

Large Language Models for Multilingual Previously Fact-Checked Claim Detection

Ivan Vykopal^{1,2}, Matúš Pikuliak², Simon Ostermann^{3,4}, Tatiana Anikina³,
Michal Gregor² and Marián Šimko²

¹ Faculty of Information Technology, Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Republic

² Kempelen Institute of Intelligent Technologies, Bratislava, Slovakia

{name.surname}@kinit.sk

³ German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI), Saarbrücken, Germany

{name.surname}@dfki.de

⁴ Centre for European Research in Trusted AI (CERTAIN)

Abstract

In our era of widespread false information, human fact-checkers often face the challenge of duplicating efforts when verifying claims that may have already been addressed in other countries or languages. As false information transcends linguistic boundaries, the ability to automatically detect previously fact-checked claims across languages has become an increasingly important task. This paper presents the first comprehensive evaluation of large language models (LLMs) for *multilingual* previously fact-checked claim detection. We assess seven LLMs across 20 languages in both monolingual and cross-lingual settings. Our results show that while LLMs perform well for high-resource languages, they struggle with low-resource languages. Moreover, translating original texts into English proved to be beneficial for low-resource languages. These findings highlight the potential of LLMs for multilingual previously fact-checked claim detection and provide a foundation for further research on this promising application of LLMs.

1 Introduction

The proliferation of false information is a global issue affecting societies across diverse linguistic and cultural boundaries. With the growing spread of false information across digital platforms, *fact-checking* has become a crucial mechanism for verifying claims and debunking false narratives. However, the process is resource-intensive, especially when conducted manually. Thus, the automation of fact-checking is an important field of research, enabling effective countermeasures against the growing scale of false information (Vosoughi et al., 2018; Aïmeur et al., 2023).

Previously fact-checked claim detection (PFCDD) is an important sub-task of fact-checking that focuses on identifying claims that have already been verified. Here, AI systems determine for a given claim whether it has been previously fact-checked




Figure 1: An example of a Facebook post with four previously fact-checked claims retrieved by the multilingual E5 embedding model, annotated by human annotators for relevance. Two claims are relevant to the post, while two are irrelevant.

by a human, usually by comparing the claim at hand against thousands of already checked claims in a database. An example is shown in Figure 1. Fact-checking organizations are seeking ways to reduce duplicative efforts and efficiently address false claims that may circulate across languages, which is hard to check for humans that are not capable of speaking all such languages (Barrón-Cedeño et al., 2020; Nakov et al., 2021; Micallef et al., 2022; Hrkova et al., 2024).

LLMs have shown promise in automating various fact-checking tasks like claim detection, evidence retrieval or claim verification (Vykopal et al., 2024). For detecting previously fact-checked claims, LLMs could enhance the identification of relevant fact-checks even across languages, addressing challenges like linguistic diversity and the limited capabilities of existing embedding-based methods, which often underperform for low-resource languages (Kazemi et al., 2021; Pikuliak et al., 2023). We believe that multilingual LLMs are beneficial because of their cross-lingual capabilities and ability to leverage resources from other,

higher-resourced languages.

In this study, we evaluate the capabilities of seven LLMs to identify relevant previously fact-checked claims in multilingual scenarios. We include 20 languages from different language families and scripts, considering high and low-resource languages¹. Our research fills an important gap in detecting previously fact-checked claims in a multilingual context.

Our contributions are as follows:

- We provide a comprehensive evaluation of LLMs for detecting previously fact-checked claims in monolingual and cross-lingual settings, analyzing the effectiveness of different prompting techniques. Our study offers insights into multilingual PFCD using LLMs and outlines the best strategies to select appropriate LLMs and techniques tailored to language-specific contexts.
- We introduce a multilingual dataset for PFCD, comprising 16K manually annotated pairs that assess the relevance between social media posts and fact-checked claims.

2 Related Work

Previously Fact-Checked Claim Detection. Detecting previously fact-checked claims, also known as claim-matching, aims to identify relevant claims for a given input (Shaar et al., 2020), reducing the need to revisit previously fact-checked information. Research in this field primarily focuses on utilizing information retriever (IR) systems that measure the similarity between input claims and fact-checked claims. Most studies have evaluated these systems in monolingual settings, mostly in English (Shaar et al., 2020, 2022; Hardalov et al., 2022).

Recent efforts have expanded the PFCD task to a multilingual context by developing multilingual datasets and exploring the performance of existing IR systems (Kazemi et al., 2021). Pikuliak et al. (2023) created the *MultiClaim* dataset with over 27 languages, demonstrating that English embedding models with translated data achieved superior results compared to multilingual models with input in the original language.

LLMs for Detecting Previously Fact-Checked Claims. The recent advent of highly capable

¹Code and data are available at: <https://github.com/kinit-sk/llms-claim-matching>




Figure 2: Our PFCD pipeline, consisting of (1) a retrieval of the top N most similar previously fact-checked claims (left-hand side) and (2) a classification of the relevance between social media posts and fact-checked claims using LLMs (right-hand side).

LLMs has opened new possibilities for PFCD in both monolingual and multilingual settings. While most research focuses primarily on text embedding models, there are marginal efforts to investigate the performance of various LLMs. A recent survey (Vykopal et al., 2024) identified only five studies utilizing LLMs for PFCD, all focused on a single language. This highlights a research gap that our study aims to address by evaluating the performance of multilingual LLMs across languages.

Current approaches for PFCD with LLMs primarily employ two strategies: *textual entailment* (Choi and Ferrara, 2024a,b) and *generative re-ranking* (Shliselberg and Dori-Hacohen, 2022; Neumann et al., 2023). The textual entailment classifies relationships between input claims and fact-checked claims as *entailment*, *contradiction* or *neutral*. Existing studies evaluated LLM’s performance using synthetic data generated from fact-checked claims for fine-tuning (Choi and Ferrara, 2024a). In contrast, generative re-ranking employs LLMs to compute conditional probabilities to re-rank claims based on their relevance to a given input. This method combines input and fact-checked claims, using the probabilities to prioritize more relevant claims (Neumann et al., 2023). This research demonstrates LLMs’ potential to improve PFCD but underscores the need for further exploration in multilingual contexts.

3 Methodology

We assess the ability of LLMs to determine the relevance between social media posts and previously fact-checked claims by instructing them to classify each post-claim pair as either relevant or irrelevant. Our experiments consider both monolingual set-

tings, where the post and fact-checked claim are in the same language, and cross-lingual settings, where they are in different languages.

We proposed a pipeline, illustrated in Figure 2, to facilitate the evaluation by identifying fact-checked claims relevant to a given social media post. The pipeline consists of two main steps. First, the retriever component retrieves the N most similar previously fact-checked claims from a database (Section 3.1) using an embedding-based similarity. In the second step, an LLM determines the relevance of the retrieved claims to the social media post. The role of LLM is, therefore, to filter out false positives from the first stage. We consider a fact-checked claim to be *relevant* when it is implied by the statements in the post and when it is potentially useful for verifying the post’s veracity.

To validate the pipeline, we created a manually annotated dataset, where human annotators assessed the relevance between posts and retrieved claims (Section 3.2).

3.1 Dataset

We evaluate LLM capabilities on the PFCF task using the *MultiClaim* dataset (Pikuliak et al., 2023), which comprises 206K fact-checks in 39 languages and 28K social media posts in 27 languages, with 31K pairings between fact-checks and posts. Pairs of social media posts and fact-checks were collected based on annotations made by professional fact-checkers, who reviewed the posts and linked them to appropriate fact-checks. These data were sourced directly from fact-checks, which specify the social media posts they address. Since each fact-check typically covers only a few posts related to the target claim, there are many potentially correct pairings between posts and fact-checks that are not annotated. In other words, the annotations are not *exhaustive*, making it impossible to measure recall and allowing only a precision-based evaluation. In our experiments, we considered 20 languages with at least 100 posts each, selecting representative subsets for each language.

3.2 Human Annotation

To ensure a comprehensive evaluation, we aim to address the lack of exhaustiveness in *MultiClaim* as much as possible. Approximating retrieval accuracy requires a complete annotation, but measuring recall directly is infeasible, as it would require comparing each post to every claim in the database. Instead, we approximate recall by retrieving and an-

notating a representative subset of the data. While this selection is biased toward the retriever and does not allow for exact recall measurement, we believe it provides the most fair evaluation possible.

