation 1: # Barabara Beltran ## Family The parents of Barabara Beltran are Dino Beltran, Shelli Beltran. Barabara Beltran's siblings are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. The sisters of Barabara Beltran are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. The mother of Barabara Beltran is Shelli Beltran. The father of Barabara Beltran is Dino Beltran. ## Friends ## Attributes The date of birth of Barabara Beltran is 0989-06-11. The occupation of Barabara Beltran is broadcast engineer. The hobby of Barabara Beltran is meteorology.

Thought 2: The siblings of Barabara Beltran are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. So the answer is Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth.

Action 2: Finish[Aida Wang{constants.answer\_sep}Vicki Hackworth].

Example 4:

Question: Who is the child of the sibling of Stacia Toombs?

Thought 1: First, I need to retrieve article about Stacia Toombs and find who her sibling is.

Action 1: RetrieveArticle[Stacia Toombs].

Observation 1: # Stacia Toombs ## Family The parents of Stacia Toombs are Alison Smock, Williams Smock. Stacia Toombs's sibling is Shelli Beltran. The sister of Stacia Toombs is Shelli Beltran. The mother of Stacia Toombs is Alison Smock. The father of Stacia Toombs is Williams Smock. The child of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. The daughter of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. The husband of Stacia Toombs is Wilbert Toombs. ## Friends The friends of Stacia Toombs are Brian Beltran, Isiah Lutz, Leeann Hackworth, Lesley Lutz, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Stacia Toombs is 0959-03-22. The occupation of Stacia Toombs is actuary. The hobby of Stacia Toombs is finance.

Thought 2: The sibling of Stacia Toombs is Shelli Beltran. Now I need to retrieve article about Shelli Beltran and find who her child is.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Shelli Beltran].

Observation 2: # Shelli Beltran ## Family The parents of Shelli Beltran are Alison Smock, Williams Smock. Shelli Beltran's sibling is Stacia Toombs. The sister of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. The mother of Shelli Beltran is Alison Smock. The father of Shelli Beltran is Williams Smock. The children of Shelli Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The daughters of Shelli Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The husband of Shelli Beltran is Dino Beltran. ## Friends The friends of Shelli Beltran are Brian Beltran, Eli Smock, Isiah Lutz, Leslee Toombs, Lesley Lutz, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Shelli Beltran is 0958-03-08. The occupation of Shelli Beltran is occupational therapist. The hobby of Shelli Beltran is sociology.

Thought 3: The child of Shelli Beltran is Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. So the answer is Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth.  
Action 3: Finish[Aida Wang{constants.answer\_sep}Barabara Beltran{constants.answer\_sep}Vicki Hackworth].

Example 5:

Question: Who is the uncle of William Smock?

Thought 1: First, I need to retrieve article about William Smock. To find the uncle of William Smock, I need to find the brother of his parent.

Action 1: RetrieveArticle[William Smock].

Observation 1: # Williams Smock ## Family The parents of Williams Smock are Dominique Smock, Gene Smock. The mother of Williams Smock is Dominique Smock. The father of Williams Smock is Gene Smock. The children of Williams Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The daughters of Williams Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The wife of Williams Smock is Alison Smock. ## Friends The friend of Williams Smock is Lannie Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Williams Smock is 0926-04-04. The occupation of Williams Smock is clinical biochemist. The hobby of Williams Smock is social studies.

Thought 2: The parents of William Smock are Dominique Smock, Gene Smock. To find the uncle of William Smock, I need to find the brother of Dominique Smock and Gene Smock.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Dominique Smock].

Observation 2: # Dominique Smock ## Family The child of Dominique Smock is Williams Smock. The son of Dominique Smock is Williams Smock. The husband of Dominique Smock is Gene Smock. ## Friends The friends of Dominique Smock are Gene Smock, Isiah Lutz, Orlando Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. ## Attributes The date of birth of Dominique Smock is 0897-09-08. The occupation of Dominique Smock is sports therapist. The hobby of Dominique Smock is dominoes.

Thought 3: Dominique Smock has no brother. Now I need to retrieve article about Gene Smock and find his brother.

Action 3: RetrieveArticle[Gene Smock].

