

# Mindful-RAG: A Study of Points of Failure in Retrieval Augmented Generation

Garima Agrawal Tharindu Kumarage Zeyad Alghamdi Huan Liu  
Arizona State University  
{garima.agrawal, kskumara, zalgham1, huanliu}@asu.edu

## ABSTRACT

Large Language Models (LLMs) are proficient at generating coherent and contextually relevant text but face challenges when addressing knowledge-intensive queries in domain-specific and factual question-answering tasks. Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems mitigate this by incorporating external knowledge sources, such as structured knowledge graphs (KGs). However, LLMs often struggle to produce accurate answers despite access to KG-extracted information containing necessary facts. Our study investigates this dilemma by analyzing error patterns in existing KG-based RAG methods and identifying eight critical failure points. We observed that these errors predominantly occur due to insufficient focus on discerning the question’s intent and adequately gathering relevant context from the knowledge graph facts. Drawing on this analysis, we propose the Mindful-RAG approach, a framework designed for intent-based and contextually aligned knowledge retrieval. This method explicitly targets the identified failures and offers improvements in the correctness and relevance of responses provided by LLMs, representing a significant step forward from existing methods.

## KEYWORDS

Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG), Large Language Models (LLMs), Knowledge Graphs Question-Answering (KGQA), Multi-hop QA, Hallucinations, Intent Identification

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Large Language Models (LLMs) excel at numerous natural language tasks, exhibiting human-like proficiency. However, they often generate hallucinated responses to domain-specific or knowledge-intensive queries [14]. In such cases, LLMs require additional relevant contextual knowledge through prompting. Consequently, Retrieval-augmented Generation (RAG) methods have been developed to equip LLMs with the capability to augment and access external knowledge sources [11, 17]. These methods enhance the model’s ability to retrieve relevant information, improving performance in domain-specific question-answering settings. Despite the advancements in this field, RAG methods encounter significant obstacles throughout the augmentation, retrieval, and generation phases due to which LLMs often do not yield correct answers, even when the relevant knowledge is accessible.

In this paper, we examine the application of RAG methods, specifically focusing on instances where LLMs leverage structured knowledge graphs (KGs) as external sources to extract factual information for answering complex queries [4, 12]. These queries typically necessitate intricate reasoning based on the data structure within the KGs. While current knowledge graph-augmented LLMs have

demonstrated notable improvements in addressing simple one-hop queries, their efficacy diminishes as query complexity increases, despite the availability of the required information within the knowledge graph to derive the answer [13].

Our analysis identifies common error patterns in fact retrieval from knowledge graphs, highlighting eight critical points of failure that often lead to incorrect responses. We categorize these failures into two main areas: **Reasoning Failures** and **KG Topology Challenges**. Reasoning Failures include difficulties that LLMs encounter in understanding questions and leveraging contextual clues, hindering their ability to align queries with relevant information. These issues also involve struggles with intricacies such as temporal context and response aggregation and complexities in relational reasoning. KG Topology Challenges relate to structural problems in the knowledge base that affect the information access or lead to inefficient processing, thereby affecting model performance.

Building on our analysis, we introduce **Mindful-RAG**, a novel methodology designed for intent-driven and contextually coherent knowledge retrieval. Unlike traditional methods that rely on semantic similarity or structural cues of knowledge base, **Mindful-RAG** uses the model’s intrinsic parametric knowledge to accurately discern the intent of the question. This guides the retrieval process, ensuring the relevance of the extracted context from the KG. The approach includes contextual alignment for efficient navigation of the KG and a validation step to ensure the response aligns with the original intent. Enhancing how LLMs understand and respond to complex queries, Mindful-RAG significantly advances over current methods, delivering more accurate and contextually appropriate responses. Our experiments on two KGQA benchmark datasets, WebQSP and MetaQA, showed improvements over existing state-of-the-art methods. This approach notably reduces reasoning errors by focusing on intent and contextual alignment.

