

Way to Specialist: Closing Loop Between Specialized LLM and Evolving Domain Knowledge Graph

Yutong Zhang
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
School of Cyber Science and
Engineering
Shanghai, China
zhangyutong.sjtu@sjtu.edu.cn

Lixing Chen*
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Institute of Cyber Science and
Engineering
Shanghai, China
lxchen@sjtu.edu.cn

Shenghong Li*
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
School of Cyber Science and
Engineering
Shanghai, China
shli@sjtu.edu.cn

Nan Cao
Tongji University
College of Design and Innovation
Shanghai, China
nan.cao@tongji.edu.cn

Yang Shi
Tongji University
College of Design and Innovation
Shanghai, China
yangshi.idvx@tongji.edu.cn

Jiaxin Ding
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
John Hopcroft Center for Computer
Science
Shanghai, China
jiaxingding@sjtu.edu.cn

Zhe Qu
Central South University
School of Computer Science and
Engineering
Changsha, Hunan, China
zhe_qu@csu.edu.cn

Pan Zhou
Huazhong University of Science and
Technology
School of Cyber Science and
Engineering
Wuhan, Hubei, China
panzhou@hust.edu.cn

Yang Bai
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Department of Automation
Shanghai, China
ybai@sjtu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated exceptional performance across a wide variety of domains. Nonetheless, generalist LLMs continue to fall short in reasoning tasks necessitating specialized knowledge. Prior investigations into specialized LLMs focused on domain-specific training, which entails substantial efforts in domain data acquisition and model parameter fine-tuning. To address these challenges, this paper proposes the Way-to-Specialist (WTS) framework, which synergizes retrieval-augmented generation with knowledge graphs (KGs) to enhance the specialized capability of LLMs in the absence of specialized training. In distinction to existing paradigms that merely utilize external knowledge from general KGs or static domain KGs to prompt LLM for enhanced domain-specific reasoning, WTS proposes an innovative "LLM \leftrightarrow KG" paradigm, which achieves bidirectional enhancement between specialized LLM and domain knowledge graph (DKG). The proposed paradigm encompasses two closely coupled components: the *DKG-Augmented LLM* and the *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution*. The former retrieves question-relevant domain knowledge from DKG and uses it to prompt LLM to enhance the reasoning capability for domain-specific tasks; the latter leverages LLM to generate new domain knowledge from processed tasks and use it to evolve DKG. WTS closes the loop between *DKG-Augmented LLM* and *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution*, enabling continuous improvement in the domain specialization as it progressively answers and learns from domain-specific questions. We validate the performance of WTS on 6 datasets spanning 5 domains. The experimental results show

that WTS surpasses the previous SOTA in 4 specialized domains and achieves a maximum performance improvement of 11.3%.

KEYWORDS

Specialized large language models, domain knowledge graph, retrieval-augmented generation.

ACM Reference Format:

Yutong Zhang, Lixing Chen, Shenghong Li, Nan Cao, Yang Shi, Jiaxin Ding, Zhe Qu, Pan Zhou, and Yang Bai. 2025. Way to Specialist: Closing Loop Between Specialized LLM and Evolving Domain Knowledge Graph. In *Woodstock '18: ACM Symposium on Neural Gaze Detection, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX>. XXXXXXXX

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs), e.g., GPT-4 [1], Gemini [54], and Llama [57] have demonstrated their exceptional performance across a wide range of general domains [1, 10, 13, 37, 56, 57]. Yet, there is a prevalent recognition that LLMs often exhibit limitations when confronted with reasoning tasks that necessitate specialized knowledge [41]. Most explorations of LLMs to date for specific domains, e.g., medical [27, 73] and law [50] fields, have leveraged domain-specialized training or parameter fine-tuning techniques in pursuit of performance enhancement. These processes necessitate the acquisition of high-quality instruction data and sophisticated design of training pipelines, both of which entail substantial efforts [11].

In light of these challenges, we focus on steering foundation models via Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [29, 48] to excel in specialty areas. RAG falls under the category of prompt engineering

*Corresponding Author

technique [10, 64, 75]. It uses a *question-retrieve-generate* framework — Given a domain-specific question, external knowledge relevant to the question is retrieved from a knowledge source, which is then incorporated in input prompts to instruct LLM for answer generation. RAG works without modifications to model parameters, thereby offering cost-effective and rapid implementations. However, empirical evidence indicates that these methods constantly provide disturbing information, causing the knowledge noise issue [26] to RAG-based LLMs. Therefore, state-of-the-art (SOTA) RAG approaches [4, 51, 67] are shifting towards the use of knowledge graphs (KG) as knowledge sources (termed as KG-augmented LLM), which offers a structured and explicit representation of knowledge and facilitates the retrieval of high-quality knowledge relevant to questions.

Current KG-augmented LLMs methods mainly utilize paradigms of “ $\text{LLM} \oplus \text{KG}$ ” [4, 70] and “ $\text{LLM} \otimes \text{KG}$ ” [51, 67]. As illustrated in Figure 1, the “ $\text{LLM} \oplus \text{KG}$ ” paradigm follows a systematic procedure: it retrieves information from KGs to augment the prompt and then inputs the enhanced prompt into LLMs. The “ $\text{LLM} \otimes \text{KG}$ ” paradigm improves “ $\text{LLM} \oplus \text{KG}$ ” framework by incorporating sophisticated interactions between KGs and large LLMs, which partially addresses the challenges associated with multi-hop reasoning. These works [28, 51, 68] utilize general KGs, e.g., Wikidata [59], Freebase [7], to enhance their performance for common-sense questions. Nevertheless, the knowledge encapsulated in general KGs is coarse and often lacks specialized information, potentially leading to knowledge mismatches when addressing domain-specific questions. Due to this limitation, recent advancements [30, 49, 53, 67] have been inspired to incorporate Domain Knowledge Graphs (DKGs) to KG-augmented LLMs to enhance domain-specific reasoning, particularly in the medical field [30, 49, 67]. However, these studies rest on the precondition that a comprehensive DKG has been established already, which is currently true only for a few specialized domains, e.g., medical [30, 49, 67] and food knowledge [16]. Most domains continue to face challenges with the absence and incompleteness of DKGs. The utilization of low-quality DKGs can adversely affect the performance of domain-specific reasoning. Furthermore, these SOTA solutions utilize static DKGs for knowledge retrieval and prompt generation, which may run the risk of being outdated and misaligned with the evolving knowledge demand during implementation [71]. Additionally, DKGs may also require personalization or customization to address unique needs, which is also overlooked in previous works. These challenges underscore the necessity of employing evolving DKGs that continuously update and integrate appropriate domain knowledge.

To fill in the above deficiencies, this work introduces the Way-to-Specialist (WTS) framework, which designs an innovative strategy for developing specialized LLMs through the mutual enhancement between LLM and DKG. In contrast to the paradigms “ $\text{LLM} \oplus \text{KG}$ ” and “ $\text{LLM} \otimes \text{KG}$ ” that operate in unidirectional enhancement processes using KG to augment input prompts of LLMs, WTS designs a novel “ $\text{LLM} \odot \text{KG}$ ” paradigm which not only leverages DKG to prompt LLM for the enhancement of domain-specific reasoning capability but also utilizes LLM to evolve DKG for the enhancement of domain knowledge comprehensiveness (illustrated in Figure 1). Such bidirectional enhancement between LLM and DKG forms interactive loops as WTS progressively addresses and learns from

domain-specific questions. The novelties and contributions of our work are summarized as follows:

1) WTS introduces an innovative $\text{LLM} \odot \text{KG}$ paradigm which enables the bidirectional enhancement of LLM and DKG for constructing specialized LLMs. This paradigm comprises two integrated components: the *DKG-Augmented LLM* and the *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution*. The *DKG-Augmented LLM* retrieves question-relevant domain knowledge from the DKG and uses it to prompt LLM for answer generation. Subsequently, the *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* leverages LLM to generate new knowledge from the processed question and use it to evolve the DKG. In particular, WTS can initiate with an empty or incomplete DKG and progressively complete it to enhance the reasoning capability for domain-specific tasks.


2) WTS designs an interactive knowledge retrieval mechanism for *DKG-Augmented LLM*. WTS maintains DKGs in the form of vector databases. In each retrieval iteration, WTS assesses the similarity of questions and knowledge in DKG by measuring the distance between their feature embeddings generated by the language embedding model of the vector database. Further, WTS utilizes LLM to evaluate the semantic relevance of knowledge triples to the question and prune less relevant ones. The retrieved knowledge is used to prompt the question reasoning, and the LLM generates the answer along with a recommendation to determine whether the retrieval proceeds to the next iteration to further enrich the external knowledge.

3) WTS proposes an LLM-based knowledge generation scheme and a redundancy-aware DKG update mechanism for *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution*. LLM-based knowledge generation leverages LLM to efficiently generate knowledge triples from the unstructured information in questions, answers, and knowledge retrieved by *DKG-Augmented LLM*. The redundancy-aware DKG update mechanism evaluates the redundancy between newly generated knowledge and existing knowledge in DKG, then excludes redundant knowledge during evolution to guarantee the knowledge efficiency of DKG, which facilitates the knowledge retrieval in *DKG-Augmented LLM*.

4) We conduct experiments of WTS on 6 datasets spanning 5 domains, including 4 specialized domains (medical, natural science, social science, and linguistics) and 1 general domain. The results show that WTS achieves overall the best performance in all 4 specialized domains, achieving a maximum performance improvement of 11.3% compared to the current SOTA.