Observation 3: # Gene Smock ## Family The parents of Gene Smock are Alvaro Smock, Lannie Smock. Gene Smock's sibling is Eli Smock. The brother of Gene Smock is Eli Smock. The mother of Gene Smock is Lannie Smock. The father of Gene Smock is Alvaro Smock. The child of Gene Smock is Williams Smock. The son of Gene Smock is Williams Smock. The wife of Gene Smock is Dominique Smock. ## Friends The friends of Gene Smock are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz, Ricardo Hackworth, Alvaro Smock, Dominique Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Gene Smock is 0898-08-16. The occupation of Gene Smock is immunologist. The hobby of Gene Smock is architecture.

Thought 4: The brother of Gene Smock is Eli Smock, and Dominique Smock has no brother. Since Gene Smock and Dominique Smock are the parents of William Smock, the uncle of William Smock is Eli Smock. So the answer is Eli Smock.

Action 4: Finish[Eli Smock].

Example 6:

Question: What is the occupation of the sister of the grandmother of Virgil Hackworth?

Thought 1: First, I need to retrieve article about Virgil Hackworth. To find the grandmother of Virgil Hackworth, I need to find the mother of his parent.

Action 1: RetrieveArticle[Virgil Hackworth].

Observation 1: # Virgil Hackworth ## Family The parents of Virgil Hackworth are Ricardo Hackworth, Vicki Hackworth. Virgil Hackworth's siblings are Leeann

Hackworth, Leisa Lutz. The sisters of Virgil Hackworth are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz. The mother of Virgil Hackworth is Vicki Hackworth. The father of Virgil Hackworth is Ricardo Hackworth. ## Friends The friends of Virgil Hackworth are Alison Smock, Eli Smock, Orlando Beltran, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Virgil Hackworth is 1009-06-23. The occupation of Virgil Hackworth is sound technician. The hobby of Virgil Hackworth is wikipedia editing.

Thought 2: The parents of Virgil Hackworth are Ricardo Hackworth, Vicki Hackworth. To find the grandmother of Virgil Hackworth, I need to find the mother of Ricardo Hackworth and Vicki Hackworth.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Ricardo Hackworth].

Observation 2: # Ricardo Hackworth ## Family The children of Ricardo Hackworth are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz, Virgil Hackworth. The son of Ricardo Hackworth is Virgil Hackworth. The daughters of Ricardo Hackworth are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz. The wife of Ricardo Hackworth is Vicki Hackworth. ## Friends The friends of Ricardo Hackworth are Gene Smock, Isiah Lutz, Johnetta Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Ricardo Hackworth is 0983-02-24. The occupation of Ricardo Hackworth is clinical research associate. The hobby of Ricardo Hackworth is dairy farming.

Thought 3: Ricardo Hackworth has no mother. So I need to retrieve article about Vicki Hackworth and find her mother.

Action 3: RetrieveArticle[Vicki Hackworth].

Observation 3: # Vicki Hackworth ## Family The parents of Vicki Hackworth are Dino Beltran, Shelli Beltran. Vicki Hackworth's siblings are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran. The sisters of Vicki Hackworth are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran. The mother of Vicki Hackworth is Shelli Beltran. The father of Vicki Hackworth is Dino Beltran. The children of Vicki Hackworth are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz, Virgil Hackworth. The son of Vicki Hackworth is Virgil Hackworth. The daughters of Vicki Hackworth are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz. The husband of Vicki Hackworth is Ricardo Hackworth. ## Friends The friends of Vicki Hackworth are Brian Beltran, Dominique Smock, Eli Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Vicki Hackworth is 0985-05-30. The occupation of Vicki Hackworth is police officer. The hobby of Vicki Hackworth is meditation.

Thought 4: The mother of Vicki Hackworth is Shelli Beltran. So the only grandmother of Virgil Hackworth is Shelli Beltran. Now I need to retrieve article about Shelli Beltran and find her sister.

Action 4: RetrieveArticle[Shelli Beltran].