Data Selection. We selected 20 languages from diverse language families and scripts to ensure broad linguistic coverage. For monolingual settings, we selected 40 posts per language and retrieved their top 10 fact-checked claims in the same language using *multilingual-e5-large* embedding model (Wang et al., 2024).

For cross-lingual settings, we defined 20 language pairs, incorporating a variety of language combinations (e.g., Slovak posts with English fact-checks). For each post, we retrieved the top 100 fact-checked claims in languages different from the post’s language. From these, we selected 400 post-claim pairs per language combination.

Our final dataset, *AMC-16K* (*Annotated-MultiClaim-16K*), consists of 8K monolingual and 8K cross-lingual pairs, as detailed in Table 3.

Annotation. Six annotators evaluated the relevance of 16K claim-post pairs. For each pair, they assessed the relevance between the post and fact-checked claim as relevant (*Yes*), irrelevant (*No*) or *Cannot tell* according to guidelines we publish alongside this paper. Following the initial annotation, all cases marked as *cannot tell* were reviewed and re-categorized into *Yes* and *No* categories. While each pair received a single annotation due to the dataset size, we implemented two agreement evaluations. First, a pre-annotation alignment test with all annotators to determine understanding of the annotation guidelines, which yielded a *Fleiss’ kappa* score of 0.60 (moderate agreement). Second, we asked the four most active annotators to complete a post-annotation test to assess their overall alignment. A post-annotation agreement achieved a score of 0.62 (substantial agreement), confirming a sufficient consistency of our methodology.

The annotation results for individual languages, as well as monolingual and cross-lingual settings, are shown in Figure 3. Overall, 16% of the presented pairs were identified as relevant, with the rest classified as irrelevant. In languages like English, Malay, Portuguese, and German, the proportion of relevant pairs exceeded 30%.




Figure 3: The proportion of relevant pairs among 400 annotated samples per language in monolingual and cross-lingual settings. Confidence intervals were computed using the Agresti-Coull method.

Model	# Params	# Langs	Organization	Citation
Mistral Large	123 B	11	Mistral AI	Mistral AI Team (2024)
C4AI Command R+	104 B	23	Cohere For AI	Cohere For AI (2024)
Qwen2.5 Instruct	72 B	29	Alibaba	Yang et al. (2024)
Llama3.1 Instruct	70 B	8	Meta	Grattafiori et al. (2024)
Llama3.1 Instruct	8 B	8	Meta	Grattafiori et al. (2024)
Qwen2.5 Instruct	7 B	29	Alibaba	Yang et al. (2024)
Mistral v3	7 B	1	Mistral AI	Jiang et al. (2023)

Table 1: A list of models evaluated on the task of detecting previously fact-checked claims.

3.3 Experimental Setup

To assess LLMs’ ability to identify the relevance between social media posts and fact-checked claims, we leveraged our *AMC-16K* dataset, seven LLMs and five prompting strategies.

Large Language Models. Based on preliminary experiments, we selected the top three open-source LLMs with less than 10B parameters, referred to hereafter as 10B- LLMs, and four LLMs with more than 70B parameters, referred to as 70B+ LLMs. To optimize resource efficiency for 70B+ LLMs, we employed their quantized versions. Table 1 lists all LLMs used in our experiments.

Prompting Strategies. In our study, we investigated five strategies for instructing LLMs to identify relevant claim-post pairs. These strategies were shown to be effective in prior research (Brown et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2023). We explore (1) *zero-shot*; (2) *zero-shot with task description*; (3) *few-shot with task description*; (4) *chain-of-thought*; and (5) *cross-lingual-thought prompting*. Examples of our prompt templates are shown in Figure 9.

In *Zero-shot prompting*, we rely entirely on the LLM’s ability to infer relationships based on provided texts without providing any task description. In contrast, the *zero-shot with task description* approach enhances original zero-shot settings by providing a task description in the system prompt.

Another technique employed in our experiments involves *few-shot with task description*, which

combines task-specific demonstrations and a task description. Demonstrations were drawn from a subset of manually annotated data from Pikuliak et al. (2023). For each pair, the top five positive (*Yes*) and five negative (*No*) samples were selected. More details on the selection process of demonstrations are in Appendix E.

Recognizing the importance of reasoning in fact-checking, we adopt *chain-of-thought* (CoT) prompting (Wei et al., 2024), which guides LLMs to provide the reasoning process before generating the decision through the prompt “*Let’s think step by step*”. By encouraging intermediate reasoning, CoT aims to improve the understanding of posts and their relationship to fact-checked claims.

The last considered prompting strategy is *cross-lingual-thought prompting* (XLT) (Huang et al., 2023), which was found beneficial with non-English inputs. Using this technique, we instruct LLMs to translate social media posts and fact-checked claims into English before evaluating their relevance, leveraging the stronger performance of many English-centric LLMs.

3.4 Evaluation

We evaluate the capabilities of LLMs for PFCF as a binary classification, aiming to determine the relevance of fact-checked claims and a given post. For evaluation, we leverage *Macro F1* due to the fact that the annotated dataset is inherently imbalanced. In addition, we calculate **True Negative Rate** (TNR), reflecting the proportion of irrelevant pairs correctly filtered, and the **False Negative Rate** (FNR), indicating how many relevant pairs were incorrectly identified as irrelevant.

4 Experiments and Results

In this section, we first provide overall findings for using LLMs for the PFCF task (Section 4.1). Then, we focus on evaluating the abilities of LLMs in monolingual (Section 4.2) and cross-lingual settings (Section 4.3). In addition, the original *Multi-Claim* dataset also contains English translations of posts and fact-checked claims obtained by Google Translate API. Hence, we also evaluate the impact of English translations on the LLMs’ performance (Section 4.4).

4.1 Overall Assessment

The overall results of the experiments are given in Figure 4. LLMs demonstrate generally strong capabilities in identifying relevant fact-checked claims




Figure 4: Performance comparison of LLMs across five prompting strategies in the original language, measured by Macro F1 score along with confidence intervals. Few-shot prompting proved to be effective for 70B+ LLMs, while CoT prompting demonstrated strong performance for 10B- LLMs.

across languages, with the best LLMs achieving Macro F1 above 80%. However, performance varies significantly based on LLM size, prompting strategy and across languages. **70B+ LLMs consistently outperformed their smaller counterparts**, with Mistral Large and C4AI Command R+ emerging as particularly effective models.

The effectiveness of prompting strategies depends on the LLM’s size and training. **For 70B+ LLMs, few-shot prompting yields the best results** for Mistral Large and Qwen2.5 72B, suggesting these LLMs can effectively leverage demonstrations to understand the task and enable them to leverage context effectively. In contrast, **10B- LLMs perform better with CoT prompting**, indicating they benefit from the reasoning (e.g., Qwen2.5 7B). CoT also demonstrated strong performance for LLMs with advanced capabilities, such as Llama3.1 and Mistral Large.

The trade-off between TNR and FNR, using the Pareto curve from Figure 5, reveals distinct optimal configurations across LLM sizes and thresholds based on the probabilities of *Yes* and *No* tokens. In practical deployments, **the choice of LLM and prompting strategy impact the balance between correctly identifying irrelevant claims and mistakenly filtering out relevant ones**. The results confirm our previous findings that Mistral Large and Qwen2.5 7B prove to be most effective among LLMs while consistently maintaining an optimal TNR-FNR trade-off across thresholds.

4.2 Monolingual Evaluation

Figure 6 (left-hand side) highlights the average performance across prompting techniques for each LLM. The capabilities to process languages vary




Figure 5: Visualization of the Pareto-optimal curve, highlighting the best combination of LLM and prompting technique for each threshold. Only Pareto points are shown. *Og* denotes input in the original language, while *En* denotes English translation.

among LLMs. For example, C4AI Command R+, trained on 23 languages, exhibits high performance across many languages. However, even **LLMs that cover fewer languages can perform well** (e.g., Mistral Large). This suggests that 70B+ LLMs demonstrate generalization on multilingual data.

In monolingual settings, some languages perform poorly, which is mostly the case for Slavic languages, Hungarian and Burmese, where the performance was lower than for other languages and language families. In contrast, **high-resource languages achieved superior results in most cases**. However, these results depend not only on the language but also on the data’s complexity – specifically, variations in data across languages and other attributes that affect how easily the LLM can predict the correct answer. This was evident since performance differences persisted even after translating all data into English. Additionally, factors such as topic distribution may influence performance, with languages that cover a wider range of topics, such as Bulgarian, potentially benefiting from this.