In summary, our study makes the following key contributions:

- (1) We conduct a comprehensive error analysis of KG-based RAG methods used in question-answering tasks, identifying eight critical types of failure points.
- (2) We identify a common theme among these failure points: the models’ inability to comprehend the intent behind questions and their subsequent struggle to contextually align with the information provided by the KG.
- (3) We propose a novel research direction to enhance the RAG pipeline. This involves adopting a fresh perspective and utilizing LLM’s parametric memory to discern question intent better and achieve contextual alignment with the knowledge.

Error Category	Error Type	Description	Representative Failed Example(s)
	<b>Misinterpretation of Question’s Context</b>	LLMs misinterprets the question or fails to understand specific requirement of the question.	- Failed to relate the birthplace of <i>Justin Bieber</i> to his country of birth because it focused on city-level information instead of the higher geographical context needed. - Failed to identify the location of <i>Fukushima Daiichi</i> nuclear plant. The model used the relation <i>street_address</i> and chose city, <i>‘Fukushima’</i> as answer instead of town <i>‘Okuma’</i> and country <i>‘Japan’</i> as the correct answer.
	<b>Incorrect Relation Mapping</b>	LLMs often chooses relations that do not correctly address the question.	- For a question about where <i>Andy Murray</i> started playing tennis, choosing <i>people.person.place_of_birth</i> suggests a misunderstanding of what the question was asking.
	<b>Ambiguity in Question or Data</b>	LLMs failed to identify the key terms and their meanings or implications across various contexts from the provided KG triples.	- Could not identify the <i>Serbian language</i> from the list of languages spoken in <i>Serbia</i> . It also failed to recognize in another query that it is about the <i>“most” exported item</i> , not just <i>any exported item</i> .
<b>Reasoning Failures</b>	<b>Specificity or Precision Errors</b>	LLMs often misinterpret questions that require aggregated responses as specific, singular answers. They also struggle to understand and apply temporal context, failing to accurately filter information by time and date.	- Model picked the <i>year 2000</i> as <i>George W. Bush’s</i> election year without considering the context that he was elected twice ( <i>2000 and 2004</i> ). - Another instance is the model picking the first name, <i>‘Sue Douglas,’</i> to appear in the spouse list of <i>‘Niall Ferguson’</i> instead of finding the current spouse, <i>‘Ayaan Hirsi Ali,’</i> without considering that a person may have multiple spouses or ex-spouses.
	<b>Constraint Identification Error</b>	LLMs failed to correctly identify or apply constraints provided or implied in the question.	- Could not effectively narrow the search for <i>Jackie Robinson’s</i> first team. For another question, <i>Who played Bilbo in Lord of the Rings?</i> , LLMs identified <i>“Old Bilbo”</i> and specific films from the series as constraints. However, it failed to parse these constraints correctly to derive a single definitive answer.
	<b>Encoding Issues</b>	The compound value types (CVT) in knowledge graphs represent complex data to maintain schema hierarchy and detail relationships. However, if mismanaged or unrecognized by LLMs, the model may stop processing and misinterpret them as final answers.	
<b>KG Topology Challenges</b>	<b>Incomplete Answer</b>	The exact match (EM) module only accepts fully correct answers and sometimes fails due to misinterpreting the required depth of information or misaligning with the expected answer format.	
	<b>Limited Query Processing</b>	These instances occur when the model recognizes that further information is required for a conclusive answer, yet receives no feedback, indicating a gap in programming or query processing.	

Table 1: KG-Based RAG Failure Analysis

## 2 KG-BASED RAG FAILURE ANALYSIS

Various methodologies have been developed to enhance LLMs with KG-based RAG systems. By leveraging structured and meticulously curated knowledge from these graphs, the retrieved information is more likely to be factually accurate.

We assessed the effectiveness of these methods and analyzed their accuracy in retrieving information for fact-based question-answering (QA) tasks using a KG. Although most of these models surpass the performance of zero-shot QA conducted directly from various standard LLMs, there is still considerable scope for improvement. For our study, we selected the WebQuestionsSP (WebQSP) [23] dataset for knowledge graph question answering (KGQA), which is frequently utilized by KG-based RAG methods. This dataset, based on the Freebase KG [9], consists of questions that require up to two-hop reasoning to identify the correct answer entity, utilizing Hits@*k* as the evaluation metric to determine if the top-*k* predicted answer is accurate. It includes approximately 1600 test samples. The vanilla ChatGPT (GPT-3.5) accuracy in zero-shot setting without any external knowledge is 61.2%.