Observation 4: # Shelli Beltran ## Family The parents of Shelli Beltran are Alison Smock, Williams Smock. Shelli Beltran's sibling is Stacia Toombs. The sister of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. The mother of Shelli Beltran is Alison Smock. The father of Shelli Beltran is Williams Smock. The children of Shelli Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The daughters of Shelli Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The husband of Shelli Beltran is Dino Beltran. ## Friends The friends of Shelli Beltran are Brian Beltran, Eli Smock, Isiah Lutz, Leslee Toombs, Lesley Lutz, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Shelli Beltran is 0958-03-08. The occupation of Shelli Beltran is occupational therapist. The hobby of Shelli Beltran is sociology.

Thought 5: The sister of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. Now I need to retrieve article about Stacia Toombs and find her occupation.

Action 5: RetrieveArticle[Stacia Toombs].

Observation 5: # Stacia Toombs ## Family The parents of Stacia Toombs are Alison Smock, Williams Smock. Stacia Toombs's sibling is Shelli Beltran. The

sister of Stacia Toombs is Shelli Beltran. The mother of Stacia Toombs is Alison Smock. The father of Stacia Toombs is Williams Smock. The child of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. The daughter of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. The husband of Stacia Toombs is Wilbert Toombs. ## Friends The friends of Stacia Toombs are Brian Beltran, Isiah Lutz, Leeann Hackworth, Lesley Lutz, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Stacia Toombs is 0959-03-22. The occupation of Stacia Toombs is actuary. The hobby of Stacia Toombs is finance.

Thought 6: The occupation of Stacia Toombs is actuary. So the answer is actuary.  
Action 6: Finish[actuary].

Example 7:

Question: Who is the brother of the person whose occupation is associate professor?

Thought 1: First, I need to search for people whose occupation is associate professor.

Action 1: Search[associate professor].

Observation 1: (1) Dino Beltran

Thought 2: Person whose hobby is associate professor is Dino Beltran. Now I need to retrieve article about Dino Beltran and find his brother.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Dino Beltran].

Observation 2: # Dino Beltran ## Family The parents of Dino Beltran are Brian Beltran, Daisy Beltran. Dino Beltran's sibling is Orlando Beltran. The brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran. The mother of Dino Beltran is Daisy Beltran. The father of Dino Beltran is Brian Beltran. The children of Dino Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The daughters of Dino Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The wife of Dino Beltran is Shelli Beltran. ## Friends The friend of Dino Beltran is Alvaro Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Dino Beltran is 0958-08-09. The occupation of Dino Beltran is associate professor. The hobby of Dino Beltran is shogi.

Thought 3: The brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran, so the answer is Orlando Beltran.

Action 3: Finish[Orlando Beltran].

Example 8:

Question: What is the date of birth of the person whose hobby is meteorology?

Thought 1: First, I need to search for people whose hobby is meteorology.

Action 1: Search[meteorology].

Observation 1: (1) Alison Smock (2) Barabara Beltran

Thought 2: People whose hobby is meteorology are Alison Smock, Barabara Beltran. Now I need to retrieve article about Alison Smock and Barabara Beltran and find their date of birth.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Alison Smock].

Observation 2: # Alison Smock ## Family The children of Alison Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The daughters of Alison Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The husband of Alison Smock is Williams Smock. ## Friends The friends of Alison Smock are Eli Smock, Lannie Smock, Virgil Hackworth. ## Attributes The date of birth of Alison Smock is 0929-10-28. The occupation of Alison Smock is health promotion specialist. The hobby of Alison Smock is meteorology.

Thought 3: The date of birth of Alison Smock is 0929-10-28. Now I need to retrieve article about Barabara Beltran and find her date of birth.

Action 3: RetrieveArticle[Barabara Beltran].

Observation 3: # Barabara Beltran ## Family The parents of Barabara Beltran are Dino Beltran, Shelli Beltran. Barabara Beltran's siblings are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. The sisters of Barabara Beltran are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. The mother of Barabara Beltran is Shelli Beltran. The father of Barabara Beltran is Dino Beltran. ## Friends ## Attributes The date of birth of Barabara Beltran is 0989-06-11. The occupation of Barabara Beltran is broadcast engineer. The hobby of Barabara Beltran is meteorology.

Thought 4: The date of birth of Barabara Beltran is 0989-06-11. So the answer is 0929-10-28, 0989-06-11.

Action 4: Finish[0929-10-28{constants.answer\_sep}0989-06-11].