Indo-European languages, particularly those using Latin script, **obtained better results**, probably attributed to the distribution of languages used when pre-training LLMs. However, LLM performance is not uniformly lower for non-Latin scripts – in fact, some LLMs excel in these languages, such as Mistral Large for Arabic.

Based on the results from Figure 7, including task descriptions in prompts improved performance




Figure 6: Performance of 70B+ and 10B- LLMs across 20 individual languages (left-side) and 20 cross-lingual combinations (right-side). The average Macro F1 performance for each LLM is calculated across all prompting strategies. Languages marked with * use a non-Latin script. Mistral Large demonstrates strong performance across both individual languages and cross-lingual combinations.




Figure 7: Averaged Macro F1 performance for each prompting technique across all LLMs and across 20 languages in a monolingual setting. ZS denotes Zero-Shot, and FS denotes Few-Shot prompting. Languages marked with * use a non-Latin script.

for most LLMs (*zero-shot* vs. *zero-shot + task description*). Additionally, when instructing LLMs to reason before predicting, using CoT, there is a performance gain for most languages compared to simple zero-shot prompting. When using demonstrations, there is a performance gain for some of the LLMs, especially Mistral Large and Qwen2.5, indicating that **providing more information to the LLM improves the performance** (see Figure 10).

4.3 Cross-Lingual Evaluation

We compare LLMs performance in monolingual and cross-lingual settings with Macro F1 scores presented in Table 2 and across techniques for each language combination in Figure 6 (right-hand side). Overall, **performance declined in cross-lingual settings**, with an average decrease of approximately 4.5%, especially for 10B- LLMs. This highlights the challenges of processing inputs in different languages.

Few-shot prompting proved effective when applied to multilingual LLMs. In contrast, **CoT helped mitigate the cross-lingual performance gap for smaller models** (5% improvement compared to XLT prompting), providing a reasoning

approach that transfers well across languages.

The C4AI Command R+ model exhibited superior performance across both monolingual and cross-lingual scenarios in zero-shot settings. In contrast, Mistral Large emerged as the best-performing LLM in few-shot settings and reasoning (CoT and XLT prompting) with original language inputs. These findings suggest that LLMs with less extensive language coverage during training can outperform highly multilingual LLMs when advanced prompting techniques are leveraged.

For 10B- LLMs, **Qwen2.5 7B consistently achieved superior performance in both settings** across prompting techniques, excluding XLT in monolingual settings. This demonstrates the effectiveness of Qwen2.5’s training in equipping the LLM with strong generalization capabilities across different prompting strategies.

4.4 Translation-Based Approaches

We analyze the performance difference between original language inputs and their English translations, as illustrated in Figure 8. The results reveal that **English translation generally enhanced LLM performance across most scenarios**. This finding highlights the potential of translation-based approaches (translating to English or using XLT) for enhancing the performance of models with limited multilingual capabilities.

English translations not only improve cross-lingual performance, but also demonstrate that LLMs often achieve higher accuracy when operating in English. However, **English translations can sometimes negatively impact performance**, as observed for the C4AI Command R+ model. This LLM, trained with a higher number of languages, performed better with original language inputs, sug-

Model	Version	Zero-Shot		Zero-Shot + Task Description		Few-Shot + Task Description		CoT		XLT		Average	
		Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross
LLMs with more than 70B parameters (70B+ LLMs)													
Mistral Large 123B	Og	72.06	67.09	74.20	71.33	82.46	80.54	79.40	71.60	81.98	74.29	78.02	72.97
	En	75.50	67.41	79.39	72.38	81.64	<u>78.06</u>	<u>78.95</u>	<u>72.09</u>	-	-	<u>78.87</u>	<u>72.49</u>
C4AI Command R+ 104B	Og	79.29	70.34	83.20	79.08	76.26	74.54	64.98	58.66	65.90	61.36	73.93	68.80
	En	<u>80.00</u>	<u>77.28</u>	<u>81.92</u>	<u>75.50</u>	80.40	75.40	66.43	58.78	-	-	77.19	71.74
Qwen 2.5 72B Instruct	Og	70.87	69.69	66.30	60.77	81.68	77.87	74.78	67.59	72.56	67.04	73.24	68.59
	En	76.16	68.48	69.70	61.76	<u>82.00</u>	<u>77.52</u>	76.55	68.46	-	-	76.10	69.06
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	Og	69.99	62.54	72.08	67.69	60.64	61.20	75.90	68.65	77.86	72.07	71.29	66.43
	En	71.87	63.77	75.27	67.46	77.01	76.79	78.29	70.66	-	-	75.61	69.67
Average	Og	73.05	67.42	73.95	69.72	75.26	73.54	73.77	66.63	74.58	68.69	74.12	69.20
	En	75.88	69.24	76.57	69.28	80.26	76.94	75.06	67.50	-	-	76.94	70.74
LLMs with less than 10B parameters (10B- LLMs)													
Llama 3.1 8B Instruct	Og	48.63	47.19	70.88	69.70	47.78	42.15	68.71	62.61	71.77	64.48	61.55	57.23
	En	60.57	53.51	76.48	71.11	64.22	56.93	74.27	66.33	-	-	68.89	61.97
Qwen 2.5 7B Instruct	Og	65.40	64.18	79.95	74.44	71.43	72.52	80.74	75.15	66.97	66.49	72.90	70.56
	En	66.76	<u>64.02</u>	<u>81.07</u>	<u>76.09</u>	<u>69.02</u>	<u>70.89</u>	<u>81.02</u>	<u>75.10</u>	-	-	<u>74.47</u>	<u>71.53</u>
Mistral v3 7B	Og	64.92	61.26	65.98	60.46	57.91	53.31	72.97	67.36	65.67	59.10	65.49	60.30
	En	<u>68.69</u>	63.94	71.01	63.49	68.67	62.79	74.00	66.08	-	-	70.59	64.08
Average	Og	59.65	57.54	72.27	68.20	59.04	55.99	74.14	68.37	68.14	63.36	66.65	62.69
	En	65.34	60.49	76.19	70.23	67.30	63.54	76.43	69.17	-	-	71.32	65.86

Table 2: Performance comparison of LLMs in monolingual and cross-lingual settings using Macro F1 score. The best results for the original language are in **bold**, and English translations are underlined for each category of LLMs (10B- vs. 70B+). Qwen2.5 7B consistently achieved superior performance for 10B- LLMs.

gesting that extensive multilingual training may outperform translation-based strategies.

LLMs trained predominantly on Latin-script data, such as Llama3.1, showed significant performance gains when translations to English were employed (e.g., a 16% improvement in Macro F1 in few-shot settings). Translation-based approaches also proved effective in addressing non-Latin scripts, making them a practical alternative in cross-lingual settings.

However, across almost all LLMs, **CoT prompting combined with English translations yielded only marginal improvements**, suggesting that CoT prompting alone can serve as a viable substitute for translation in achieving comparable performance. This highlights the potential of reasoning-based strategies to bridge cross-lingual gaps without relying on intermediate translations. Additionally, the impact of English translations proved less effective for few-shot settings, with Mistral Large and Qwen2.5 7B models showing a negative effect on the results in these scenarios.

The Pareto curve, see Figure 5, shows a comparison of the efficiency of English translations against original language inputs. For 10B- LLMs, the **Llama3.1 8B model demonstrates improved performance** and occurs more frequently on the Pareto curve when processing English translations.

5 Error Analysis

In this section, we investigate the errors in the reasoning generated by LLMs, with a particular




Figure 8: Overall difference between English translation and the original language using Macro F1 score.

focus on the CoT and XLT techniques. We categorize these errors into two types. First, *output consistency* errors, which occur when the LLM’s responses are inconsistent or deviate from the expected format. Second, *reasoning* errors, which account for misclassified relevance pairs.

5.1 Output Consistency Errors

Output consistency errors can be detected using automatic tools such as language identification or sequence repeating analysis. For language identification, we employed FastText (Joulin et al., 2017, 2016) and langdetect to identify the output language. To identify repeating sequences, we employed sequence occurrence analysis.