StructGPT [15] is a state-of-the-art approach that leverages LLM’s capabilities for reasoning with evidence extracted from a

KG. This method involves extracting a sub-graph from a KG by matching the topic entities in the question. The LLM is then directly employed to identify useful relations and extract relevant triples from the sub-graph, guiding it to effectively traverse and reason within the graph structure. The Hits@1 accuracy of StructGPT on the WebQSP dataset, when utilizing ChatGPT (GPT-3.5) for question-answering tasks, was reported to be 72.6%. In this study, we have selected StructGPT as our reference model to analyze the current SOTA developments of KG-based RAGs in the QA setting.

We initiated our analysis by examining all the failure instances of StructGPT on WebQSP. We meticulously reviewed the logs of 435 error cases to decipher the behavior of LLMs throughout the reasoning process. This detailed scrutiny allowed us to pinpoint the error patterns in LLMs, as evidenced by these cases. Our analysis identified that these errors predominantly fall into eight categories, outlined below. We further categorize these issues into two primary divisions: *Reasoning Failures*, which involve errors stemming from reasoning deficiencies, and *KG Topology Challenges*, which encompass various structural issues.

**Reasoning Failures:** Most failures stem from the LLMs’ inability to reason correctly. These issues primarily include a failure to accurately understand the question, leading to difficulty in mapping the question to the available information. Additionally, LLMs struggle to effectively apply the clues in the question to narrow down the relevant entities. They also often fail to apply specific constraints that logically limit the search space. Generally, LLMs have difficulty grasping specifics such as temporal context, aggregating or summarizing answers, and disambiguating among multiple choices. Furthermore, they frequently choose incorrect relations, particularly in complex queries requiring multi-hop reasoning, finding it challenging to focus on the relevant elements necessary to formulate an answer. In Table 1, we detail various reasoning failures, each illustrated with an example.

**KG Topology Challenges:** These issues arise when knowledge is inaccessible due to limitations in the knowledge base’s structural design or inefficient processing. In Table 1, we categorize all such issues under challenges related to the KG topology.

In this work, our primary focus is addressing errors resulting from reasoning failures in LLM models and enhancing their reasoning capabilities. An analysis of samples across five reasoning error types highlights two main challenges. ③ The models often fail to grasp the question’s intent, primarily relying on structural cues and semantic similarity to extract relevant relations and derive answers. ④ They struggle with aligning the context of the question with the available information. This inability to comprehend the intent and context leads to incorrect relations ranking and misuse of constraints. A review of response logs from failed and successful interactions shows that LLMs provide answers based mostly on semantic matching. This method works for simple queries but is inadequate for complex questions requiring multi-hop reasoning and extensive contextual understanding. Hence, enhancing intent identification and context alignment is crucial for improving model performance.

### 3 MINDFUL-RAG

In response to our findings, we introduce a novel approach called **Mindful-RAG**, which targets the two critical gaps mentioned above: the lack of question-intent identification and the insufficient contextual alignment with available knowledge. This method utilizes a strategic hybrid method that integrates the model’s intrinsic parametric knowledge with non-parametric external knowledge from a KG. The following steps provide a detailed overview of our design and methodology, illustrated with an example.

- **Step ① Identify Key Entities and Relevant Tokens:** The first step is to pinpoint the key entities within a question to facilitate the extraction of pertinent information from an external KG or a sub-graph within a KG. Additionally, in our method, we task the LLM model with identifying other significant tokens that may be crucial for answering the question. For instance, consider the question from WebQSP, “**Who is Niall Ferguson’s wife?**” The key entity identified by the model is ‘Niall Ferguson’, and the other relevant token is ‘wife’.
- **Step ② Identify the Intent:** In this step, we leverage the LLM’s understanding to discern the intent behind the

question, prompting it to focus on keywords and phrases that clarify the depth and scope of the intent. For instance, in the provided example, the model identifies the question’s intent as “*identify spouse*”.