Example 9:

Question: Who is the cousin of the person whose occupation is broadcast engineer?

Thought 1: First, I need to search for people whose occupation is broadcast engineer.

Action 1: Search[broadcast engineer].

Observation 1: # Barabara Beltran ## Family The parents of Barabara Beltran are Dino Beltran, Shelli Beltran. Barabara Beltran's siblings are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. The sisters of Barabara Beltran are Aida Wang, Vicki Hackworth. The mother of Barabara Beltran is Shelli Beltran. The father of Barabara Beltran is Dino Beltran. ## Friends ## Attributes The date of birth of Barabara Beltran is 0989-06-11. The occupation of Barabara Beltran is broadcast engineer. The hobby of Barabara Beltran is meteorology.

Thought 2: Person whose hobby is broadcast engineer is Barabara Beltran. The cousin of Barabara Beltran is the child of sibling of her parent. Barabara Beltran's parents are Dino Beltran and Shelly Beltran. Now I need to find the sibling of Dino Beltran and Shelly Beltran.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Dino Beltran].

Observation 2: # Dino Beltran ## Family The parents of Dino Beltran are Brian Beltran, Daisy Beltran. Dino Beltran's sibling is Orlando Beltran. The brother of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran. The mother of Dino Beltran is Daisy Beltran. The father of Dino Beltran is Brian Beltran. The children of Dino Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The daughters of Dino Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The wife of Dino Beltran is Shelli Beltran. ## Friends The friend of Dino Beltran is Alvaro Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Dino Beltran is 0958-08-09. The occupation of Dino Beltran is associate professor. The hobby of Dino Beltran is shogi.

Thought 3: The sibling of Dino Beltran is Orlando Beltran. Now I need to retrieve article about Orlando Beltran and find his child.

Action 3: RetrieveArticle[Orlando Beltran].

Observation 3: # Orlando Beltran ## Family The parents of Orlando Beltran are Brian Beltran, Daisy Beltran. Orlando Beltran's sibling is Dino Beltran. The brother of Orlando Beltran is Dino Beltran. The mother of Orlando Beltran is Daisy Beltran. The father of Orlando Beltran is Brian Beltran. ## Friends The friends of Orlando Beltran are Virgil Hackworth, Dominique Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Orlando Beltran is 0953-10-23. The occupation of Orlando Beltran is petroleum engineer. The hobby of Orlando Beltran is learning.

Thought 4: Orlando Beltran has no child, so no cousin from the side of Dino Beltran. Now I need to retrieve article about Shelli Beltran and find her sibling.

Action 4: RetrieveArticle[Shelli Beltran].

Observation 4: # Shelli Beltran ## Family The parents of Shelli Beltran are Alison Smock, Williams Smock. Shelli Beltran's sibling is Stacia Toombs. The sister of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. The mother of Shelli Beltran is Alison Smock. The father of Shelli Beltran is Williams Smock. The children of Shelli Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The daughters of Shelli Beltran are Aida Wang, Barabara Beltran, Vicki Hackworth. The husband of Shelli Beltran is Dino Beltran. ## Friends The friends of Shelli Beltran are Brian Beltran, Eli Smock, Isiah Lutz, Leslee Toombs, Lesley Lutz, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Shelli Beltran is 0958-03-08. The occupation of Shelli Beltran is occupational therapist. The hobby of Shelli Beltran is sociology.

Thought 5: The sibling of Shelli Beltran is Stacia Toombs. Now I need to retrieve article about Stacia Toombs and find her child, to get the cousin of Barabara Beltran.

Action 5: RetrieveArticle[Stacia Toombs].

Observation 5: # Stacia Toombs ## Family The parents of Stacia Toombs are Alison Smock, Williams Smock. Stacia Toombs's sibling is Shelli Beltran. The sister of Stacia Toombs is Shelli Beltran. The mother of Stacia Toombs is Alison Smock. The father of Stacia Toombs is Williams Smock. The child of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. The daughter of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. The husband of Stacia Toombs is Wilbert Toombs. ## Friends The friends of Stacia Toombs are Brian Beltran, Isiah Lutz, Leeann Hackworth, Lesley Lutz, Ryan Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Stacia Toombs is 0959-03-22. The occupation of Stacia Toombs is actuary. The hobby of Stacia Toombs is finance.