A commonly observed issue relates to the **language of LLM outputs**, as all responses were ex-

pected in English. Llama3.1 models with CoT prompting frequently generated non-English outputs – 37% for 8B version and 28% for 70B version. More details are given in Table 7.

Other errors included **repeating sequences**, mainly observed in Llama3.1 8B with CoT prompting (215×). Other LLMs, such as Llama3.1 (33×), Mistral Large (16×) and Qwen2.5 72B (11×), exhibited fewer occurrences using XLT prompting. In addition, we also observed that Llama3.1 refused to generate responses for five pairs due to the disinformation content.

5.2 Reasoning Errors

We selected 20 random samples incorrectly classified for each LLM and for the CoT and XLT techniques, which we manually reviewed to identify common reasoning errors. For CoT, we also included the version with English translations, which resulted in 420 annotated samples overall. Our analysis revealed several types of errors, particularly those contributing to false positives.

The most frequent error stemmed from **incorrect reasoning due to topic similarity** (around 65%), where the LLM misclassified posts and fact-checked claims as relevant based solely on shared topics. This was especially common for topics like COVID-19 or vaccination and cases when both statements are attributed to the same person. Additionally, some incorrectly identified samples exhibit contradictory reasoning (approximately 7%), mostly attributed to Mistral 7B with CoT. For example, while individual statements are correctly classified as irrelevant, the LLM focused on the topic similarity rather than the actual irrelevance, leading to misclassifications (see Appendix H.1).

Other reasoning errors arise from **missing context in social media posts or fact-checked claims**, particularly when they reference images or videos that LLMs cannot process or lack key information needed to determine the relevance. Since we were aware of the issue with images and videos, we ignored posts that contained visual information through links or embedded images and videos during the selection process for our annotation. However, some of the posts were missing URL links, but referred to images. Therefore, such posts with visual information are still included in the dataset.

6 Discussion

Multilingual Previously Fact-Checked Claim Detection and Low-Resource Languages. Our experiments revealed that LLMs work reasonably well in English and high-resource languages, demonstrating robust capabilities in detecting previously fact-checked claims. However, a notable performance gap persists for some low-resource languages and those with non-Latin scripts. This disparity emphasizes the need for tailored adaptations, particularly for non-English settings.

Superiority of Translations-Based Approaches. Translation-based approaches were particularly effective for low-resource languages and non-Latin scripts, as well as when using 10B- LLMs. Translating inputs into English (using machine translation) allows LLMs to benefit from their extensive training in English, which typically provides more robust results. This method is useful in scenarios where processing of low-resource languages would otherwise lead to suboptimal outcomes.

Prompting Techniques. No single prompting technique emerged as universally superior across all settings. Zero-shot was beneficial for high-resource languages but did not work well with low-resource languages due to limited contextual understanding and sparse pre-training data. Few-shot prompting showed improvements in low-resource languages, but required carefully selected samples.

For high-resource scenarios, using larger LLMs with few-shot prompting in the original language provides reliable results across languages. In contrast, resource-constrained scenarios benefited from combining 10B- LLMs, CoT and translation-based approaches. These findings emphasize that the choice of technique should be guided by specific languages and other considerations.

7 Conclusion

This paper provides a comprehensive evaluation of seven LLMs, ranging from 7B up to 123B parameters, for detecting previously fact-checked claims in monolingual and cross-lingual settings. We created and released the dataset consisting of 16,000 manually annotated pairs of posts and fact-checked claims. Among the LLMs, Mistral Large and C4AI Command R+ achieved the best performance. In contrast, the Qwen2.5 7B model exhibited strong capabilities with Chain-of-Though prompting, outperforming LLMs with significantly larger param-

eter counts. These findings underscore the importance of both LLM selection and prompting strategies in optimizing performance for previously fact-checked claim detection tasks.

Limitations

Model selection. Our study focused on state-of-the-art large language models that are openly available. We excluded closed-source models like GPT-4 since our experiments required analyzing token probabilities, which are only accessible in open-source models. Additionally, open-source models offer greater experimental control compared to closed-source LLMs. Furthermore, our analysis considered models released prior to the second half of 2024, which marked the primary research period of this study.

Language support. The selected LLMs exhibit varying degrees of multilingual capabilities, ranging from primarily English-centric models to those supporting 29 languages. While model cards indicate intended language support, the models may demonstrate capabilities in additional languages due to the training data diversity and potential data contamination. Our analysis spans 20 languages across different language families and writing systems, making multilingual support a key selection criterion. Although some languages in our study lack explicit support in any of the evaluated models, we assume that the models might still demonstrate some capacity to assess text similarity in these languages. This setup enabled us to evaluate the models' multilingual capabilities and compare their performance for PFCD across different languages.

Language detection for error analysis. For error analysis of LLM outputs, we employed language identification using two tools, especially FastText and langdetect. Due to the varying accuracy across different languages (mostly concerned with low-resource languages), we employed both tools in parallel for the final language analysis. Outputs were identified as a different language than English when both tools agreed on identifying a non-English language, providing a more robust detection mechanism for language-related errors in model responses. However, the performance of these tools can vary across languages, and their performance can be lower for low-resource languages, which can result in incorrect identification of the

language for some inputs.

Ethical Consideration

Inteded Use. The annotated dataset is intended primarily for research purposes and is derived from the existing *MultiClaim* dataset (Pikuliak et al., 2023). In our work, we selected a subset of *MultiClaim* and annotated a portion of the data, specifically assessing the relevance between social media posts and fact-checked claims. Along with the dataset, we also release code to reproduce our results. Both the datasets and code are only for research use, and reproducing the results requires access to the original *MultiClaim* dataset.

Usage of AI assistants. We have used the AI assistant for grammar checks and sentence structure improvements. We have not used AI assistants in the research process beyond the experiments detailed in the Methodology section (Sec. 3).

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by *DisAI - Improving scientific excellence and creativity in combating disinformation with artificial intelligence and language technologies*, a project funded by Horizon Europe under GA No.101079164, and by *MODERMED*, a project funded by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under GA No. APVV-22-0414.

This work was supported by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic through the e-INFRA CZ (ID:90254).

References

- Esma Aïmeur, Sabine Amri, and Gilles Brassard. 2023. Fake news, disinformation and misinformation in social media: a review. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 13(1):30.
- Alberto Barrón-Cedeño, Tamer Elsayed, Preslav Nakov, Giovanni Da San Martino, Maram Hasanain, Reem Suwaileh, Fatima Haouari, Nikolay Babulkov, Bayan Hamdan, Alex Nikolov, Shaden Shaar, and Zien Sheikh Ali. 2020. Overview of checkthat! 2020: Automatic identification and verification of claims in social media. In *Experimental IR Meets Multilinguality, Multimodality, and Interaction*, pages 215–236. Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child,

- Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. [Language models are few-shot learners](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Eun Cheol Choi and Emilio Ferrara. 2024a. [Automated claim matching with large language models: Empowering fact-checkers in the fight against misinformation](#). In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024, WWW '24*, page 1441–1449, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Eun Cheol Choi and Emilio Ferrara. 2024b. [Fact-gpt: Fact-checking augmentation via claim matching with llms](#). In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024, WWW '24*, page 883–886, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Cohere For AI. 2024. [c4ai-command-r-plus-08-2024 \(revision dfda5ab\)](#).
- 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, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Allonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, Danny Wyatt, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Govind Thattai, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Milon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jack Zhang, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Jung-teng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Karthik Prasad, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Kushal Lakhotia, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Maria Tsimpoukelli, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kam-badur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Ning Zhang, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohan Maheswari, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparthi, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collet, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gonguet, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vitor Albiero, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xide Xia, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuwei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papanikos, Aaditya Singh, Aayushi Srivastava, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Amos Teo, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Dong, Annie Franco, Anuj Goyal, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Ce Liu, Changhan Wang, Changkyu Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Cynthia Gao, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, Dingkang Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Eric-Tuan Le, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun,

- Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Filippos Kokkinos, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hakan Inan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Hongyuan Zhan, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Ilias Leontiadis, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Janice Lam, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kiran Jagadeesh, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabza, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Miao Liu, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usunier, Nikhil Mehta, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratanchandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Rangaprabhu Parthasarathy, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sachin Mehta, Sachin Siby, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Mahajan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shishir Patil, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Summer Deng, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury, Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Koehler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaojian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yaniv Kleinman, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yu Zhao, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yunlu Li, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, Zhiwei Zhao, and Zhiyu Ma. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Momchil Hardalov, Anton Chernyavskiy, Ivan Koychev, Dmitry Ilvovsky, and Preslav Nakov. 2022. [Crowd-Checked: Detecting previously fact-checked claims in social media](#). In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 266–285, Online only. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Andrea Hrckova, Robert Moro, Ivan Srba, Jakub Simko, and Maria Bielikova. 2024. [Autonomation, not automation: Activities and needs of fact-checkers as a basis for designing human-centered ai systems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2211.12143.
- Haoyang Huang, Tianyi Tang, Dongdong Zhang, Xin Zhao, Ting Song, Yan Xia, and Furu Wei. 2023. [Not all languages are created equal in LLMs: Improving multilingual capability by cross-lingual-thought prompting](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 12365–12394, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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 elio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth ee Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.06825.
- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Matthijs Douze, H erve J egou, and Tomas Mikolov. 2016. [Fasttext.zip: Compressing text classification models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03651*.
- Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. 2017. [Bag of tricks for efficient text classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 427–431, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ashkan Kazemi, Kiran Garimella, Devin Gaffney, and Scott Hale. 2021. [Claim matching beyond English to scale global fact-checking](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4504–4517, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Nicholas Micallef, Vivienne Armacost, Nasir Memon, and Sameer Patil. 2022. [True or false: Studying the work practices of professional fact-checkers](#). *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.*, 6(CSCW1).
- Mistral AI Team. 2024. [Large enough](#).
- Preslav Nakov, David Corney, Maram Hasanain, Firoj Alam, Tamer Elsayed, Alberto Barrón-Cedeño, Paolo Papotti, Shaden Shaar, and Giovanni Da San Martino. 2021. [Automated fact-checking for assisting human fact-checkers](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, pages 4551–4558. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Survey Track.
- Anna Neumann, Dorothea Kolossa, and Robert M Nickel. 2023. [Deep learning-based claim matching with multiple negatives training](#). In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Natural Language and Speech Processing (ICNLSP 2023)*, pages 134–139, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Matúš Pikuliak, Ivan Srba, Robert Moro, Timo Hromadka, Timotej Smoleň, Martin Melišek, Ivan Vykopal, Jakub Simko, Juraj Podroužek, and Maria Bielikova. 2023. [Multilingual previously fact-checked claim retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16477–16500, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shaden Shaar, Nikolay Babulkov, Giovanni Da San Martino, and Preslav Nakov. 2020. [That is a known lie: Detecting previously fact-checked claims](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3607–3618, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shaden Shaar, Nikola Georgiev, Firoj Alam, Giovanni Da San Martino, Aisha Mohamed, and Preslav Nakov. 2022. [Assisting the human fact-checkers: Detecting all previously fact-checked claims in a document](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 2069–2080, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Shlisselberg and Shiri Dori-Hacohen. 2022. Riet lab at checkthat!-2022: Improving decoder based re-ranking for claim matching. In *CLEF (Working Notes)*, pages 671–678.
- Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. [The spread of true and false news online](#). *Science*, 359(6380):1146–1151.
- Ivan Vykopal, Matúš Pikuliak, Simon Ostermann, and Marián Šimko. 2024. [Generative large language models in automated fact-checking: A survey](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.02351.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Linjun Yang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2024. [Multilingual e5 text embeddings: A technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.05672.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. 2024. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '22*, Red Hook, NY, USA. Curran Associates Inc.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. 2024. [Qwen2 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.10671.

A Computational Resources

For our experiments, we leveraged a computational infrastructure consisting of A40 PCIe 40GB, A100 80GB and H100 NVL 94GB NVIDIA GPUs while our experiments ran in parallel on multiple GPUs. In total, our experiments required approximately 1500 GPU hours.

B Characteristics of Human Annotators

For the purpose of annotating a subset of *MultiClaim* data, we employed six annotators. The annotators are all from our research team with backgrounds in artificial intelligence and fact-checking. The annotation involved three men and three women, all from European countries, aged between 20 and 30 years.

C Analyzed Languages

All languages and language pairs that are included in our experiments are listed in Table 3 along with the proportion of relevant pairs annotated by human annotators.

Moreover, Table 4 reports the proportion of relevant pairs identified for each language and language pair out of 400 pairs for each of them.

Code	Language	Average WC Posts	Average WC FC claims	# posts	# FC claims
ara	Arabic	57.26 ± 92.63	30.82 ± 49.46	69	825
bul	Bulgarian	169.18 ± 238.08	11.95 ± 3.87	40	118
ces	Czech	151.54 ± 181.16	11.09 ± 8.87	56	201
deu	German	114.74 ± 146.74	19.90 ± 17.08	60	558
ell	Greek	120.62 ± 237.78	19.67 ± 8.47	40	271
eng	English	195.66 ± 266.51	23.92 ± 30.45	111	2651
fra	French	129.27 ± 152.93	18.52 ± 12.33	55	823
hbs	Serbo-Croatian	130.70 ± 162.29	23.77 ± 25.12	40	405
hin	Hindi	46.95 ± 39.16	24.20 ± 14.18	43	326
hun	Hungarian	127.51 ± 155.68	10.68 ± 3.60	55	111
kor	Korean	95.19 ± 103.14	9.96 ± 7.19	48	172
msa	Malay	146.50 ± 196.29	13.42 ± 5.61	50	576
mya	Burmese	51.91 ± 52.08	7.78 ± 5.79	42	75
nld	Dutch	110.17 ± 113.22	21.24 ± 18.72	45	240
pol	Polish	139.75 ± 173.43	20.38 ± 15.63	71	808
por	Portuguese	105.28 ± 121.96	37.29 ± 61.69	40	1242
ron	Romanian	126.65 ± 140.73	13.78 ± 4.60	40	131
slk	Slovak	222.77 ± 562.15	13.61 ± 8.63	91	154
spa	Spanish	91.06 ± 142.76	20.55 ± 13.08	61	366
tha	Thai	82.50 ± 66.99	4.00 ± 2.92	55	137

Table 3: Statistics of *AMC-16K* dataset. We provide the averaged word count (WC) with standard deviation for posts and fact-checked claims (FC claims). We also calculated the number of posts and fact-checked claims for each language.

D Dataset

Our dataset encompasses several popular topics, primarily related to COVID-19, the Russia-Ukraine war, vaccination, migration, and election fraud. Additionally, it includes the misattributed claims involving various politicians or public figures, such as Donald Trump, Greta Thunberg or George Orwell. Furthermore, the dataset covers region-specific topics that are prevalent in certain countries, such as claims related to Slovak politics or protests in specific regions.

E Prompt Templates

To evaluate the capabilities of LLMs to identify the relevance between social media posts and fact-checked claims, we utilized five prompting techniques, which are commonly employed in experiments with LLMs. In Figure 9, we provide templates and system prompts used to instruct LLMs for different prompting strategies. Our experiments include *zero-shot*, *zero-shot with task description*, *few-shot with task description*, *Chain-of-Thought* and *Cross-Lingual-Thought* prompting.

Few-Shot Prompting Selection. The demonstrations used for few-shot prompting were drawn from a subset of manually annotated data from [Pikuliak et al. \(2023\)](#), which consists of 3390 manually annotated pairs of social media posts and fact-checked claims. We excluded from this initial seed overlapping social media posts to prevent bias, resulting in 3310 multilingual samples.

Languages	Relevant pairs [%]	Language pairs (post - fact-check)	Relevant pairs [%]
ara	20.00	spa - eng	17.50
bul	11.25	hin - eng	5.25
ces	16.50	eng - ara	5.25
deu	30.25	fra - eng	12.00
ell	26.75	deu - eng	15.25
eng	38.50	eng - por	6.00
fra	19.25	spa - por	1.50
hbs	19.50	deu - fra	16.75
hin	22.25	slk - ces	7.50
hun	13.75	slk - eng	36.25
kor	13.25	pol - hbs	11.00
msa	36.00	ces - eng	22.50
mya	9.50	ces - pol	9.00
nld	20.00	nld - deu	12.25
pol	20.25	msa - ara	2.25
por	31.75	kor - eng	27.50
ron	11.50	mya - msa	0.50
slk	14.25	ara - fra	2.25
spa	23.50	hun - pol	13.75
tha	12.25	tha - por	7.75

Table 4: List of analyzed languages and language pairs in our experiments along with the proportion of relevant pairs annotated by human annotators out of 400 pairs. Each language and language combination consists of 400 pairs.

