Our Method 000000 Experiments 000000000 Conclusion

More Cases

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

yuweiyin@cs.ubc.ca carenini@cs.ubc.ca

Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Science University of British Columbia, on unceded Musqueam land Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada



#### THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000		00000000000000000000

- **2** Our Method
- **3** Experiments
- **4** Conclusion
- **5** More Cases



Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenin

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
•00000	000000	000000000	0000	0000000000	0000000000000000000

- Our Method
- **3** Experiments
- **4** Conclusion
- **6** More Cases

### 6 References

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
00000	000000	000000000	0000	0000000000	000000000000000000
Backgrou	nd				

• Large language models (LLMs) [1, 2, 3] have been a transformative technique in Natural Language Processing (NLP) owing to their excellent text generation and conversation abilities [4, 5, 6].

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
00000	000000	000000000	0000	0000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000
Backgrour	nd				

• Challenging benchmarks for language model evaluation have significantly driven LLM advancements [7], with most designed as multiple-choice question-answering (MCQA) tasks [8] requiring answer selection from given options [9, 10, 11].

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
00000	000000	000000000	0000	0000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000
Backgrou	nd				

 Recent LLM benchmarks demand extensive commonsense, world knowledge, and complex reasoning [12, 13, 14], posing significant challenges for LLMs.
 ⇒ Optimizing LLM performance in QA tasks is increasingly crucial for their continued development.



## • An example in OpenBookQA [15]:

Fact: the summer solstice is on June 21st in the northern hemisphere.Task Input x<sub>i</sub>Question: The summer solstice in the northern hemisphere is four months before<br/>(A) May (B) July (C) April (D) October

Table 1: An instance from the OpenBookQA dataset [15].

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini



• Baseline method: directly answer the question.

Task Input $x_i$	Fact: the summer solstice is on June 21st in the northern hemisphere. Question: The summer solstice in the northern hemisphere is four months before (A) May (B) July (C) April (D) October
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(B) July. Explanation: The summer solstice is the longest day of the year and marks the beginning of summer. It is four months before the beginning of winter. The beginning of winter is in December, so the summer solstice is in June.
	Therefore, the summer solstice is four months before July.

#### Table 2: The output by the Baseline method.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini



- Baseline method: directly answer the question.
- **Problem:** The answer generation is only based on the task input, without reasoning or explanation.

Task Input $x_i$	Fact: the summer solstice is on June 21st in the northern hemisphere. Question: The summer solstice in the northern hemisphere is four months before (A) May (B) July (C) April (D) October
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(B) July. Explanation: The summer solstice is the longest day of the year and marks the beginning of summer. It is four months before the beginning of winter. The beginning of winter is in December, so the summer solstice is in June. Therefore, the summer solstice is four months before July.

#### Table 2: The output by the Baseline method.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

# Introduction Our Method Experiments Conclusion More Cases References QA with LLMs (CoT - Reasoning First) Reasoning First) References Reference

• China-of-Thought (CoT) method: "Let's think step by step". Generating step-by-step reasoning before giving the final answer.

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	<ul> <li>Fact: the summer solstice is on June 21st in the northern hemisphere.</li> <li>Question: The summer solstice in the northern hemisphere is four months before</li> <li>(A) May (B) July (C) April (D) October</li> </ul>
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The summer solstice is on June 21st. If we count four months before that, we get March 21st. March is the third month of the year, so the answer is (C). April is the fourth month, May is the fifth month, and October is the tenth month. None of these months is four months before June. July is the seventh month, which is five months after June, so it is not the correct answer either. The correct answer is (C).

#### Table 3: The output by the CoT method.

#### 

- China-of-Thought (CoT) method: "Let's think step by step". Generating step-by-step reasoning before giving the final answer.
- Advantage: The final answer is based on the intermediate steps.
   ⇒ More likely to answer correctly (if the LLM reasons well)

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	<ul> <li>Fact: the summer solstice is on June 21st in the northern hemisphere.</li> <li>Question: The summer solstice in the northern hemisphere is four months before</li> <li>(A) May (B) July (C) April (D) October</li> </ul>
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The summer solstice is on June 21st. If we count four months before that, we get March 21st. March is the third month of the year, so the answer is (C). April is the fourth month, May is the fifth month, and October is the tenth month. None of these months is four months before June. July is the seventh month, which is five months after June, so it is not the correct answer either. The correct answer is (C).

#### Table 3: The output by the CoT method.



• Argument: "Let's think step by step" is too generic and vague.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini



- Argument: "Let's think step by step" is too generic and vague.
- For QA tasks, how do we humans answer a question?



- Argument: "Let's think step by step" is too generic and vague.
- For QA tasks, how do we humans answer a question?
- "Step by Step" → What **steps** are we thinking?

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning



- Argument: "Let's think step by step" is too generic and vague.
- For QA tasks, how do we humans answer a question?
- "Step by Step" → What **steps** are we thinking?
- Can we guide LLMs to answer questions with human heuristics?