2 RELATED WORKS

Large Language Models & Knowledge Graphs: The integration of KG and LLM can be categorized into two branches: KG for LLM and LLM for KG. The works in the branch of **KG for LLM** mainly use Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [21] to incorporate non-parametric information [26, 46, 52, 63, 76] from KGs to pre-trained LLM for addressing knowledge-intensive text generation task. KAPING [4] pioneered KG-augmented LLM by retrieving relevant knowledge triples from KGs and prepending them to the input question as a prompt. KAPING only utilizes a single-layer KG, making it challenging to address questions that require multi-hop knowledge analysis on KGs. To address this issue, the works [2, 28, 51, 68] conduct multi-hop knowledge retrieval over KGs to improve the reasoning capacity of LLMs. KG-augmented LLMs also

Figure 1: Comparison of “LLM \odot KG” against SOTA paradigms in KG-augmented LLM.

have spurred research into specialized LLMs in medical field [18, 30, 49, 67], politics [35], scholar [53] and law [14]. These works utilize existing RAG frameworks, e.g. mind map [67], reason chain [18], and aligned embeddings [35], to generate input prompts. The works in the branch of **LLM for KG** leverages LLMs to support knowledge engineering tasks [31], including KG construction [6, 12] and KG completion [43, 61, 74]. KG construction involves collecting and integrating information from various sources [39]. Recent works have adopted both schema-based methods [12, 17, 33] and schema-free methods [6] with LLM to construct KGs based on structured texts. KG completion involves inferring missing knowledge triples. These works are typically categorized into rule-based methods [43, 72], embedding-based methods [9, 58], and text-based methods [60, 61, 74]. LLM is mostly implemented with text-based methods due to its exceptional capability in semantic understanding. For example, KICGPT [65] and KERMIT [22] utilized LLMs as entity-sorting assistants and data-enhancement tools and validated the advantage of using LLMs in KG completion. However, these methods were limited to completing the KG based on existing entities and could not introduce new entities and triples into the KG.

Specialized LLM: Despite the remarkable performance of LLMs, they still struggle with problems that require specialized domain expertise [32]. Recent efforts have sought to address this issue through fine-tuning, which involves partial modification of model parameters, or through RAG-based prompting, which incorporates specialized domain knowledge, e.g., in the medical [18, 30, 49, 67, 69] and finance [5] field. The works [5, 19, 25, 55, 73] have investigated fine-tuning techniques to LLMs and achieved considerable performance improvements for domain-specific questions. However, fine-tuning techniques require substantial computational resources and time and may lead to catastrophic forgetting [24] where the LLM loses

its general knowledge while adapting to the specialized domain. Compared to fine-tuning techniques, RAG dynamically integrates up-to-date external domain knowledge into LLM reasoning, providing enhanced efficiency and simplified implementation. These works, e.g., MVPKG in [35] and CMCKG [67], all utilize manually constructed KGs. However, most specialized domains still lack available KGs, which hinders the implementation of KG-augmented LLM. Furthermore, KGs may become outdated, potentially diminishing the effectiveness of RAG methods.

3 METHODOLOGY OF WAY-TO-SPECIALIST

3.1 Preliminaries

As WTS rests on a synergistic integration of domain knowledge graph (DKG) and retrieval-augmented LLM, it is essential to provide a brief introduction to these two techniques prior to delineating the design of WTS.

Domain Knowledge Graph: A DKG is characterized as a collection of knowledge triples $\mathcal{G} = \{(e_s, r, e_o) | e_s \in \mathcal{E}, r \in \mathcal{R}, e_o \in \mathcal{E}\}$, where (e_s, r, e_o) is a knowledge triple, \mathcal{E} is the entity set, \mathcal{R} is the relation set, e_s , r , and e_o correspond to the subject entity, relation and object entity, respectively. WTS maintains DKG in the form of vector databases[47], where entities and relationships within the DKG are represented as high-dimensional feature embedding. This approach enables efficient storage, retrieval, and analysis of the DKG through vector-based operations, drastically improving the efficiency of DKG-based prompting (will be demonstrated in subsequent sections).

Retrieval-augmented LLM: Retrieval-augmented LLM [4] involves integrating an external knowledge base with LLM to provide relevant information during the generation process. The key idea is




Figure 2: Overview of WTS. The upper part is *DKG-Augmented LLM* which extracts entities from the received question and performs iterative Retrieval-Prune-Reason processes. The bottom part is *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* which generates new knowledge triples from the processed question to evolve the DKG.

to retrieve pertinent documents or data from an external source and use this information to augment the LLM’s predictions. A retrieval-augmented LLM typically comprises two main components: a retriever $\text{Retriever}(q) \rightarrow I_q$ to obtain related information about question q and a generator (i.e., LLM) $\text{Generator}(q, I_q) \rightarrow a_q$ to produces the answer a_q to question q . Retrieval-augmented LLM offers enhanced contextual understanding and mitigates the hallucination problem commonly associated with LLM.

3.2 Architecture of WTS

As illustrated in Figure 3, WTS encompasses two closely interconnected components: *DKG-Augmented LLM* and *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution*. *DKG-Augmented LLM* prompts LLM with domain knowledge in DKG to improve the reasoning capability of LLM for domain-specific questions. *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* employs LLM to generate knowledge triples from questions and answers, and use them to evolve DKG.

3.2.1 DKG-Augmented LLM. The *DKG-Augmented LLM* consists of four modules: entity extraction module, retrieval module, pruning module, and reasoning module.

Entity Extraction Module: Upon receiving a question q , WTS utilizes the entity extraction module to identify the topic entities of the question. While traditional entity extraction methods, e.g., Hidden Markov Models (HMMs) [34, 78] and Conditional Random Fields (CRFs) [40], exist for implementation, they often struggle with handling domain terms. Inspired by the superior performance of LLMs in entity recognition [3, 45, 62], we utilize LLM for entity extraction. Specifically, the entity extraction module prompts LLM (the input prompt is given in Appendix D.1, Prompts 1) to extract N primary entities, denoted by $\mathcal{E}_q = \{e_{q,1}, e_{q,2}, \dots, e_{q,N}\}$, from question q . This process can be mathematically written as

$\mathcal{E}_q = \text{LLM}_{\text{Ent}}(q)$, where LLM_{Ent} is the prompted LLM. The extracted entities will be fed to the subsequent retrieval module. Note that the number of extracted entities is restricted to N to mitigate the retrieval overhead for non-informative entities.

Retrieval Module: Given extracted entities, the retrieval module retrieves within the DKG to obtain knowledge triples related to the extracted entities in \mathcal{E}_q . For ease of description, we for now consider that the retrieval module operates with a non-empty DKG. Subsequent sections will provide a detailed exposition of the construction and evolution of DKG. The retrieval process executes in an iterative manner, with the retrieval depth progressively increasing over successive iterations.

We delineate 1st-depth retrieval to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the retrieval process. The 1st-depth retrieval acquires knowledge triples associated with entities in \mathcal{E}_q . It is important to note that DKG can be of considerable scale with dense relations between entities. This complexity presents stressing challenges to retrieval efficiency. Our retrieval module employs a dual approach, using *Exact Match* for coarse-grained retrieval and *Similarity Retrieval* for fine-grained retrieval, to mitigate the retrieval overhead over large DKGs. We let $\mathcal{E}_q^{(1)}$ ($\mathcal{E}_q^{(1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_q$) be the input to the 1st-depth retrieval. For each entity $e \in \mathcal{E}_q^{(1)}$, the retrieval module first executes *Exact Match* as coarse filtering to include knowledge triples in DKG that have e as their subject entity or object entity. Mathematically, the output of *Exact Match* at 1-st depth can be written as $\mathcal{T}_q^{(1), \text{EM}} = \{t = (e_s, r, e_o) \in \mathcal{G} \mid e_s = e \text{ or } e_o = e, \forall e \in \mathcal{E}_q^{(1)}\}$. Subsequently, *Similarity Retrieval* is implemented to refine knowledge triples in $\mathcal{T}_q^{(1), \text{EM}}$. *Similarity Retrieval* uses the pre-trained

language model, e.g., sentence transformers¹ or OpenAI embedding models API², associated with the vector database to convert question q and knowledge triple $t \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(1),EM}$ to feature embedding. The similarity of triple t and question q is quantified as the cosine distance between their feature embedding, calculated by $S(q, t) = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{F}(q) \cdot \mathcal{F}(t)}{\|\mathcal{F}(q)\|^2 \|\mathcal{F}(t)\|^2}$, where $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ denotes the feature embedding operation. A lower S score indicates a higher degree of similarity. We introduce L as the maximum permissible similarity gap, which functions as a threshold to filter out triples that exhibit low similarity to the question. The triples outputted by *Similarity Retrieval* are collected in $\mathcal{T}_q^{(1),SR} = \{t \mid S(q, t) \leq L, t \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(1),EM}\}$, which is also the output of 1st-depth retrieval, i.e., $\mathcal{T}_q^{(1)}$.

Upon the completion of the 1st-depth retrieval, the module advances to the next depth to further expand the domain knowledge related to the question. The objective of the 2nd-depth retrieval is to acquire knowledge triples associated with the entities newly identified during the 1st-depth retrieval. The input entities to the 2nd-depth retrieval is $\mathcal{E}_q^{(2)} = \{e \mid e \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(1)}, e \notin \mathcal{E}_q^{(1)}\}$. A similar retrieval process will be executed and gives the result of 2nd-depth retrieval $\mathcal{T}_q^{(2)}$. Following this logic, the retrieval module iteratively performs D iterations of triple retrieval, where the input entity set to d -depth retrieval is $\mathcal{E}_q^{(d)} = \{e \mid e \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(d-1)}, e \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{d-1} \mathcal{E}_q^{(i)}\}$. The final output of the retrieval module comprises KG triples retrieved over D interactions, which constitutes a sub-graph of DKG.

Pruning Module: Given the design of the retrieval module, it is evident that the size of the retrieved DKG subgraph expands exponentially as retrieval goes deep. The explosion of retrieved knowledge triples not only incurs substantial retrieval overhead but also leads to unfocused and redundant prompts that potentially diminish the performance of specialized LLM. In observation of this issue, WTS introduces a pruning module to identify the most informative knowledge triples to the question.

The pruning module functions during the retrieval process, selectively excluding retrieved triples $\mathcal{T}_q^{(d)}$ at each retrieval depth d . At each depth d , the pruning module first prompts LLM (the input prompt is given in Appendix D.1, Prompt 2) to evaluate the semantic relevance between question q and each knowledge triple t in $\mathcal{T}_q^{(d)}$. This evaluation gives a semantic relevance score $M(q, t) \in [0, 1]$ for each question-triple pair, mathematically denoted by $M(q, t) = \text{LLM}_{\text{Sem}}(q, t)$, $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(d)}$, where a higher M score indicates greater semantic relevance.