To select demonstrations for a particular pair of social media posts and fact-checked claims, we employed the selection based on the similarity between input and demonstrations. However, our analyzed samples and samples from the demonstrations pool consist of two texts, especially social media posts and fact-checked claims. To address this issue, we first calculated the similarity between the input social media post and social media posts from the seed pool and the similarity between the input fact-checked claim and fact-checked claims from the seed pool. This resulted in two similarity scores for each sample, one similarity between posts and another between fact-checked claims. To obtain only one similarity for each sample, we multiplied those two similarity scores to get the overall similarity between the analyzed pair and the pair from the demonstration pool. Furthermore, the top five positive (*Yes*) and five negative (*No*) samples were selected and randomly ordered in the prompt.

F Preliminary Experiments

Before conducting the experiments on all the data annotated in our study, we explored the performance of 16 open-sourced LLMs in zero-shot settings to identify a final list of models for the final experiments. These LLMs included various models of sizes ranging from 7B up to 123B parameters and with different model families, such as Llama,

	Zero-Shot	Zero-Shot Task Description	Few-Shot Task Description	Chain-of-Thought	Cross-Lingual- Thought Prompting
System Prompt		<p>You are a fact-checker responsible for determining the relevance of previously debunked claims to a given social media post. Your task is to assess if the claim is relevant to the post and whether it is possible to infer main statements from the post from the debunked claim.</p> <p>Based on your analysis, provide one of the following answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Yes' if the claim is relevant to the social media post. - 'No' if the debunked claim is not relevant to the social media post. 	<p>You are a fact-checker responsible for determining the relevance of previously debunked claims to a given social media post. Your task is to assess if the claim is relevant to the post and whether it is possible to infer main statements from the post from the debunked claim.</p> <p>Based on your analysis, provide one of the following answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Yes' if the claim is relevant to the social media post. - 'No' if the debunked claim is not relevant to the social media post. 	<p>You are a fact-checker responsible for determining the relevance of previously debunked claims to a given social media post. Your task is to assess if the claim is relevant to the post and whether it is possible to infer main statements from the post from the debunked claim.</p> <p>Based on your analysis, provide one of the following answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Yes' if the claim is relevant to the social media post. - 'No' if the debunked claim is not relevant to the social media post. 	
Template	<p>Claim: {document}</p> <p>Post: {query}</p> <p>Is the claim relevant to the social media post? Respond with a single word, either "Yes" or "No", in English only.</p>	<p>Claim: {document}</p> <p>Post: {query}</p> <p>Is the claim relevant to the social media post? Respond with a single word, either "Yes" or "No", in English only.</p>	<p>{ 5 negative and 5 positive examples in random order }</p> <p>Claim: {document}</p> <p>Post: {query}</p> <p>Answer:</p>	<p>Claim: {document}</p> <p>Post: {query}</p> <p>Let's think step by step.</p>	<p>I want you to act as a fact-checker.</p> <p>Claim: {document}</p> <p>Post: {query}</p> <p>You should retitle the claim and the post in English.</p> <p>You should determine whether the claim is relevant to the social media post.</p> <p>You should step-by-step answer the request.</p> <p>You should tell me Yes if the claim is relevant to the post, otherwise No, in this format: Answer: Yes/No.</p>

Figure 9: Thy system prompts and prompt templates for all prompting strategies used in our experiments. System prompts are the same for zero-shot and few-shot with task descriptions and also for CoT prompting.

Model	Zero-Shot	Zero-Shot + Task description
Mistral 7B	0.70 (0.77)	0.70 (0.77)
Qwen2 7B	0.68 (0.79)	0.68 (0.79)
Qwen2.5 7B	0.73 (0.82)	<u>0.81 (0.88)</u>
Llama3 8B	0.68 (0.72)	<u>0.69 (0.73)</u>
Llama3.1 8B	0.58 (0.60)	0.72 (0.78)
AYA Expanse 8B	0.72 (0.81)	0.71 (0.77)
AYA Expanse 32B	0.77 (0.86)	0.67 (0.79)
AYA 35B	0.72 (0.86)	0.82 (0.88)
C4AI Command R 35B	0.77 (0.81)	0.57 (0.59)
Llama3 70B	0.71 (0.76)	0.70 (0.74)
Llama3.1 70B	0.79 (0.88)	0.71 (0.74)
Llama3.1 Nemotron 70B	0.79 (0.88)	0.58 (0.81)
Qwen2 72B	0.79 (0.84)	0.78 (0.82)
Qwen2.5 72B	0.81 (0.87)	0.75 (0.78)
C4AI Command R+ 104B	0.84 (0.90)	0.80 (0.84)
Mistral Large 123B	<u>0.84 (0.88)</u>	0.74 (0.78)

Table 5: Preliminary experiments with 16 LLMs using zero-shot settings (with and without task description). We report *Macro F1 (Accuracy)* in each cell. The best result is in **bold**, and the second best is underlined.

Qwen, Mistral, etc.

For the purpose of the preliminary experiments, we leveraged manually annotated data from (Piku-liak et al., 2023), which consists of 3900 annotated pairs of social media posts and fact-checked claims (1212 are in monolingual and 2178 are in cross-lingual settings). We investigated whether these LLMs are able to predict the relevance between two texts and the best models were selected for the final experiments. Table 5 presents the results obtained in zero-shot settings with and without providing the task description.

The results demonstrated that without using the

task description, the **C4AI Command R+ model performed the best**, while **Mistral Large obtained comparable results**. In contrast, AYA 35B proved to be effective when the task description was provided to the model. Based on these preliminary results, we categorized the models into two categories: 10B- LLMs and 70B+ LLMs. We decided not to include LLMs with a parameter size between 10 and 70 billion and to focus only on the comparison of the above-mentioned categories. As LLMs with over 70B parameters, Llama3.1, Qwen2.5, C4AI Command R+ and Mistral Large proved to be the most capable models for further exploration. On the other hand, we extended a list of LLMs with three models with less than 10B parameters from the same model families, especially Llama3.1 8B, Qwen2.5 7B and Mistral 7B.

For our final experiments, we excluded older versions of the Qwen (Qwen2) and Llama (Llama3) models, as well as the AYA Expanse 8B model, which performed worse when incorporating task description into the prompt. The Mistral 7B model was selected to ensure both smaller and larger counterparts of the same model were represented, specifically as a smaller counterpart to the Mistral Large model.

G Additional Results

In this section, we present additional results and findings based on our experiments with LLMs to identify relevant pairs of social media posts and fact-checked claims in both monolingual and cross-lingual settings. The overall results with the best combination of the LLM and prompting techniques

are illustrated in Figure 14.

G.1 Monolingual Evaluation

The evaluation of the monolingual performance of 70B+ LLMs across languages is shown in Figure 10 and for 10B- LLMs is shown in Figure 11. The results demonstrated that for some languages, the performance is lower than for others, especially languages such as Czech, Hungarian, Polish, and Slovak. This confirms our previous findings that LLMs have lower capabilities in Slavic languages.

G.2 Cross-Lingual Evaluation

Table 12 shows the cross-lingual performance of 70B+ LLMs. In addition, the results for models with less than 10B parameters are illustrated in Figure 13.

Along with the Macro F1 scores, we also calculated True Negative Rate (TNR) and False Negative Rate (FNR). The results are shown in Table 10.

G.3 Experiments with Optimized Thresholds

Since we store the probabilities of *Yes* and *No* tokens, we conducted experiments to identify the optimal threshold for each combination of models and prompting techniques. This investigation is problematic for CoT and XLT prompting because the final prediction can be anywhere in the predicted response. Therefore, we limited our investigation only to zero-shot and few-shot results, where only the final prediction is generated.

To identify the optimal threshold and the resulting performance, we calculated *Youden’s index* and selected the threshold with the highest *Youden’s index*. The Macro F1 performance and thresholds are shown in Table 6. The final thresholds demonstrate that most LLMs generated *Yes* tokens with a high probability, which resulted in higher optimal thresholds.