- **Step ③ Identify the Context:** Next, we instruct the model to understand and analyze the context of the question, which is essential for formulating an accurate response. For the provided example, the model identifies relevant contextual aspects such as “*personal relationships*,” “*marital status*,” and “*current spouse*.”
- **Step ④ Candidate Relation Extraction:** We extract key entity relations from the sub-graph within a one-hop distance. For our example, the candidate relations include information about the subject’s profession, personal life, and societal role.
- **Step ⑤ Intent-based Filtering and Context-based Ranking of Relations:** In this step, we direct the model to conduct a detailed analysis to filter and rank relations and entities based on the question’s intent, ensuring their relevance and accuracy. Relations are ranked according to contextual significance, and the top-*k* relations are selected. For instance, considering the intent and context in the example, the model identifies the most relevant relation as “*people.person.spouse\_s*.”
- **Step ⑥ Contextually Align the Constraints:** In this step, the model is instructed to take into account temporal and geographical constraints, utilizing relevant data from various indicators for more complex queries. This process ensures that responses are accurately tailored to specific times, locations, or historical periods. Once constraints are identified, the model is asked to align them contextually and refine the list of candidate entities. For instance, in our example, the model identified constraints such as names of spouses, marriage start and end times, and location of the ceremony. It narrowed the list to potential spouses and extracted all related triples. It then aligned this information with the context of ‘current spouse’ to tailor the response to the specified time period. The final response given is ‘*Ayaan Hirsi Ali*’, contrasting with existing methods [15] where an LLM erroneously selected the first name on the spouse list, ‘*Sue Douglas*’.
- **Step ⑦ Intent-based feedback:** In the final step, we prompt the model to validate whether the final answer aligns with the initially identified intent and context of the question. If the answer does not meet these criteria, the model is instructed to revisit Steps 5 and 6 to refine its response further.

Similarly, the model adeptly contextualizes and aggregates pertinent information in other instances. For example, when asked, “*What songs did Justin Bieber write?*” it successfully compiles all relevant songs. In response to, “*What is the state flower of Arizona?*” it identifies ‘*Arizona*’ as the key entity, with ‘*state*’ and ‘*flower*’ as relevant tokens. It correctly interprets the intent to “*identify state flower*” and recognizes the context of “*botany*,” “*state symbols*,” and




Figure 1: Mindful-RAG results on WebQSP and MetaQA

“Arizona’s official flora,” choosing the appropriate relation: “government.governmental\_jurisdiction.official\_symbols.” In contrast, traditional methods only identify ‘Arizona’ as the key entity, often missing the broader context, leading to choosing incorrect relations “base.locations.states\_and\_provinces.country” and answer stating the state flower of Arizona is unknown.

**Mindful-RAG** leverages the LLM’s intrinsic understanding in the first three steps to identify not only the key entities but also to gather additional information such as relevant tokens, intent, and current context, all of which are essential for accurately answering the question. These steps enable the model to appropriately filter relations and align constraints with the current context. By incorporating these steps, the LLM becomes more mindful of the specific elements to consider. In the final two steps, the LLM is prompted to tailor its response and align it with specific constraints such as time, location, and any requirements for aggregating an answer.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

**Datasets:** We evaluate **Mindful-RAG** on two benchmark KGQA datasets, specifically WebQSP and MetaQA(3hop)[25]. MetaQA features questions related to the movie domain, with answers up to three hops away from the topic entities in a movie KG (based on OMDb). For our experiments, we focused on 3-hop questions.

In our analysis of the WebQSP dataset, we evaluated several baseline methods: KAPING [8], Retrieve-Rewrite-Answer (RRA) [22], Reasoning on Graphs (RoG) [18], and StructGPT [15]. For the MetaQA dataset, StructGPT [15] served as the baseline. The results for these methods were taken directly from the respective publications. In our experiments, we adapted the base code of StructGPT [15] and modified it as outlined in the previous section. We also examined the performance of ChatGPT without the use of Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) on these two datasets. The results, presented in Figure 1, show that our approach, **Mindful-RAG**, achieved a Hits@1 accuracy of 84% on WebQSP and 82% on MetaQA (3-hop). The primary goal of this study is to explore methods to mitigate reasoning errors. We propose that further accuracy improvements can be achieved by addressing structural and formatting issues within the KB and by considering partial answers to enhance accuracy instead of requiring exact matches.