The pruning module then outputs K triples with the highest semantic relevance score, denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)} = \{\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_q^{(d)}, |\mathcal{T}| = K \mid M(q, t) \geq M(q, t'), \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall t' \in \mathcal{T}_q^{(d)} \setminus \mathcal{T}\}$. By applying the pruning module, the retrieved triples at d -depth becomes $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)}$. Correspondingly, the input entity set to d -depth retrieval should be modified as $\mathcal{E}_q^{(d+1)} = \{e \mid e \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)}, e \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^d \mathcal{E}_q^{(i)}\}$.

The above procedures implement width pruning, which constrains the number of knowledge triples at each retrieval depth level. Actually, WTS also executes depth pruning, which entails early exit of retrieval before reaching the maximum depth D . The

depth pruning is conducted during the reasoning process. Therefore, it will be detailed in the subsequent reasoning module.

Reasoning Module: The reasoning process performs progressively as the retrieval depth increases. Suppose that we have completed d -depth of retrieval and pruning, the retrieved knowledge triples are denoted as $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)} = \bigcup_{i=1}^d \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(i)}$. The reasoning module arranges the knowledge triples to form a prompt using the format in Appendix D.1, Prompt 3, and then feeds the prompt and question to LLM to generate the answer $\alpha_q^{(d)}$ to question q , i.e., $\alpha_q^{(d)} = \text{LLM}_{\text{Rea}}(q, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)})$.

The format of the $\alpha_q^{(d)}$ is stipulated with the system prompt [36] for ease of performance evaluation. If the evaluation[51] is positive, the retrieval stops, otherwise, the retrieval enters the $(d + 1)$ -th iteration. This process is repeated until the maximum search depth D is reached.

Take-away: *DKG-Augmented LLM* is not merely an isolated sequence of retrieving information from the DKG and reasoning with the LLM. Rather, it involves tight-coupling interactions between DKG and LLM through the process, e.g., LLM is employed for semantic relevance evaluation in retrieval width pruning and early exit judgment in retrieval depth pruning. This allows LLM to retrieve relevant knowledge more efficiently over DKG, thereby enhancing its reasoning capacity for domain-specific questions.

3.2.2 LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution. LLM-assisted DKG endeavors to enhance the completeness of DKG by progressively incorporating domain knowledge acquired during question answering. The objective of DKG completion is twofold. Firstly, it aims to incorporate new knowledge (entities and relations) previously absent from both DKG and inherent knowledge of LLM. This is pertinent in scenarios where no triples are retrieved for a question or the evaluation of the answer $\alpha_q^{(D)}$ remains negative at the final depth D . Secondly, DKG completion seeks to enhance the characterization of knowledge dependencies by activating knowledge connections previously neglected. This is pertinent to scenarios where a positive answer is obtained after multiple iterations of knowledge retrieval, which indicates relevant knowledge in the current DKG is not adequately connected. In this case, additional relations should be incorporated into DKG to ensure closer association between related entities.

Domain Knowledge Generation: The fundamental step of DKG evolution is generating knowledge triples based on questions and answers. However, the extraction of knowledge graphs from unstructured data presents significant challenges, primarily due to the inherent variability and complexity of natural language [42]. Given the irregular and unstructured nature of question-answer pairs, our work leverages LLMs to design a schema-free solution for KG triple generation. Firstly, WTS prompts LLM (the input prompt is given in Appendix D.1, Prompt 4) to extract domain knowledge from question-answer pairs, using entities in the previously retrieved knowledge triples, i.e., $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(D)}$, as references. Then LLMs generate knowledge triples based on the extracted domain knowledge. Given question q and the gold answer α_q^* , the module

¹<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers>

²<https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/embeddings>

prompts LLM to create KG triples $\mathcal{T}_q^+ = \text{LLM}_{\text{Gen}}(q, \alpha_q^*, \bar{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(D)})$. In the case of Figure 2, the triple generated from this Q&A pair is { subject: auriculotemporal nerve, relation: encircle, object: middle meningeal artery }.

Redundancy Checking and DKG Evolution: It should be noted that the knowledge triples generated via the above process might already exist in the DKG. The incorporation of these redundant triples would result in increased complexity of the DKG without contributing any new information. Therefore, we perform redundancy checking before incorporating \mathcal{T}_q^+ into the DKG. For a generated knowledge triple $t = (e_s, r, e_o) \in \mathcal{T}_q^+$, WTS first verifies whether the triple t already exists in the DKG, i.e., if $t = (e_s, r, e_o) \in \mathcal{G}$. If it does, the triple will not be added. To further reduce the complexity of the KG, we compare the similarity of t with the existing triples in \mathcal{G} and establish a maximum similarity threshold L' . For $\forall t' = (e'_s, r', e'_o) \in \mathcal{G}$, if $S(t', t) \leq L'$ indicating that t and t' convey almost the same semantic information, the new triple t will not be added in \mathcal{G} .

Take-away: *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* endows a learn-from-experience capability to WTS without parameter refinement/retraining. It enables the DKG to evolve to a refined form as WTS encounters and answers more questions. The evolution of DKG not only enhances its overall comprehensiveness but also allows DKG to achieve a distinctive knowledge distribution that is tailored to the question source.

3.3 WTS Formation Pipeline

In previous sections, we have presented *DKG-Augmented LLM* and *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* independently. Next, to show how these two components work in tandem to complement each other's capabilities.

Let us start from the initialization stage. The initial DKG can be either an empty dataset or an established DKG composed of knowledge triples. This enables WTS to support various implementation scenarios, including those where the domain lacks a pre-existing KG or where the available DKG is incomplete.

As shown in Figure 3, the formation pipeline of WTS involves cyclical interactions between *DKG-Augmented LLM* and *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* throughout the process of question answering. The timeline of WTS formation is discretized by the arrival of questions. The DKG possessed by WTS at the reception of question q is denoted by \mathcal{G}_q , which is used in *DKG-Augmented LLM* to prompt the LLM for answer generation. Subsequently, WTS calls *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* to generate knowledge triples \mathcal{T}_q^+ based on question q and gold answer α_q^* , and retrieved knowledge triples $\bar{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(D)}$. The generated triples \mathcal{T}_q^+ are then incorporated to update DKG from \mathcal{G}_q to \mathcal{G}_{q+1} . The updated DKG \mathcal{G}_{q+1} will be used to answer the subsequent question $q+1$.

From a practical perspective, the formation pipeline of WTS can be split into two phases, Apprenticeship and Mastership, contingent upon the availability of gold answers. During Apprenticeship, WTS functions akin to an apprentice, receiving gold answers from a mentor after addressing questions. This scenario is applicable when comprehensive Q&A datasets are established in a particular




Figure 3: Illustration of WTS formation pipeline.

domain. Furthermore, this scenario may also occur when an expert utilizes WTS as an assistant and constantly provides gold answers to questions. The period of Mastership typically follows the Apprenticeship stage, once a DKG has been sufficiently established for prompting domain-specific tasks. During Mastership, WTS operates autonomously without the guidance of gold answers. Instead, WTS relies on the user feedback (e.g., “Good Response” and “Bad Response” buttons in ChatGPT) to determine whether to extract knowledge triples from generated answers. If positive feedback is received, WTS considers the generated answer as a gold answer to extract \mathcal{T}_q^+ as aforementioned in *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution*. Conversely, if negative feedback (or no feedback) is received, WTS relies solely on the question \mathcal{T}_q^+ for DKG evolution.

Take-away: The formation of WTS is in essence a process of closing the loop between *DKG-Augmented LLM* and *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* as WTS progressively answers and learns from domain-specific questions. The connector is an evolving DKG that is utilized by *DKG-Augmented LLM* to prompt the question reasoning and updated by *LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution* based on the retrieved knowledge and answers to enhance domain knowledge comprehensiveness for subsequent questions.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Experiment Setup

4.1.1 Datasets and Baselines. We evaluate each method on 6 Q&A datasets, covering 5 domains, including medical (ChatDoctor5k [23], PubMedQA [20], MedMCQA [38]), natural science, social science, linguistics (SciQ [66], ScienceQA [44]), and one general domain Q&A datasets (Simple Questions [8]). The MedMCQA dataset includes both single-choice and multiple-choice questions, while in the ScienceQA dataset, SOC, NAT, and LAN refer to the social science, natural science, and linguistics domains, respectively.

For the dataset ChatDoctor5k, we evaluate the text generation task with BERTScore [77], which computes a similarity score of the LLM-generated answer and the real answer. To calculate the BERTScore, we use the bert-base-uncased [15] model as the embedding model. For the other dataset, we use Accuracy as the metric.

Detailed information about datasets and metrics is shown in Appendix B.1 and B.2.

WTS is compared with 4 SOTA baselines using prompting-based methods, including standard prompting (I/O prompt) [10] on ChatGPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4o, Think-on-Graph (ToG) [51] with constant Freebase knowledge graph [7], and Chain-of Thought (CoT) [64] with 5-shot prompting.

4.1.2 Hyperparameters. The experiments run WTS with two LLMs, ChatGPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4o, using OpenAI API. The temperature is set to 0.2 and the maximum token length of output is set to 2048. For all datasets, WTS is initialized with an empty vector database as its DKG. With ChromaDB³ serving as the vector database, we employ the pre-trained sentence transformer, all-mpnet-base-v2⁴, as the embedding model. The embedding similarity is measured by the cosine distance and the maximum permissible similarity gap is set to $L = 0.55$. To facilitate result evaluation, WTS utilizes prompts to restrict its output format to JSON. This restriction is also applied to GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4o baselines for fairness consideration. For the ToG and CoT baselines, minimal instructions are added to their original prompts to ensure consistency in the evaluation process. Further details are provided in Appendix B.3.

4.2 Results and Evaluations

4.2.1 Comparison to Baselines.

Table 1 compares the performance of WTS and baselines. The results indicate that WTS (with GPT-4o) outperforms the baselines in 5 of 6 evaluated datasets. The exception occurs on the SimpleQA which is a general domain Q&A dataset, and in this case, ToG achieves the best performance as it includes a well-established general KG, i.e., Freebase KG, for knowledge retrieval.