Many of the optimal thresholds are close to 0 or 1, suggesting that the model assigns probabilities near these extremes, resulting in fewer predictions distributed across the intermediate range. A manual review of the predicted probabilities revealed that LLMs, particularly larger ones, often exhibited high confidence in their predictions, frequently assigning a high probability to the predicted class.

H Error analysis

Table 7 outlines the frequency of *output consistency errors* across LLMs and prompting techniques when using the original language (Og) or

Model	Zero-Shot		Zero-Shot + Task Description		Few-Shot + Task Description	
	Threshold	Macro F1	Threshold	Macro F1	Threshold	Macro F1
<i>LLMs with more than 70B parameters (70B+ LLMs)</i>						
Mistral Large 123B	0.99	0.76	1.00	0.84	0.83	<u>0.78</u>
C4AI Command R+ 104B	0.10	<u>0.75</u>	0.22	<u>0.79</u>	0.15	0.73
Qwen 2.5 72B Instruct	0.55	0.71	1.00	0.78	0.30	0.79
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	0.78	0.72	0.87	0.76	0.08	0.62
<i>LLMs with less than 10B parameters (10B- LLMs)</i>						
Llama 3.1 8B Instruct	0.94	0.64	0.61	0.73	0.60	0.48
Qwen 2.5 7 B Instruct	0.05	0.61	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.73
Mistral v3 7B	0.75	0.63	0.84	0.64	0.73	0.55

Table 6: The Macro F1 performance of LLMs based on optimal thresholds calculated using *Youden’s index*.

Model	Prompting technique	Incorrect language	Repeating sequences	Refusal
Mistral Large 123B	CoT (Og)	0	0	0
	CoT (En)	0	0	0
	XLT (Og)	0	16	0
C4AI Command R+	CoT (Og)	3	0	0
	CoT (En)	0	0	0
	XLT (Og)	0	4	0
Qwen2.5 72B Instruct	CoT (Og)	0	0	0
	CoT (En)	0	0	0
	XLT (Og)	8	11	0
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	CoT (Og)	5970	0	0
	CoT (En)	1	2	0
	XLT (Og)	20	<u>33</u>	0
Llama 3.1 8B Instruct	CoT (Og)	<u>4556</u>	215	<u>1</u>
	CoT (En)	0	5	3
	XLT (Og)	11	0	<u>1</u>
Qwen2.5 7B Instruct	CoT (Og)	7	1	0
	CoT (En)	0	0	0
	XLT (Og)	2	1	0
Mistral 7B v3	CoT (Og)	0	0	0
	CoT (En)	0	0	0
	XLT (Og)	23	0	0

Table 7: Summary of the frequency of *output consistency errors* across different LLMs and prompting techniques. The Llama3.1 models exhibited the highest number of such errors.

English translation (En). The Llama3.1 8B model demonstrated significant issues, producing over 4,500 outputs in the incorrect language and more than 200 outputs containing repeating sequences.

For incorrect language errors, we identified the most problematic languages for specific LLMs. The Llama3.1 70B model, when using CoT prompting, struggled the most with French (733×), German (607×), or Serbo-Croatian (498×). In contrast, the Llama3.1 8B model encountered the most errors with Polish (568×), Czech (481×), or Dutch (406×). Additionally, other models exhibited most of the errors in generating outputs for the Burmese language.

work. This claim is about the effectiveness of the vaccine in preventing hospitalizations.

2. The social media post shares information from a friend who works in a retirement home in Graz. It mentions that 75 residents were vaccinated, and 9 are still alive. This post appears to be making a claim about the vaccine's effectiveness in preventing deaths, specifically in a retirement home setting.

Now, let's analyze the relevance:

- Both the debunked claim and the social media post are related to the effectiveness of the Covid-19 vaccine.

- However, the debunked claim focuses on hospitalizations, while the social media post focuses on deaths in a specific setting (a retirement home).

- The post does not mention hospitalizations, and the debunked claim does not mention deaths in a retirement home.

Considering these points, while both the debunked claim and the social media post are related to vaccine effectiveness, they focus on different aspects (hospitalizations vs. deaths in a specific setting). However, the core idea of questioning vaccine effectiveness is present in both.

Answer: Yes

H.2.2 Example #5 - Missing Context

Post (En): A message from a month ago at news.cafe.....

Fact-check (En): Photo of Dutch protests is current

Ground truth relevance: No

Model: C4AI Command R+ using CoT prompting

Generated response: Reasoning: The claim and the social media post refer to different time frames. While the claim suggests that the photo is from a recent event, the post indicates that the message is from a month ago.

Answer: Yes

H.2.3 Example #6 - Contradiction

Post (En): RIP THE NURSE vaccinated yesterday DIED. Media and politicians try to hide the truth and desperately prevent the grieving family from getting the truth out to the whole world. We have clear proof that their vaccines are made to KILL DEPOPULATION. All the politicians, MEDIA, doctors, etc. - are UNFORTUNATE CRIMINALS, who campaign for these vaccines.. Make criminal complaints against organized criminal group of

organized crime and genocide, qualified premeditated murder, abuse of office This nurse did kill her colleague manlawfully. Was it reckless? Is this injection really safe? Jane's Post update you've all been wa you the to share Not much and probably not what you were wanting to hear he will let us know the The questions can an Caucasian female Time of proximately to 10 hours he thanks all of you for your condolences so bad Me too. My mom doesn't want her name released to the public. They're going to do an to us within 48 hours. She wanted to be cremated so we're doing a small family ceremony. Il keep you updated but it seems my family doesn't want the publicity or her name remembered like that. Conectează-te Ninnyd Waiting 4 t... 10 h Sadly I'm hearing the nurse who collapsed who took the vaccine has since passed away, it seems social media is trying to stop the family from speaking out, yet they are trying to non the less to warn people, I hope this is wrong but from what I've seen it looks to be true. RIP HET US KNOW ENE BUTopay reauna curtir sure they'll say it wasn't vaccine related in the The questions I can answer are Age: 42, Caucasian female. Time of death approximately 8 to 10 hours after vaccine Înregistrează-te She thanks all of you for your condolences. so bad This nurse did her colle maiatulty, whitvélang Is this injection really sale Me too. My mom doesn't want her name released to the public. They're going to do an autopsy and release her body to us within 48 hours. She wanted to be cremated so we're doing a small family ceremonukeen vuundated Poți răspunde la această conversație Ninnyd Waiting 4 ... 20 m

Fact-check (En): Spike proteins in Covid-19 mRNA vaccines are toxic.

Ground truth relevance: No

Model: Mistral 7B with CoT prompting with English translations

Generated response: The social media post is expressing condolences for a nurse who died after receiving a vaccine, and questioning the safety of the vaccine. The debunked claim is that spike proteins in Covid-19 mRNA vaccines are toxic.

While the post does not explicitly mention spike proteins, it does question the safety of the vaccine, which is a common concern raised in relation to the debunked claim. Therefore, it is possible to infer that the debunked claim about spike proteins being toxic could be relevant to the post.

However, it is important to note that the post does not provide evidence to support the claim that

the vaccine caused the nurse's death. The claim that the vaccine is made to kill people is not supported by any evidence and is a conspiracy theory.

Answer: Yes, but with a significant caveat that the claim is not supported by evidence presented in the post.




Figure 10: Monolingual performance evaluation of 70B+ LLMs across individual languages (except those from Figure 6) for different prompting strategies. ZS denotes Zero-Shot, and FS denotes Few-Shot prompting.




Figure 11: Monolingual performance evaluation of 10B- LLMs across individual languages for different prompting strategies. ZS denotes Zero-Shot, and FS denotes Few-Shot prompting.




Figure 12: Cross-lingual performance evaluation of 70B+ LLMs across 20 language pairs for different prompting strategies. ZS denotes Zero-Shot, and FS denotes Few-Shot prompting.




Figure 13: Cross-lingual performance evaluation of 10B-LLMs across eight selected language pairs for different prompting strategies. ZS denotes Zero-Shot, and FS denotes Few-Shot prompting.