## 5 RELATED WORK

Recent efforts to enhance RAG systems have focused on various improvements. Siriwardhana et al. [20] aimed to improve domain adaptation for Open Domain Question Answering (ODQA) by jointly training the retriever and generator and enriching the Wikipedia-based knowledge base with healthcare and news content. RAFT [24] enhances RAG by customizing language models for specific domains in open-book QA. Self-RAG [7] aims to increase the factual accuracy of LLMs through adaptive self-critique and retrieval-generation feedback loops. Fit-RAG [19] introduces a method that uses detailed prompts to ensure deep question understanding and clear reasoning in fact retrieval.

Domain-specific knowledge graphs [1, 3, 5, 21] have been effectively employed in KG-based RAG within LLMs [6, 10, 16] for question-answering tasks [2, 26]. While most efforts enhance LLMs by augmenting knowledge graphs with relevant facts, there is limited work on improving the reasoning capabilities of LLMs during knowledge retrieval. Our research with **Mindful-RAG** aims to significantly enhance these methods by using the model’s inherent knowledge for better question understanding.

## 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We conduct a detailed error analysis of KG-based RAG methods integrated with LLMs for QA tasks, identifying eight critical failure points grouped into Reasoning Failures and KG Topology Challenges. Reasoning Failures involve LLMs struggling to comprehend questions and utilize contextual clues, hindering accurate query-information alignment. This category also includes challenges with temporal context and complex relational reasoning. KG Topology Challenges pertain to structural issues within the knowledge base that impede information access and efficient processing. Our findings reveal significant areas for improvement in state-of-the-art approaches, particularly their reliance on structural cues and semantic similarity, which prove inadequate in complex, multi-hop queries requiring deep contextual understanding.

To address these shortcomings, we introduce the **Mindful-RAG** framework, which enhances intent-driven retrieval and ensures contextually coherent responses, targeting the main deficiencies identified in our analysis. While this work focuses on mitigating reasoning-based failures, future research could aim to refine knowledge graph structures and optimize query processing to boost the accuracy of KG-based RAG methods further. Exploring feedback loops where models actively request and integrate user corrections in real time could also enhance accuracy and practical utility. Moreover, combining vector-based search methods with KG-based sub-graph retrieval could significantly improve performance. These developments in intent identification and context alignment represent promising research directions that could substantially elevate the performance of LLMs in knowledge-intensive QA tasks across diverse domains.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Bilal Abu-Salih. 2021. Domain-specific knowledge graphs: A survey. *Journal of Network and Computer Applications* 185 (2021), 103076.
- [2] Garima Agrawal, Dimitri Bertsekas, and Huan Liu. 2023. Auction-Based Learning for Question Answering over Knowledge Graphs. *Information* 14, 6 (2023), 336.
- [3] Garima Agrawal, Yuli Deng, Jongchan Park, Huan Liu, and Ying-Chih Chen. 2022. Building Knowledge Graphs from Unstructured Texts: Applications and