WTS demonstrates a substantial performance improvement over the standard I/O prompt methods (i.e., GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o) on all 5 domain datasets. The highest performance improvement is achieved on the PubMedQA, providing 103.8% and 126.9% accuracy gain for GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o, respectively. However, it is noteworthy that in the ChatDoctor5k dataset, GPT-4o underperforms GPT-3.5. This anomaly is attributed to the conservation of GPT-4o, wherein it frequently qualifies its responses as non-professional advice and recommends patients to consult a medical professional.

WTS exhibits notable advantages in comparison with CoT across all evaluated datasets. The most significant performance improvements are 15.6% and 12.1% on the single-choice and multiple-choice MedMCQA datasets, respectively. These enhancements are attributable to the incorporation of external domain knowledge. In contrast, CoT relies solely on the intrinsic knowledge of the LLM, which lacks domain-specialized information.

For commonsense reasoning (i.e., SimpleQA), ToG outperforms other methods as it utilizes commonsense knowledge retrieved from Freebase. However, when applied to specialized domains, the performance of ToG becomes inferior because the knowledge in Freebase is coarse and insufficient for domain-specialized questions.

To examine the complexity of the knowledge retrieval process, we calculate the average retrieval time and the execution time of DKG-Augmented LLM (with GPT-3.5) for a single question. The

result is depicted in Figure 4, which reveals that the execution time is two orders of magnitude greater than the retrieval time, indicating that the retrieval time has a negligible impact on the overall efficiency of WTS.




Figure 4: Retrieval time and execution time of WTS with GPT-3.5.




Figure 5: DKG Size of WTS with GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o.

We further investigate the impact of base LLM models on the retrieval process of WTS. Figure 6 illustrates the retrieval depth for questions when WTS is implemented with GPT-3.5 and GPT-4o. The results indicate that a more powerful base model can better leverage its internal knowledge, thereby avoiding deep retrieval of domain knowledge in DKG. Additionally, the enhanced text understanding and summarization abilities of stronger base models facilitate superior knowledge extraction, leading to improved performance.

4.2.2 Ablation Study.

How does the retrieval mechanism influence the performance of WTS? We conduct ablation studies on the retrieval mechanism by executing WTS with 3 alternative retrieval methods.




Figure 6: Percentage of questions across different retrieval depths with WTS (GPT-3.5) and WTS (GPT-4o).

³<https://www.trychroma.com/>

⁴<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2>

Table 1: Performance comparison of WTS and baselines on different datasets.

Domain	Medical						Natural		Social	Linguistic	General
Dataset	ChatDoctor5k			PubMedQA	MedMCQA Single Multi		sciq	ScienceQA NAT	ScienceQA SOC	ScienceQA LAN	SimpleQA
Metric Method	Pre	Rec	BertScore	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc
GPT-3.5	0.775	0.792	0.782	0.157	0.512	0.507	0.909	0.842	0.884	0.724	0.220
GPT-4o	0.759	0.798	0.777	0.175	0.708	0.654	0.966	0.960	0.995	0.862	0.282
CoT [64]	0.757	0.799	0.777	0.372	0.538	0.497	0.935	0.824	0.876	0.768	0.203
ToG [51]	0.741	0.800	0.769	0.210	0.576	0.507	0.933	0.864	0.800	0.778	0.536
WTS(GPT-3.5)	0.781	0.810	0.795	0.320	0.622	0.557	0.942	0.890	0.964	0.810	0.264
WTS(GPT-4o)	0.774	0.809	0.791	0.397	0.781	0.728	0.971	0.980	0.995	0.906	0.306

Table 2: Impact of retrieval mechanisms.

Domain	Medical						Natural		Social	Linguistic	General
Dataset	ChatDoctor5k			PubMedQA	MedMCQA Single Multi		sciq	ScienceQA NAT	ScienceQA SOC	ScienceQA LAN	SimpleQA
Metric Method	Pre	Rec	BertScore	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc	Acc
GPT-3.5	0.775	0.792	0.783	0.157	0.512	0.507	0.909	0.842	0.884	0.724	0.220
WTS(EM)	0.775	0.809	0.791	0.281	0.576	0.548	0.915	0.874	0.933	0.786	0.256
WTS(EM-ESR)	0.778	0.808	0.792	0.293	0.604	0.563	0.917	0.876	0.960	0.808	0.264
WTS(EM-QSR)	0.781	0.810	0.795	0.320	0.622	0.557	0.942	0.890	0.964	0.810	0.264

(1) **Exact Match (EM)**. This method retrieves knowledge triples that have the target entity as their subject or object entity.

(2) **Exact Match with Entity Similarity Retrieval (EM-ESR)**. This method first uses the exact match method for knowledge triple retrieval. The retrieved triple will then be refined by evaluating the similarity between the embedding of extracted topic entities and knowledge triples retrieved by exact match.

(3) **Exact Match with Question Similarity Retrieval (EM-QSR)**. This method follows a similar procedure as EM-ESR. The key difference is that EM-QSR calculates the similarity between the embedding of questions and knowledge triples.

Table 2 presents the performance of WTS with different retrieval mechanisms configured in DKG-Augmented LLM. We see that EM-QSR exhibits the highest performances on most datasets as it fully utilizes the entities and other semantic information in question to identify most relevant knowledge triples. EM-ESR ranks second because it captures less semantic information compared to EM-QSR. The inferior performance of EM indicates that relying solely on exact matching and neglecting the semantic information of the question fails to obtain high-quality knowledge.

How does DKG evolution affect the WTS performance?

Next, we show how DKG evolution benefits the reasoning performance of specialized LLM. Figure 7 shows the accuracy improvement of WTS over GPT-3.5 as WTS proceeds. It is evident that as the number of processed Q&A samples increases, the size of DKG increases accordingly. It can be observed that the performance improvement experiences fluctuations during the formation process of WTS. This is attributed to the uncertain knowledge overlap between previously answered questions and questions yet to be answered. Despite these fluctuations, the overall trend indicates an enhancement in generation quality. Figure 5 illustrates the sizes of DKGs constructed by WTS with different base models and retrieval mechanisms. Disregarding the minor randomness introduced by

the “temperature parameter” of LLMs, we see that employing advanced models and retrieval mechanisms results in the construction of compact DKGs. This is because an advanced base model possesses more comprehensive inherent knowledge, and an advanced retrieval model can acquire relevant knowledge triples from DKG with greater efficiency.

Table 3: Accuracy of WTS with different retrieval depth.

Dataset	D1	D2	D3	D4
Chatdoctor5k	0.792	0.795	0.794	0.794
PubMedQA	0.211	0.256	0.320	0.275
MedMCQA(Single)	0.358	0.457	0.622	0.550
MedMCQA(Multi)	0.360	0.493	0.557	0.527

How does the retrieval depth affect the WTS performance?

To investigate the impact retrieval Depth D , we conducted experiments of WTS with various depths. For ChatDoctor5k and PubMedQA, the maximum retrieval depth ranges from 1 to 4, while for MedMCQA, it is set from 2 to 5. Table 3 illustrates the performance on ChatDoctor5k, PubMedQA, and MedMCQA datasets with varying retrieval depths. As shown in the results, the performance of WTS improves with increased search depth, suggesting that further enhancement could be achieved with deeper exploration in DKG. However, this improvement decreases as the retrieval depth becomes excessive. This is primarily because deeper retrieval introduces more irrelevant information, which disrupts the generation of accurate answers and increases computational overhead. The execution time of the different maximal retrieval depths on these datasets is shown in Appendix C Table 7.

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced the LLM \odot KG paradigm, which achieves bidirectional enhancement between LLMs and knowledge graphs. We proposed the flexible plug-and-play Way-to-Specialist (WTS)




Figure 7: Accuracy improvements and KG size in medical domain.

framework, combining specialized LLMs with evolving domain knowledge graphs to address knowledge-intensive tasks in specific domains. Through its two tightly integrated components—the DKG-Augmented LLM and the LLM-Assisted DKG Evolution—WTS demonstrates superior performance over existing prompting-based methods in domain-specific tasks, all while avoiding additional training costs. Our experimental results demonstrate that WTS surpasses the previous state-of-the-art in four specialized domains, achieving a maximum performance improvement of 11.3%. In future work, we will focus on developing more efficient and high-quality approaches for dynamic knowledge graph completion.