Model	Original					English			
	Zero-Shot	Zero-Shot + Task Description	Few-Shot + Task Description	CoT	XLT	Zero-Shot	Zero-Shot + Task Description	Few-Shot + Task Description	CoT
All irrelevant	45.64	45.64	45.64	45.64	45.64	45.64	45.64	45.64	45.64
All relevant	13.83	13.83	13.83	13.83	13.83	13.83	13.83	13.83	13.83
<i>LLMs with more than 70B parameters</i>									
Mistral Large 123B	70.14	73.33	81.88	76.12	78.73	72.04	76.45	80.31	76.12
C4AI Command R+ 104B	76.61	82.02	75.83	62.36	64.17	79.13	79.31	78.52	63.07
Qwen 2.5 72B Instruct	70.94	64.05	80.25	71.70	70.32	73.10	66.22	80.32	73.01
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	66.78	70.43	61.17	72.82	75.61	68.30	71.89	77.10	75.06
<i>LLMs with less than 10B parameters</i>									
Llama 3.1 8B Instruct	48.41	70.81	45.05	66.20	68.68	57.48	74.37	61.00	70.92
Qwen 2.5 7B Instruct	65.57	77.99	72.09	78.63	67.33	65.85	79.20	70.01	78.74
Mistral v3 7B	63.58	63.96	56.02	70.68	62.95	66.84	67.79	66.16	70.63

Table 8: The Macro F1 performance across LLMs and prompting techniques for both original language input and English translations. The best performance is highlighted in **bold**, with the overall best performance for each prompting strategy marked in **green**. The performance worse than the baseline (where all texts are identified as irrelevant) marked in **red**. Only Llama3.1 8B with few-shot prompting achieved lower performance as the baseline.

Model	Original					English			
	Zero-Shot	Zero-Shot + Task Description	Few-Shot + Task Description	CoT	XLT	Zero-Shot	Zero-Shot + Task Description	Few-Shot + Task Description	CoT
All irrelevant	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00	1.00 / 1.00
All relevant	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00	0.00 / 0.00
<i>LLMs with more than 70B parameters</i>									
Mistral Large 123B	0.73 / 0.04	0.77 / 0.04	0.91 / 0.19	0.80 / 0.05	0.85 / 0.10	0.76 / 0.06	0.80 / 0.05	0.87 / 0.13	0.81 / 0.07
C4AI Command R+ 104B	0.97 / 0.51	0.91 / 0.21	0.95 / 0.48	0.63 / 0.06	0.64 / 0.03	0.95 / 0.39	0.86 / 0.12	0.89 / 0.24	0.63 / 0.06
Qwen 2.5 72B Instruct	0.77 / 0.15	0.64 / 0.02	0.88 / 0.14	0.75 / 0.05	0.74 / 0.06	0.84 / 0.27	0.67 / 0.03	0.88 / 0.15	0.77 / 0.06
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	0.70 / 0.09	0.73 / 0.05	0.97 / 0.79	0.79 / 0.13	0.84 / 0.18	0.72 / 0.10	0.75 / 0.06	0.94 / 0.42	0.81 / 0.12
<i>LLMs with less than 10B parameters</i>									
Llama 3.1 8B Instruct	0.42 / 0.06	0.77 / 0.13	0.45 / 0.31	0.72 / 0.17	0.78 / 0.23	0.58 / 0.14	0.82 / 0.17	0.67 / 0.25	0.80 / 0.21
Qwen 2.5 7B Instruct	0.78 / 0.36	0.90 / 0.27	0.96 / 0.58	0.90 / 0.27	0.75 / 0.21	0.91 / 0.62	0.92 / 0.31	0.95 / 0.60	0.91 / 0.29
Mistral v3 7B	0.73 / 0.30	0.70 / 0.21	0.68 / 0.44	0.83 / 0.31	0.75 / 0.35	0.84 / 0.45	0.76 / 0.22	0.83 / 0.44	0.80 / 0.23

Table 9: The capabilities of LLMs in filtering irrelevant and relevant pairs using TNR (higher is better) and FNR (lower is better) metrics. Each cell is presented as TNR / FNR , with the highest TNR and lowest FNR **bolded** for each prompting technique within each model category. C4AI Command R+ and Llama3.1 70B achieved the highest true negative rate, while Qwen2.5 72B achieved the lowest false negative rate.

Model	Version	Zero-Shot		Zero-Shot + Task Description		Few-Shot + Task Description		CoT		XLT	
		Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross	Mono	Cross
<i>LLMs with more than 70B parameters</i>											
Mistral Large 123B	Og	0.71 / 0.04	0.74 / 0.03	0.73 / 0.04	0.79 / 0.04	0.89 / 0.19	0.91 / 0.18	0.81 / 0.05	0.80 / 0.05	0.86 / 0.11	0.84 / 0.09
	En	0.76 / <u>0.06</u>	0.75 / <u>0.06</u>	0.81 / 0.05	0.80 / 0.03	0.87 / <u>0.14</u>	0.88 / <u>0.10</u>	0.81 / 0.07	<u>0.81</u> / 0.06	-	-
C4AI Command R+ 104B	Og	0.96 / 0.42	0.98 / 0.66	0.89 / 0.15	0.94 / 0.32	0.95 / 0.47	0.95 / 0.50	0.61 / 0.05	0.64 / 0.07	0.62 / 0.03	0.67 / 0.03
	En	<u>0.94</u> / 0.38	<u>0.95</u> / 0.40	<u>0.86</u> / 0.13	<u>0.86</u> / 0.12	0.89 / 0.23	0.89 / 0.26	0.63 / 0.06	0.64 / 0.05	-	-
Qwen 2.5 72B Instruct	Og	0.72 / 0.12	0.82 / 0.20	0.62 / 0.02	0.65 / 0.01	0.87 / 0.15	0.88 / 0.12	0.75 / <u>0.06</u>	0.75 / 0.03	0.73 / 0.07	0.75 / 0.05
	En	0.84 / 0.24	0.84 / 0.32	0.67 / <u>0.03</u>	0.67 / <u>0.02</u>	0.87 / 0.15	0.89 / 0.16	0.78 / 0.07	0.76 / <u>0.04</u>	-	-
Llama 3.1 70B Instruct	Og	0.70 / 0.09	0.70 / 0.09	0.71 / 0.06	0.75 / 0.04	0.97 / 0.79	0.98 / 0.80	0.79 / 0.14	0.79 / 0.12	0.83 / 0.17	0.84 / 0.20
	En	0.73 / 0.11	0.72 / 0.09	0.76 / 0.07	0.75 / 0.05	<u>0.94</u> / 0.44	<u>0.94</u> / 0.38	<u>0.82</u> / 0.12	<u>0.81</u> / 0.12	-	-
<i>LLMs with less than 10B parameters</i>											
Llama 3.1 8B Instruct	Og	0.38 / 0.07	0.46 / 0.04	0.73 / 0.13	0.80 / 0.13	0.47 / 0.35	0.44 / 0.24	0.71 / 0.16	0.73 / 0.18	0.78 / 0.23	0.77 / 0.24
	En	0.58 / <u>0.13</u>	0.59 / <u>0.15</u>	0.82 / <u>0.17</u>	0.83 / <u>0.17</u>	0.68 / <u>0.24</u>	0.67 / <u>0.25</u>	0.80 / <u>0.20</u>	0.79 / <u>0.23</u>	-	-
Qwen 2.5 7B Instruct	Og	0.73 / 0.32	0.83 / 0.43	0.89 / 0.24	0.91 / 0.33	0.96 / 0.60	0.96 / 0.56	0.90 / 0.26	0.90 / 0.30	0.70 / 0.20	0.80 / 0.24
	En	<u>0.92</u> / 0.61	<u>0.91</u> / 0.63	<u>0.92</u> / 0.30	<u>0.92</u> / 0.32	<u>0.94</u> / 0.61	<u>0.95</u> / 0.56	<u>0.91</u> / 0.28	<u>0.91</u> / 0.32	-	-
Mistral v3 7B	Og	0.72 / 0.30	0.75 / 0.30	0.68 / 0.18	0.73 / 0.27	0.67 / 0.43	0.69 / 0.45	0.83 / 0.31	0.83 / 0.30	0.74 / 0.33	0.75 / 0.38
	En	0.84 / 0.44	0.84 / 0.46	0.77 / 0.22	0.76 / 0.23	0.84 / 0.44	0.82 / 0.43	0.81 / 0.22	0.79 / 0.24	-	-

Table 10: The comparison of TNR (higher is better) and FNR (lower is better) metrics for each prompting technique in monolingual and cross-lingual settings. The best results (highest TNR and lowest FNR) for the original language are **bolded**, and English translations are underlined for each category of LLMs (10B- vs. 70B+).