- Impact Analyses in Cybersecurity Education. *Information* 13, 11 (2022), 526.
- [4] Garima Agrawal, Tharindu Kumarage, Zeyad Alghami, and Huan Liu. 2023. Can knowledge graphs reduce hallucinations in LLMs?: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07914* (2023).
- [5] Garima Agrawal, Kuntal Pal, Yuli Deng, Huan Liu, and Chitta Baral. 2023. AI-SecKG: Knowledge Graph Dataset for Cybersecurity Education. *AAAI-MAKE 2023: Challenges Requiring the Combination of Machine Learning 2023* (2023).
- [6] Garima Agrawal, Kuntal Pal, Yuli Deng, Huan Liu, and Ying-Chih Chen. 2024. CyberQ: Generating Questions and Answers for Cybersecurity Education Using Knowledge Graph-Augmented LLMs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 23164–23172.
- [7] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511* (2023).
- [8] Jinheon Baek, Alham Fikri Aji, and Amir Saffari. 2023. Knowledge-Augmented Language Model Prompting for Zero-Shot Knowledge Graph Question Answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04136* (2023).
- [9] Kurt Bollacker, Colin Evans, Praveen Paritosh, Tim Sturge, and Jamie Taylor. 2008. Freebase: a collaboratively created graph database for structuring human knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*. 1247–1250.
- [10] Julien Delile, Srayanta Mukherjee, Anton Van Pamel, and Leonid Zhukov. 2024. Graph-Based Retriever Captures the Long Tail of Biomedical Knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12352* (2024).
- [11] Yujuan Ding, Wenqi Fan, Liangbo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. 2024. A Survey on RAG Meets LLMs: Towards Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06211* (2024).
- [12] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. 2023. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997* (2023).
- [13] Soyeong Jeong, Jinheon Baek, Sukmin Cho, Sung Ju Hwang, and Jong C Park. 2024. Adaptive-rag: Learning to adapt retrieval-augmented large language models through question complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14403* (2024).
- [14] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 12 (2023), 1–38.
- [15] Jinhao Jiang, Kun Zhou, Zican Dong, Keming Ye, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. Structgpt: A general framework for large language model to reason over structured data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09645* (2023).
- [16] Xinke Jiang, Ruizhe Zhang, Yongxin Xu, Rihong Qiu, Yue Fang, Zhiyuan Wang, Jinyi Tang, Hongxin Ding, Xu Chu, Junfeng Zhao, et al. [n. d.]. HyKGE: A Hypothesis Knowledge Graph Enhanced Framework for Accurate and Reliable Medical LLMs Responses. ([n. d.]).
- [17] Jiarui Li, Ye Yuan, and Zehua Zhang. 2024. Enhancing LLM Factual Accuracy with RAG to Counter Hallucinations: A Case Study on Domain-Specific Queries in Private Knowledge-Bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10446* (2024).
- [18] Linhao Luo, Yuan-Fang Li, Gholamreza Haffari, and Shirui Pan. 2023. Reasoning on graphs: Faithful and interpretable large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01061* (2023).
- [19] Yuren Mao, Xuemei Dong, Wenyi Xu, Yunjun Gao, Bin Wei, and Ying Zhang. 2024. FIT-RAG: Black-Box RAG with Factual Information and Token Reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14374* (2024).
- [20] Shamane Siriwardhana, Rivindu Weerasekera, Elliott Wen, Tharindu Kaluarachchi, Rajib Rana, and Suranga Nanayakkara. 2023. Improving the domain adaptation of retrieval augmented generation (RAG) models for open domain question answering. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 1–17.
- [21] Xianming Tang, Zhiqiang Feng, Yitian Xiao, Ming Wang, Tianrui Ye, Yujie Zhou, Jin Meng, Baosen Zhang, and Dongwei Zhang. 2023. Construction and application of an ontology-based domain-specific knowledge graph for petroleum exploration and development. *Geoscience Frontiers* 14, 5 (2023), 101426.
- [22] Yike Wu, Nan Hu, Guilin Qi, Sheng Bi, Jie Ren, Anhuan Xie, and Wei Song. 2023. Retrieve-Rewrite-Answer: A KG-to-Text Enhanced LLMs Framework for Knowledge Graph Question Answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11206* (2023).
- [23] Wen-tau Yih, Matthew Richardson, Christopher Meek, Ming-Wei Chang, and Jina Suh. 2016. The value of semantic parse labeling for knowledge base question answering. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. 201–206.
- [24] Tianjun Zhang, Shishir G Patil, Naman Jain, Sheng Shen, Matei Zaharia, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E Gonzalez. 2024. Raft: Adapting language model to domain specific rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10131* (2024).
- [25] Yuyu Zhang, Hanjun Dai, Zornitsa Kozareva, Alexander Smola, and Le Song. 2018. Variational reasoning for question answering with knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [26] Yan Zhao, Zhongyun Li, and Jiaying Wang. 2024. LB-KBQA: Large-language-model and BERT based Knowledge-Based Question and Answering System. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05130* (2024).