REFERENCES

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Floren- cia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [2] Dhruv Agarwal, Rajarshi Das, Sopan Khosla, and Rashmi Gangadharaiah. 2023. Bring your own kg: Self-supervised program synthesis for zero-shot kgqa. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07850* (2023).
- [3] Dhananjay Ashok and Zachary C Lipton. 2023. Promptner: Prompting for named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15444* (2023).
- [4] Jinheon Baek, Alham Fikri Aji, and Amir Saffari. 2023. Knowledge-Augmented Language Model Prompting for Zero-Shot Knowledge Graph Question Answering. In *The 61st Annual Meeting Of The Association For Computational Linguistics*.
- [5] Teodoro Baldazzi, Luigi Bellomarin, Stefano Ceri, Andrea Colombo, Andrea Gentili, and Emanuel Sallinger. 2023. Fine-tuning large enterprise language models via ontological reasoning. In *International Joint Conference on Rules and Reasoning*. Springer, 86–94.
- [6] Zhen Bi, Jing Chen, Yinyu Jiang, Feiyu Xiong, Wei Guo, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2024. Codekgc: Code language model for generative knowledge graph construction. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing* 23, 3 (2024), 1–16.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. Large-scale simple question answering with memory networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02075* (2015).
- [9] Antoine Bordes, Nicolas Usunier, Alberto Garcia-Duran, Jason Weston, and Oksana Yakhnenko. 2013. Translating embeddings for modeling multi-relational data. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [10] 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*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin (Eds.), Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1877–1901. https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf
- [11] Yihan Cao, Yanbin Kang, and Lichao Sun. 2023. Instruction mining: High-quality instruction data selection for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06290* (2023).
- [12] Salvatore Carta, Alessandro Giuliani, Leonardo Piano, Alessandro Sebastian Podda, Livio Pompianu, and Sandro Gabriele Tiddia. 2023. Iterative zero-shot llm prompting for knowledge graph construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01128* (2023).
- [13] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24, 240 (2023), 1–113.
- [14] Jiaxi Cui, Zongjian Li, Yang Yan, Bohua Chen, and Li Yuan. 2023. Chatlaw: Open-source legal large language model with integrated external knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16092* (2023).
- [15] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [16] Steven Haussmann, Oshani Seneviratne, Yu Chen, Yarden Ne’eman, James Codella, Ching-Hua Chen, Deborah L McGuinness, and Mohammed J Zaki. 2019. FoodKG: a semantics-driven knowledge graph for food recommendation. In *The Semantic Web-ISWC 2019: 18th International Semantic Web Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, October 26–30, 2019, Proceedings, Part II* 18. Springer, 146–162.
- [17] Yuelin Hu, Futai Zou, Jiajia Han, Xin Sun, and Yilei Wang. 2023. Llm-Tikg: Threat Intelligence Knowledge Graph Construction Utilizing Large Language Model. *Available at SSRN 4671345* (2023).
- [18] Xinke Jiang, Ruizhe Zhang, Yongxin Xu, Rihong Qiu, Yue Fang, Zhiyuan Wang, Jinyi Tang, Hongxin Ding, Xu Chu, Junfeng Zhao, et al. 2023. Think and Retrieval: A Hypothesis Knowledge Graph Enhanced Medical Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15883* (2023).
- [19] Zhouyu Jiang, Ling Zhong, Mengshu Sun, Jun Xu, Rui Sun, Hui Cai, Shuhan Luo, and Zhiqiang Zhang. 2024. Efficient Knowledge Infusion via KG-LLM Alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03746* (2024).
- [20] Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. PubMedQA: A Dataset for Biomedical Research Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 2567–2577.
- [21] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.
- [22] Haotian Li, Lingzhi Wang, Yuliang Wei, Richard Yi Da Xu, and Bailing Wang. 2023. KERMIT: Knowledge Graph Completion of Enhanced Relation Modeling with Inverse Transformation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14770* (2023).
- [23] Yunxiang Li, Zihan Li, Kai Zhang, Ruilong Dan, Steve Jiang, and You Zhang. 2023. Chatdoctor: A medical chat model fine-tuned on a large language model meta-ai

- (llama) using medical domain knowledge. *Cureus* 15, 6 (2023).
- [24] Yong Lin, Lu Tan, Hangyu Lin, Zeming Zheng, Renjie Pi, Jipeng Zhang, Shizhe Diao, Haoxiang Wang, Han Zhao, Yuan Yao, et al. 2023. Speciality vs generality: An empirical study on catastrophic forgetting in fine-tuning foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06256* (2023).
- [25] Qidong Liu, Xian Wu, Xiangyu Zhao, Yuanshao Zhu, Derong Xu, Feng Tian, and Yefeng Zheng. 2024. When MOE Meets LLMs: Parameter Efficient Fine-tuning for Multi-task Medical Applications. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1104–1114.
- [26] Weijie Liu, Peng Zhou, Zhe Zhao, Zhiruo Wang, Qi Ju, Haotang Deng, and Ping Wang. 2020. K-bert: Enabling language representation with knowledge graph. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 2901–2908.
- [27] Zhengliang Liu, Aoxiao Zhong, Yiwei Li, Longtao Yang, Chao Ju, Zihao Wu, Chong Ma, Peng Shu, Cheng Chen, Sekeun Kim, et al. 2023. Tailoring large language models to radiology: A preliminary approach to llm adaptation for a highly specialized domain. In *International Workshop on Machine Learning in Medical Imaging*. Springer, 464–473.
- [28] 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).
- [29] Alex Mullen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10511* (2022).
- [30] Nicholas Matsumoto, Jay Moran, Hyunjun Choi, Miguel E Hernandez, Mythreye Venkatesan, Paul Wang, and Jason H Moore. 2024. KRAGEN: a knowledge Graph-Enhanced RAG framework for biomedical problem solving using large language models. *Bioinformatics* (2024), btae353.
- [31] Lars-Peter Meyer, Claus Stadler, Johannes Frey, Norman Radtke, Kurt Junghanns, Roy Meissner, Gordian Dziwi, Kirill Bulert, and Michael Martin. 2023. Llm-assisted knowledge graph engineering: Experiments with chatgpt. In *Working conference on Artificial Intelligence Development for a Resilient and Sustainable Tomorrow*. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden Wiesbaden, 103–115.
- [32] Grégoire Mialon, Roberto Dessi, Maria Lomeli, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Ram Pasunuru, Roberta Raileanu, Baptiste Rozière, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Asli Celikyilmaz, et al. 2023. Augmented language models: a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07842* (2023).
- [33] Nandana Mihindukulasooriya, Sanju Tiwari, Carlos F Enguix, and Kusum Lata. 2023. Text2kgbench: A benchmark for ontology-driven knowledge graph generation from text. In *International Semantic Web Conference*. Springer, 247–265.
- [34] Sudha Morwal, Nusrat Jahan, and Deepti Chopra. 2012. Named entity recognition using hidden Markov model (HMM). *International Journal on Natural Language Computing (IJNLC) Vol 1* (2012).
- [35] Xinyi Mou, Zejun Li, Hanjia Lyu, Jiebo Luo, and Zhongyu Wei. 2024. Unifying local and global knowledge: Empowering large language models as political experts with knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 2603–2614.
- [36] OpenAI. [n.d.]. Chat Completions Guide. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/chat-completions>. Accessed: 2024-08-06.
- [37] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
- [38] Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikannan Sankarasubbu. 2022. MedMQA: A Large-scale Multi-Subject Multi-Choice Dataset for Medical domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 174)*, Gerardo Flores, George H Chen, Tom Pollard, Joyce C Ho, and Tristan Naumann (Eds.). PMLR, 248–260.
- [39] Jeff Z Pan, Simon Razniewski, Jan-Christoph Kalo, Sneha Singhanian, Jiaoyan Chen, Stefan Dietze, Hajira Jabeen, Janna Omeliyanenko, Wen Zhang, Matteo Lisandrini, et al. 2023. Large language models and knowledge graphs: Opportunities and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06374* (2023).
- [40] Nita Patil, Ajay Patil, and BV Pawar. 2020. Named entity recognition using conditional random fields. *Procedia Computer Science* 167 (2020), 1181–1188.
- [41] Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Hao Cheng, Yujia Xie, Yu Hu, Qiuyuan Huang, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2023. Check your facts and try again: Improving large language models with external knowledge and automated feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12813* (2023).
- [42] André Gomes Regino, Rodrigo Oliveira Caus, Victor Hochgreb, and Julio Cesar dos Reis. 2022. From Natural Language Texts to RDF Triples: A Novel Approach to Generating e-Commerce Knowledge Graphs. In *International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering, and Knowledge Management*. Springer, 149–174.
- [43] Ali Sadeghian, Mohammadreza Armandpour, Patrick Ding, and Daisy Zhe Wang. 2019. Drum: End-to-end differentiable rule mining on knowledge graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [44] Tanik Saikh, Tirthankar Ghosal, Amish Mittal, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhat-tacharyya. 2022. Scienceqa: A novel resource for question answering on scholarly articles. *International Journal on Digital Libraries* 23, 3 (2022), 289–301.
- [45] Prateek Sancheti, Kamalakara Karlapalem, and Kavita Vemuri. 2024. LLM Driven Web Profile Extraction for Identical Names. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*. 1616–1625.
- [46] Apoorv Saxena, Aditay Tripathi, and Partha Talukdar. 2020. Improving multi-hop question answering over knowledge graphs using knowledge base embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*. 4498–4507.
- [47] Viktor Schlegel and André Freitas. 2019. DBee: A database for creating and managing knowledge graphs and embeddings. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Workshop on Graph-Based Methods for Natural Language Processing (TextGraphs-13)*. 177–185.
- [48] Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. 2021. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.07567* (2021).
- [49] Karthik Soman, Peter W Rose, John H Morris, Rabia E Akbas, Brett Smith, Braian Peetoom, Catalina Villouta-Reyes, Gabriel Ceron, Yongmei Shi, Angela Rizk-Jackson, et al. 2023. Biomedical knowledge graph-enhanced prompt generation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17330* (2023).
- [50] Jingyun Sun, Chengxiao Dai, Zhongze Luo, Yangbo Chang, and Yang Li. 2024. LawLuo: A Chinese Law Firm Co-run by LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16252* (2024).
- [51] Jiashuo Sun, Chengjin Xu, Lumingyuan Tang, Saizhuo Wang, Chen Lin, Yeyun Gong, Heung-Yeung Shum, and Jian Guo. 2023. Think-on-graph: Deep and responsible reasoning of large language model with knowledge graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07697* (2023).
- [52] Tianxiang Sun, Yunfan Shao, Xipeng Qiu, Qipeng Guo, Yaru Hu, Xuanjing Huang, and Zheng Zhang. 2020. Colake: Contextualized language and knowledge embedding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00309* (2020).
- [53] Tilahun Abedissa Taffa and Ricardo Usbeck. 2023. Leveraging llms in scholarly knowledge graph question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09841* (2023).
- [54] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. 2023. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805* (2023).
- [55] Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Darren Shu Jeng Ting, Kabilan Elangovan, Laura Gutierrez, Ting Fang Tan, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. 2023. Large language models in medicine. *Nature medicine* 29, 8 (2023), 1930–1940.
- [56] Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kuleshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. Lambda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239* (2022).
- [57] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [58] Théo Trouillon, Johannes Welbl, Sebastian Riedel, Éric Gaussier, and Guillaume Bouchard. 2016. Complex embeddings for simple link prediction. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2071–2080.
- [59] Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. 2014. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Commun. ACM* 57, 10 (2014), 78–85.
- [60] Bo Wang, Tao Shen, Guodong Long, Tianyi Zhou, Ying Wang, and Yi Chang. 2021. Structure-augmented text representation learning for efficient knowledge graph completion. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*. 1737–1748.
- [61] Liang Wang, Wei Zhao, Zhuoyu Wei, and Jingming Liu. 2022. SimKGC: Simple Contrastive Knowledge Graph Completion with Pre-trained Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 4281–4294.
- [62] Shuhe Wang, Xiaofei Sun, Xiaoya Li, Rongbin Ouyang, Fei Wu, Tianwei Zhang, Jiwei Li, and Guoyin Wang. 2023. Gpt-ner: Named entity recognition via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10428* (2023).
- [63] Xiaoyan Wang, Pavan Kapanipathi, Ryan Musa, Mo Yu, Kartik Talamadupula, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Maria Chang, Achille Fokoue, Bassem Makni, Nicholas Mattei, et al. 2019. Improving natural language inference using external knowledge in the science questions domain. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 33. 7208–7215.
- [64] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 24824–24837.
- [65] Yanbin Wei, Qiushi Huang, James T Kwok, and Yu Zhang. 2024. KICGPT: Large Language Model with Knowledge in Context for Knowledge Graph Completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02389* (2024).
- [66] Johannes Welbl, Nelson F. Liu, and Matt Gardner. 2017. Crowdsourcing Multiple Choice Science Questions. *ArXiv abs/1707.06209* (2017). <https://api>.

- semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1553193
- [67] Yilin Wen, Zifeng Wang, and Jimeng Sun. 2023. Mindmap: Knowledge graph prompting sparks graph of thoughts in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09729* (2023).
 - [68] 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).
 - [69] Fei Xia, Bin Li, Yixuan Weng, Shizhu He, Kang Liu, Bin Sun, Shutao Li, and Jun Zhao. 2022. MedConQA: medical conversational question answering system based on knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*. 148–158.
 - [70] Tianbao Xie, Chen Henry Wu, Peng Shi, Ruiqi Zhong, Torsten Scholak, Michihiro Yasunaga, Chien-Sheng Wu, Ming Zhong, Pengcheng Yin, Sida I Wang, et al. 2022. Unifedskg: Unifying and multi-tasking structured knowledge grounding with text-to-text language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.05966* (2022).
 - [71] Yao Xu, Shizhu He, Jiabei Chen, Zihao Wang, Yangqiu Song, Hanghang Tong, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2024. Generate-on-Graph: Treat LLM as both Agent and KG in Incomplete Knowledge Graph Question Answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14741* (2024).
 - [72] Fan Yang, Zhilin Yang, and William W Cohen. 2017. Differentiable learning of logical rules for knowledge base reasoning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
 - [73] Qimin Yang, Rongsheng Wang, Jiexin Chen, Runqi Su, and Tao Tan. 2024. Fine-Tuning Medical Language Models for Enhanced Long-Contextual Understanding and Domain Expertise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11536* (2024).
 - [74] Liang Yao, Chengsheng Mao, and Yuan Luo. 2019. KG-BERT: BERT for knowledge graph completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03193* (2019).
 - [75] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2024. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
 - [76] Miao Zhang, Rufeng Dai, Ming Dong, and Tingting He. 2022. Drlk: dynamic hierarchical reasoning with language model and knowledge graph for question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 5123–5133.
 - [77] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675* (2019).
 - [78] GuoDong Zhou and Jian Su. 2002. Named entity recognition using an HMM-based chunk tagger. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*. 473–480.

A ALGORITHM FOR WTS

We present a detailed overview of the algorithmic progress of WTS, as shown on Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: The workflow of WTS

Data: question q , real_answer α_q^* , domain knowledge graph \mathcal{G} , max_depth D , max_width W , max_hop H ($H < D$)

Result: LLM answer α_q

$\mathcal{E}_q \leftarrow \text{LLM_Entity_Extract}(q);$

depth $d \leftarrow 1;$

$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q \leftarrow \{\};$

$\mathcal{E}_q^{(1)} \leftarrow \mathcal{E}_q;$

while $d \leq D$ **do**

$\mathcal{T}_q^{(d)} \leftarrow \text{Retrieve_KG}(\mathcal{E}_q^{(d)}, \mathcal{G})$ # Retrieve entities in DKG;

$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)} \leftarrow \text{LLM_Score_and_Prune}(\mathcal{T}_q^{(d)}, q, W)$ # Use LLM to score and prune the triples;

$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q \leftarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^d \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(i)}$ # Update the retrieved knowledge triples;

$\mathcal{E}_q^{(d+1)} = \{e | e \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q^{(d)}, e \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^d \mathcal{E}_q^{(i)}\}$ # Update the retrieved entities;

confidence, $\alpha_q^{(d)} \leftarrow \text{LLM_Generation}(q, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q)$ # Prompt LLM to generate answer;

if confidence is positive and $d \leq H$ **then**

$\alpha_q \leftarrow \alpha_q^{(d)}$ # Get the final answer of LLM;

break;

else

if confidence is positive and $d > H$ **then**

$\alpha_q \leftarrow \alpha_q^{(d)};$

$\mathcal{T}_q^+ \leftarrow \text{LLM_Create_Triple}(q, \alpha_q^*, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q)$ # Prompt LLM to generate KG triples;

$\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \text{Update_KG}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}_q^+)$ # Update KG with generated triples;

break;

else

if confidence is negative and $d == D$ **then**

$\alpha_q \leftarrow \alpha_q^{(d)};$

$\mathcal{T}_q^+ \leftarrow \text{LLM_Create_Triple}(q, \alpha_q^*, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q);$

$\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \text{Update_KG}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{T}_q^+);$

end

end

end

end

B EXPERIMENT DETAILS

B.1 Dataset

The statistics of the datasets used in this paper are shown in Table 4. To avoid the influence of context provided by the dataset on the

evaluation of methods, no extra context information except the retrieved results is offered as the support information during the experiments. The detailed descriptions of their usage in this paper are as follows:

ChatDoctor5k ChatDoctor5k [23] is a generated conversation between patients and physicians from ChatGPT grounded on a disease database. Each input describes the patient’s symptoms possibly with past medical history or etiological factor attached. And the desired output needs to give professional suggestions covering the diagnosis, symptoms, recommended treatments, medical tests, and so on. We sampled 1000 dialogues as the test set to test the long text generation capability of WTS.

PubMedQA PubMedQA [20] contains tests requiring to answer biomedical research questions with yes, no or maybe given the context provided by PubMed abstracts. To fully display the performance of knowledge augmentation, we adopt no given context and reasoning-free setting and use the labeled 1000 Q&A pairs in the experiment.

MedMCQA MedMCQA [38] is a large-scale, Multiple-Choice Question Answering (MCQA) dataset designed to address real-world medical entrance exam questions. We sample 1000 single-choice questions and 1000 multiple-choice questions from the “dev” subset of the dataset with random 2 to 4 choices as the test set.

SciQ SciQ [66] is a multiple-choice format science exam dataset about physics, chemistry and biology. Each question has 4 answer options. We use the “test” subset of SciQ containing 1000 questions and provide no additional paragraph with supporting evidence to evaluate our methods.

ScienceQA ScienceQA [44] is a large-scale science question-answering dataset containing various knowledge domains. In our experiment, we sample the 500 natural science questions, 500 language science questions, and 225 social science questions in the “test” subset of ScienceQA with no image and no textual context.

Simple Questions Simple Questions [8] is a large-scale Q&A dataset with 100k Q&A pairs constructed based on Freebase knowledge base. Each pair in Simple Questions has a corresponding fact from Freebase and can be rephrased as the form of (subject, relationship, ?). We sample 1000 pairs as the test set.

B.2 Metrics

For the dataset ChatDoctor5k, we evaluate the text generation task with BERTScore [77], which computes a similarity score for each token in the candidate sentence with each token in the reference sentence. The complete score matches each token in \hat{x} to a token in x to compute recall, and each token in \hat{x} to a token in x to compute precision. We use greedy matching to maximize the matching similarity score, where each token is matched to the most similar token in the other sentence. We combine precision and recall to compute an F1 measure. For a reference x and candidate \hat{x} , the recall, precision, and F1 scores are:

$$R_{\text{BERT}} = \frac{1}{|\hat{x}|} \sum_{x_i \in x} \max_{\hat{x}_j \in \hat{x}} x_i^\top \hat{x}_j, P_{\text{BERT}} = \frac{1}{|\hat{x}|} \sum_{\hat{x}_j \in \hat{x}} \max_{x_i \in x} \hat{x}_j^\top x_i \quad (1)$$

$$F_{\text{BERT}} = 2 \times \frac{P_{\text{BERT}} \cdot R_{\text{BERT}}}{P_{\text{BERT}} + R_{\text{BERT}}} \quad (2)$$

For the other datasets, we use Accuracy as the metric to evaluate the correctness of the results. Accuracy is defined as the ratio of correctly predicted instances to the total number of instances, particularly suitable for multiple-choice questions where the primary concern is the correctness of the predicted labels.

B.3 Evaluation

To facilitate result evaluation, WTS employs prompts to constrain its output format to JSON. To prevent irrelevant generations from interfering with answer evaluation, the LLMs are instructed to provide the label of their answers in multiple-choice questions. Consequently, the evaluation is based solely on whether the label corresponds to the correct answer. This constraint is also applied to the GPT-3.5-turbo and GPT-4o baselines for the sake of fairness. For the ToG and CoT baselines, to avoid imposing format restrictions that may affect their performance, we use a specific signal by adding ‘(’ before the answer and ‘)’ after it. This method ensures the precise extraction of answers and upholds consistency throughout the evaluation process.

C SUPPLEMENTARY RESULTS

Table 5 shows the average execution time of WTS for a question, where D represents the maximal retrieval depth. It is apparent that WTS with GPT-4o API incurs a higher time cost compared to GPT-3.5.

Table 6 shows the performance of the Mastership phase on the ChatDoctor5k dataset. During the Apprenticeship phase, we sampled 800 data to conduct medical Q&A and consistently evolve the DKG. In the Mastership phase, we tested the performance of WTS with another 200 non-overlapping samples. The results show that WTS achieves state-of-the-art performance compared to the four baseline models.

The execution time (sec) of the different maximal retrieval depths on three medical domain datasets, ChatDoctor5k, PubMedQA, and MedMCQA, is shown in Table 7. For ChatDoctor5k and PubMedQA, the maximum retrieval depth ranges from 1 to 4, while for MedMCQA, it is set from 2 to 5. The results indicate that as the maximum retrieval depth increases, execution time correspondingly rises.