Thought 6: The child of Stacia Toombs is Leslee Toombs. So the cousin of Barabara Beltran is Leslee Toombs. The answer is Leslee Toombs.

Action 6: Finish[Leslee Toombs].

Example 10:

Question: Who is the great-granddaughter of the person whose hobby is biology?

Thought 1: First, I need to search for people whose hobby is biology.

Action 1: Search[biology].

Observation 1: (1) Alvaro Smock

Thought 2: Person whose hobby is biology is Alvaro Smock. Now I need to retrieve article about Alvaro Smock and find his great-granddaughter. A great-granddaughter is the daughter of the child of the child of the person.

Action 2: RetrieveArticle[Alvaro Smock].

Observation 2: # Alvaro Smock ## Family The children of Alvaro Smock are Eli Smock, Gene Smock. The sons of Alvaro Smock are Eli Smock, Gene Smock. The wife of Alvaro Smock is Lannie Smock. ## Friends The friends of Alvaro Smock are Dino Beltran, Gene Smock, Aida Wang. ## Attributes The date of birth of Alvaro Smock is 0867-07-12. The occupation of Alvaro Smock is osteopath. The hobby of Alvaro Smock is biology.

Thought 3: The children of Alvaro Smock are Eli Smock, Gene Smock. Now I need to retrieve article about Eli Smock and Gene Smock and find their child.

Action 3: RetrieveArticle[Eli Smock].

Observation 3: # Eli Smock ## Family The parents of Eli Smock are Alvaro Smock, Lannie Smock. Eli Smock's sibling is Gene Smock. The brother of Eli Smock is Gene Smock. The mother of Eli Smock is Lannie Smock. The father of Eli Smock is Alvaro Smock. ## Friends The friends of Eli Smock are Leisa Lutz, Shelli Beltran, Vicki Hackworth, Virgil Hackworth, Alison Smock, Brian Beltran. ## Attributes The date of birth of Eli Smock is 0901-01-18. The occupation of Eli Smock is retail manager. The hobby of Eli Smock is tether



car.

Thought 4: Eli Smock has no child. Now I need to retrieve article about Gene Smock and find his child.

Action 4: RetrieveArticle[Gene Smock].

Observation 4: # Gene Smock ## Family The parents of Gene Smock are Alvaro Smock, Lannie Smock. Gene Smock's sibling is Eli Smock. The brother of Gene Smock is Eli Smock. The mother of Gene Smock is Lannie Smock. The father of Gene Smock is Alvaro Smock. The child of Gene Smock is Williams Smock. The son of Gene Smock is Williams Smock. The wife of Gene Smock is Dominique Smock. ## Friends The friends of Gene Smock are Leeann Hackworth, Leisa Lutz, Ricardo Hackworth, Alvaro Smock, Dominique Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Gene Smock is 0898-08-16. The occupation of Gene Smock is immunologist. The hobby of Gene Smock is architecture.

Thought 5: The child of Gene Smock is Williams Smock. Now I need to retrieve article about Williams Smock and find his daughter, to get the great-granddaughter of Alvaro Smock.

Action 5: RetrieveArticle[Williams Smock].

Observation 5: # Williams Smock ## Family The parents of Williams Smock are Dominique Smock, Gene Smock. The mother of Williams Smock is Dominique Smock. The father of Williams Smock is Gene Smock. The children of Williams Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The daughters of Williams Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The wife of Williams Smock is Alison Smock. ## Friends The friend of Williams Smock is Lannie Smock. ## Attributes The date of birth of Williams Smock is 0926-04-04. The occupation of Williams Smock is clinical biochemist. The hobby of Williams Smock is social studies.

Thought 6: The daughters of Williams Smock are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. So the great-granddaughters of Alvaro Smock, whose hobby is biology, are Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs. The answer is Shelli Beltran, Stacia Toombs.

Action 6: Finish[Shelli Beltran{constants.answer\_sep}Stacia Toombs].

(END OF EXAMPLES)

Now answer the following question:  
 Question: {{question}}  
 {{scratchpad}}

### D. Additional Results




Figure 7. F1 scores against reasoning steps, for questions with only 1 solution.