We analyzed the answers across six datasets to investigate the evidence for WTS in generating answers, as illustrated in Figure 8. The results indicate that in the general domain and certain science domains, e.g., social science, which includes a considerable amount of commonsense questions, a significant proportion of the answers rely exclusively on the intrinsic knowledge embedded within LLM’s parameters. However, in specialized domains such as the medical domain and linguistics, accurate answer generation requires specific domain knowledge. Consequently, a substantial proportion of these queries rely on a combination of knowledge from both retrieved triples and the LLM’s inherent knowledge for answer generation.

Table 8 shows the size of the knowledge graph constructed in the process of WTS. The results show that advanced models with more inherent knowledge lead to the construction of more concise DKGs. Furthermore, the advanced retrieval mechanisms also enhance the conciseness of DKGs by optimizing the WTS’s capability to utilize knowledge efficiently.

Table 4: Statistics of datasets used in experiments.

Dataset	Answer Format	Train	Validation	Test	Details
ChatDoctor5k	Text Generation	5,452	-	-	-
PubMedQA	True/False Question	273,518	-	-	Artificial Generated: 211,269 Expert Labeled: 1,000 Unlabeled: 61,249
MedMCQA	Multiple Choice Question	182,822	6,150	4,183	Single Choice Question: 127,715 Multiple Choice Question: 65,400
Sciq	Multiple Choice Question	11,679	1,000	1,000	-
ScienceQA	Multiple Choice Question	12,726	4,241	4,241	Social Science: 4,350 Natural Science: 11,487 Language Science: 5,371
SimpleQA	Multiple Choice Question	14,894	-	1,000	-


Table 5: Total average execution time (sec) and maximal retrieval depth of WTS in each dataset.

Method	WTS(GPT-3.5)/sec	WTS(GPT-4o)/sec	D
ChatDoctor5k	21.26	37.37	2
PubMedQA	21.93	33.95	3
MedMCQA(Single)	30.38	23.15	4
MedMCQA(Multi)	17.17	32.50	4
sciq	9.28	19.17	2
ScienceQA(SOC)	8.48	21.91	3
ScienceQA(NAT)	11.84	17.87	3
ScienceQA(LAN)	11.63	21.35	3
SimpleQA	14.77	31.31	3

prompt instructs the LLM to function as a medical assistant, performing Named Entity Recognition to identify and output up to five meaningful entities. This prompt ensures that the most relevant information is captured concisely.

PROMPT 1. Question Entity Extraction

- system prompt:
You are a [medical] assistant to carry out [Medical] Name Entity Recognition from a question and output JSON with only one key entity, like {entities: [entity1, entity2,...]}
- user prompt:
Get at most 5 meaningful entities in the question: { Question }.

**Figure 8: Proportions of WTS's evidence of answers.**

D PROMPTS OF METHODS

Taking MedMCQA, a medical QA dataset with choices as an example, we show the prompt used in the experiments of WTS, ChatGPT, CoT and ToG methods.

D.1 WTS (Way-to-Specialist)

In WTS, there are four kinds of interaction with the LLMs. The following shows the prompts of WTS including Question Entity Extract Prompt, Triple Score and Prune Prompt, LLM Reason with Triples Prompt, and LLM Generate KG Triple Prompt.

As shown in Prompt 1, the "Question Entity Extraction" prompt of WTS is designed to extract key entities from questions. The

As shown in Prompt 2, the "Score and Prune" prompt of WTS is designed to evaluate and rank the retrieved KG triples based on their relevance to a given question. The prompt instructs the LLM to assign a relevance score to each triple, and output a structured JSON object listing the most relevant triples in descending order of their scores.

PROMPT 2. Triple Score and Prune

- system prompt:
You are a [medical] expert to score the triples based on the relevance of the question and output JSON with only one key triple like { triples: [{ triple: { head: xxx, relation: xxx, tail: xxx }, score: xxx },...] }. The score is between 0 and 1, and the order is from high to low.
- user prompt:
Based on the question: { Question }, score the triples: { Triples }.

The "LLM Reason with Triples" prompt of WTS is designed to instruct LLM in generating answers to questions by reasoning with both its inherent knowledge and provided KG triples. The system prompt restricts the LLM to output a JSON object that includes the confidence level of LLM, the answer to the question, and the supporting information used to generate the answer, ensuring clarity in the response and precision in further evaluation.

Table 6: Performance of Apprenticeship and Mastership phase on ChatDoctor5k.

Phase Metric Method	Apprenticeship			Mastership		
	Pre	Rec	BertScore	Pre	Rec	BertScore
GPT-3.5	0.774	0.792	0.782	0.776	0.792	0.783
CoT	0.757	0.799	0.777	0.758	0.797	0.776
ToG	0.741	0.800	0.768	0.741	0.800	0.769
GPT-4o	0.759	0.798	0.777	0.760	0.796	0.777
WTS(GPT-3.5)	0.781	0.810	0.794	0.778	0.809	0.792

Table 7: Execution time of different retrieval depth on medical domain datasets.

Dataset	D1	D2	D3	D4
Chatdoctor5k	15.27	21.26	21.62	23.48
PubMedQA	9.61	12.64	21.93	18.14
MedMCQA(Single)	15.44	16.80	30.38	37.14
MedMCQA(Multi)	15.50	18.77	17.17	37.57

PROMPT 3. LLM Reason with Triples

- system prompt:
You are a [medical] expert to answer patients' questions based on your own knowledge and the given information and give confidence [Yes/No]. The output should be a JSON with three keys confidence, answer, and support_info like {confidence: xxx, answer: xxx, support_info: xxx}
- user prompt:
Based on your own knowledge and the <knowledge triple>, choose one of the <Option> to answer the question. knowledge triple: { Triples }, Q: { Question }, Option: { Option }, A: ?

The "Generate KG Triple" prompt in the WTS framework instructs the LLM to extract and construct KG triples from the provided question, answer, and entities. The prompt instructs the LLM to produce KG triples formatted with a head, relation, and tail, which creates a structured representation of knowledge.

PROMPT 4. LLM Generate KG Triple

- system prompt:
You are a [medical] expert to extract general [medical] knowledge from question and answer to create [medical] knowledge graph triples. The output should be a JSON with only one key: triples like this: { triples: [<triple1>, <triple2>, ...] }, and each triple should be like: { head: xxx, relation: xxx, tail: xxx }.
- user prompt:
Based on the question: { Question }, answer: { Answer } and entity: { Entity }, extract and output triples.

D.2 ChatGPT

For ChatGPT, we prompt it to directly generate the answer to the given question with one shot. The single example given is to assist

its comprehension. To achieve accurate evaluations, we constrain the form of the output as JSON. The prompt is shown as Prompt 5.

PROMPT 5. Directly Generate Answer

- system prompt:
You are an assistant to answer questions to output JSON.
- user prompt:
Here is a question, choose one of the <Option> to answer the question. Your answer must be [0/1/2/3] which is the order of your choice and your output has only one key answer.
Q: { Question }, Option:{ Option }, A: ?
Example:
Q: Which time zone is sesto ed uniti located in?
Option: [Central European Time Zone, Greenwich Mean Time, Coordinated Universal Time, Central Standard Time]
A: { answer: 0 }

D.3 CoT (Chain-of-Thought)

As shown in Prompt 6, with 5-shot prompting, the CoT prompt in our experiment aims to minimize modifications to the original text. To avoid any influence of the output format on the results, the output format is not constrained.

PROMPT 6. Directly Generate Answer

- system prompt:
You are an assistant to answer questions.
- user prompt:
Select the [0/1/2/3] which is the order of your choice in Option as part of your answer.
Example:
Q: Sammy wanted to go to where the people were. Where might he go?
Option: [race track, populated areas, desert, apartment]
A: The answer must be a place with a lot of people. Race tracks, deserts, apartments, and roadblocks don't have a lot of people, but populated areas do. So the answer is (1).
Q: Google Maps and other highway and street GPS services have replaced what?
Option: [united states, mexico, countryside, atlas]
A: The answer must be something that is used to do what Google Maps and GPS services do, which is to give directions. Of the

Table 8: Number of knowledge triples in generated DKGs.

Dataset	WTS (GPT-3.5 w/CM)	WTS (GPT-3.5 w/EM-ESR)	WTS (GPT-3.5 w/EM-QSR)	WYS (GPT-4o w/EM-QSR)
ChatDoctor5k	3,712	3,554	3,178	3,136
PubMedQA	1,227	1,635	1,480	1,178
MedMCQA(Single)	1,024	1,033	1,124	533
MedMCQA(Multi)	807	1,361	1,204	655
SimpleQA	1,095	1,134	1,097	828
sciq	181	184	191	52
ScienceQA-NAT	156	171	146	21
ScienceQA-SOC	43	29	25	1
ScienceQA-LAN	385	329	317	159

above choices, only atlases are used to give directions. So the answer is (3).

Q: Before getting a divorce, what did the wife feel who was doing all the work?

Option: [harder, anguish, bitterness, tears]

A: The answer should be the feeling of someone getting divorced who was doing all the work. Of the above choices, the closest feeling is bitterness. So the answer is (2).

Q: What home entertainment equipment requires cable?

Option: [television, radio shack, substation, cabinet]

A: The answer must require cable. Of the above choices, only television requires cable. So the answer is (0).

Q: What kitchen appliance uses water to function?

Option: [microwave, toaster, dishwasher, blender]

A: The answer must use water to function. Of the above choices, only the dishwasher uses water to function. So the answer is (2).

Q: { Question }, Option: { Option }, A: ?

D.4 ToG (Think-on-Graph)

The prompts for ToG are adapted from [51] where ToG is proposed and tailored to the dataset used in this paper. In [51], the entities in the questions are provided in their datasets. Therefore, we incorporated a Question Entity Extraction module similar to that in WTS.

PROMPT 7. *Directly Generate Answer*

- system prompt:
You are an AI assistant that helps people find information.
- user prompt:
Select the [0/1/2/3] which is the order of your choice in Option as part of your answer.
Example:
Q: Sammy wanted to go to where the people were. Where might he go?
Option: [race track, populated areas, desert, apartment]
A: The answer must be a place with a lot of people. Race tracks, deserts, apartments, and roadblocks don't have a lot of people, but populated areas do. So the answer is (1).

Q: Google Maps and other highway and street GPS services have replaced what?

Option: [united states, mexico, countryside, atlas]

A: The answer must be something that is used to do what Google Maps and GPS services do, which is to give directions. Of the above choices, only atlases are used to give directions. So the answer is (3).

Q: Before getting a divorce, what did the wife feel who was doing all the work?

Option: [harder, anguish, bitterness, tears]

A: The answer should be the feeling of someone getting divorced who was doing all the work. Of the above choices, the closest feeling is bitterness. So the answer is (2).

Q: What home entertainment equipment requires cable?

Option: [television, radio shack, substation, cabinet]

A: The answer must require cable. Of the above choices, only television requires cable. So the answer is (0).

Q: What kitchen appliance uses water to function?

Option: [microwave, toaster, dishwasher, blender]

A: The answer must use water to function. Of the above choices, only the dishwasher uses water to function. So the answer is (2).

Q:{ Question }, Option: { Option }, A: ?

PROMPT 8. *Question Entity Extraction*

- system prompt:
You are an assistant to carry out Name Entity Recognition from a question and output JSON with only one key entity, like {entities: [entity1, entity2,...]}
- user prompt:
Get at most 5 meaningful entities in the question: { Question }.

PROMPT 9. *Extract Relation*

- system prompt:
You are an AI assistant that helps people find information.
- user prompt:
Please retrieve %s relations (separated by semicolon) that contribute to the question and rate their contribution on a scale from 0 to 1 (the sum of the scores of %s relations is 1).

PROMPT 10. *Extract Entity*

- system prompt:
You are an AI assistant that helps people find information.
- user prompt:
Get the meaningful entities in the question. The answer should be like this:
Q: Doctor, I've been experiencing a condition called cryptorchidism. My testicles have not descended properly into the scrotum. What medical tests do I need to take?
A:entities: [cryptorchidism, testicles] in the form of a list.
Q: { Question }

PROMPT 11. *Score Entity Candidates*

- system prompt:
You are an AI assistant that helps people find information.
- user prompt:
Please score the entities' contribution to the question on a scale from 0 to 1 (the sum of the scores of all entities is 1).
Example:
Q: The movie featured Miley Cyrus and was produced by Tobin Armbrust?
Relation: film.producer.film
Entities: The Resident; So Undercover; Let Me In; Begin Again; The Quiet Ones; A Walk Among the Tombstones
Score: 0.0, 1.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0 The movie that matches the given criteria is "So Undercover" with Miley Cyrus and produced by Tobin Armbrust. Therefore, the score for "So Undercover" would be 1, and the scores for all other entities would be 0.
Q: { Question } Relation: { Relation } Entities: { Entities }

PROMPT 12. *Reason Answer*

- system prompt:
You are an AI assistant that helps people find information.
- user prompt:
Given a question and the associated retrieved knowledge graph triplets (entity, relation, entity), you are asked to answer the question with these triplets and your knowledge. You must select the [0/1/2/3] which is the order of your choice in Option as part of your answer.
Q: Find the person who said "Taste cannot be controlled by law; what did this person die from?"
Option: [illness, earthquake, murder, accident]
Knowledge Triplets: Taste cannot be controlled by law., media_common.quotation.author, Thomas Jefferson
A: Based on the given knowledge triplets, it's not sufficient to answer the entire question. The triplets only provide information about the person who said "Taste cannot be controlled by law," which is Thomas Jefferson. To answer the second part of the question, it's necessary to have additional knowledge about where Thomas Jefferson's dead. In my opinion, the answer to the question is (0).
Q: The artist nominated for The Long Winter lived where?

Option: [De Smet, Denmark, Italy, Tokyo]

Knowledge Triplets: The Long Winter, book.written_work.author, Laura Ingalls Wilder, Laura Ingalls Wilder, people.person.places_lived, Unknown-Entity Unknown-Entity, people.place_lived.location, De Smet

A: Based on the given knowledge triplets, the author of The Long Winter, Laura Ingalls Wilder, lived in De Smet. Therefore, the answer to the question is (0).

Q: Who is the coach of the team owned by Steve Bisciotti? Option: [Donald J. Trump, Vincent Thomas Lombardi, Joe Paterno, John Harbaugh]

Knowledge Triplets: Steve Bisciotti, sports.professional_sports_team.owner_s, Baltimore Ravens Steve Bisciotti, sports.sports_team.owner.teams_owned, Baltimore Ravens Steve Bisciotti, organization.organization_founder.organizations_founded, Allegis Group

A: Based on the given knowledge triplets, the coach of the team owned by Steve Bisciotti is not explicitly mentioned. However, it can be inferred that the team owned by Steve Bisciotti is the Baltimore Ravens, a professional sports team. Therefore, additional knowledge about the current coach of the Baltimore Ravens can be used to answer the question. In my opinion, the answer to the question is (3).

Q: Rift Valley Province is located in a nation that uses which form of currency?

Option: [Afghan afghani, Japanese yen, Kenyan shilling, Euro]

Knowledge Triplets: Rift Valley Province, location.administrative_division.country, Kenya Rift Valley Province, location.location.geolocation, UnName_Entity Rift Valley Province, location.mailing_address.state_province_region, UnName_Entity Kenya, location.country.currency_used, Kenyan shilling

A: Based on the given knowledge triplets, Rift Valley Province is located in Kenya, which uses the Kenyan shilling as its currency. Therefore, the answer to the question is (2).

Q: The country with the National Anthem of Bolivia borders which nations?

Option: [Uruguay, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia]

Knowledge Triplets: National Anthem of Bolivia, government.national_anthem_of_a_country.anthem, UnName_Entity National Anthem of Bolivia, music.composition.composer, Leopoldo Benedetto Vincenti National Anthem of Bolivia, music.composition.lyricist, José Ignacio de Sanjinés UnName_Entity, government.national_anthem_of_a_country.country, Bolivia Bolivia, location.country.national_anthem, UnName_Entity

A: Based on the given knowledge triplets, we can infer that the National Anthem of Bolivia is the anthem of Bolivia. Therefore, the country with the National Anthem of Bolivia is Bolivia itself. However, the given knowledge triplets do not provide information about which nations border Bolivia. To answer this question, we need additional knowledge about the geography of Bolivia and its neighboring countries. In my opinion, the answer to the question is (1).

Q: { Question }

PROMPT 13. Information Evaluate

• system prompt:
You are an AI assistant that helps people find information.

• user prompt:
Given a question and the associated retrieved knowledge graph triplets (entity, relation, entity), you are asked to answer whether it's sufficient for you to answer the question with these triplets and your knowledge (Yes or No). Besides, you must select the [0/1/2/3] which is the order of your choice in Option as part of your answer.

Q: Find the person who said "Taste cannot be controlled by law; what did this person die from?"

Option: [illness, earthquake, murder, accident]

Knowledge Triplets: Taste cannot be controlled by law., media_common.quotation.author, Thomas Jefferson

A: No. Based on the given knowledge triplets, it's not sufficient to answer the entire question. The triplets only provide information about the person who said "Taste cannot be controlled by law," which is Thomas Jefferson. To answer the second part of the question, it's necessary to have additional knowledge about where Thomas Jefferson's dead. In my opinion, the answer to the question is (0).

Q: The artist nominated for The Long Winter lived where?

Option: [De Smet, Denmark, Italy, Tokyo]

Knowledge Triplets: The Long Winter, book.written_work.author, Laura Ingalls Wilder Laura Ingalls Wilder, people.person.places_lived, Unknown-Entity Unknown-Entity, people.place_lived.location, De Smet

A: Yes. Based on the given knowledge triplets, the author of The Long Winter, Laura Ingalls Wilder, lived in De Smet. Therefore, the answer to the question is (0).

Q: Who is the coach of the team owned by Steve Bisciotti?

Option: [Donald J. Trump, Vincent Thomas Lombardi, Joe Paterno, John Harbaugh]

Knowledge Triplets: Steve Bisciotti, sports.professional_sports_team.owner_s, Baltimore Ravens Steve Bisciotti, sports.sports_team_owner.teams_owned, Baltimore Ravens Steve Bisciotti, organization.organization_founder.organizations_founded, Allegis Group

A: No. Based on the given knowledge triplets, the coach of the team owned by Steve Bisciotti is not explicitly mentioned. However, it can be inferred that the team owned by Steve Bisciotti is the Baltimore Ravens, a professional sports team. Therefore, additional knowledge about the current coach of the Baltimore Ravens can be used to answer the question. In my opinion, the answer to the question is (3).

Q: Rift Valley Province is located in a nation that uses which form of currency?

Option: [Afghan afghani, Japanese yen, Kenyan shilling, Euro]

Knowledge Triplets: Rift Valley Province, location.administrative_division.country, Kenya Rift Valley Province, location.location.geolocation, UnName_Entity Rift Valley Province, location.mailing_address.state_province_region,

UnName_Entity Kenya, location. country.currency_used, Kenyan shilling

A: Yes. Based on the given knowledge triplets, Rift Valley Province is located in Kenya, which uses the Kenyan shilling as its currency. Therefore, the answer to the question is (2).

Q: The country with the National Anthem of Bolivia borders which nations?

Option: [Uruguay, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia]

Knowledge Triplets: National Anthem of Bolivia, government.national_anthem_of_a_country.anthem, UnName_Entity National Anthem of Bolivia, music.composition.composer, Leopoldo Benedetto Vincenti National Anthem of Bolivia, music.composition.lyricist, José Ignacio de Sanjinés UnName_Entity, government.national_anthem_of_a_country.country, Bolivia Bolivia, location.country.national_anthem, UnName_Entity

A: No. Based on the given knowledge triplets, we can infer that the National Anthem of Bolivia is the anthem of Bolivia. Therefore, the country with the National Anthem of Bolivia is Bolivia itself. However, the given knowledge triplets do not provide information about which nations border Bolivia. To answer this question, we need additional knowledge about the geography of Bolivia and its neighboring countries. In my opinion, the answer to the question is (1).

Q:{ Question }, Option: { Option }, Knowledge Triplets: { Knowledge Triplets }, A: ?