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	●00000	0000000000	0000		000000000000000000





- 3 Experiments
- 4 Conclusion
- 6 More Cases





• For QA tasks, how do we humans answer a question?



Figure 1: **ARR motivation.** To answer a question, we often need to **analyze** the question's intent, **retrieve** relevant information, and **reason** step by step.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

# Introduction Our Method Experiments Conclusion More Cases References Conclusion ARR: Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

- "Step by Step"  $\rightarrow$  What steps are we thinking?
  - (1) Analyze the question's **intent** [16, 17, 18] to obtain a thorough context understanding, a clear problem-solving target, and a purposeful planning guide,
  - (2) Retrieve relevant information from context, external sources, or memory for supportive reference [19, 20], and
  - (3) Systematically apply inductive and deductive reasoning [21, 22, 23, 24].



Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini



- Can we guide LLMs to answer questions with human heuristics?
- $\Rightarrow$  Prompting via Answer Trigger Sentence  $\Phi_i$ :
  - Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question , find relevant information , and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning .

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning



#### • Baseline vs. CoT vs. ARR: Different Answer Trigger Sentences



Figure 2: Question answering with LLMs. We first obtain rationale  $r_i$  by reasoning generation and then select the optimal option via evaluating the language modeling losses of different context-option combinations.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini



- ARR: Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning
- Our ARR method identifies the question's intent clearly, leading to a correct reasoning path and final answer.

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	<ul><li>Fact: the summer solstice is on June 21st in the northern hemisphere.</li><li>Question: The summer solstice in the northern hemisphere is four months before</li><li>(A) May (B) July (C) April (D) October</li></ul>
<b>ARR</b> $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The question asks for the month that is four months after the summer solstice. The summer solstice is on June 21st. Four months after June 21st is October 21st. Therefore, the correct answer is <b>(D) October</b> .

#### Table 4: The output by our ARR method.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	•000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000

- **2** Our Method
- **3** Experiments
- **4** Conclusion
- **5** More Cases

### 6 References

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

000000	000000		0000	0000000000	
Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References

Task	MCQA Dataset	Split	# Item	# Token	# Class
Reading	BoolQ [25]	Valid	3,270	145	2
Comprehension	LogiQA [10]	Test	651	192	4
Commonsense	CSQA [26]	Valid	1,221	43	5
Reasoning	SIQA [27]	Valid	1,954	51	3
	SciQ [28]	Test	1,000	132	4
World Knowledge	OBQA [15]	Test	500	55	4
	ARC [9]	Test	3,548	59	4
Multitock	BBH [13]	Test	5,281	112	2-18
Understanding	MMLU [11]	Test	13,842	108	4
	MMLU-Pro [14]	Test	12,032	186	10

Table 5: **QA dataset statistics.** "# Class" is the number of <u>options</u> *m*, "# Item" is the total number of data items for evaluation, and "# Token" is the average number of tokens per instance (zero-shot prompt), tokenized by the LLaMA [29] tokenizer.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000		000000000000000000
Experime	ntal Setup -	• Models			

- Main Experiments:
  - LLaMA-3.1-8B-Instruct
- Generalizability Exp (Model Sizes):
  - LLaMA-3.2-1B-Instruct, LLaMA-3.2-3B-Instruct
- Generalizability Exp (Model Series):
  - Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct, Gemma-7b-it, Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.3

LLM Series	Size	Туре	URL
	8B	Chat	Link
LLaMA3 [29]	3B	Chat	Link
	1B	Chat	Link
Qwen2.5 [30]	7B	Chat	Link
Gemma [31, 32]	7B	Chat	Link
Mistral [33]	7B	Chat	Link

Table 6: The URL links of models and tokenizers.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000
Main Exr	periments				

Method	Reading		Commo	Commonsense V		ld Knowl	edge	Multitask Understanding			Ανσ.
	BoolQ	LogiQA	CSQA	SIQA	SciQ	OBQA	ARC	BBH	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	
w/o Reason	77.86	35.64	50.37	47.49	91.20	69.80	64.61	50.26	45.54	29.60	56.24
Baseline	84.16	35.79	72.97	69.55	85.90	72.20	82.59	52.19	60.68	38.75	65.48
CoT	84.65	38.10	73.71	68.12	93.70	78.20	84.31	58.40	62.08	40.10	68.14
ARR	86.33	39.02	74.94	70.98	94.40	80.00	84.84	59.01	63.51	42.72	69.58

Table 7: Main experiments. The zero-shot performance (Accuracy %) of the LLaMA3-8B-Chat model on various multiple-choice QA datasets using different answer trigger sentences  $\phi$ . (1) w/o Reason: directly selecting an option without rationales; (2) Baseline:  $\phi$  is "Answer:"; (3) CoT [34]:  $\phi$  is "Answer: Let's think step by step."; (4) ARR: our method that elicits intent analysis, information retrieval, and step-by-step reasoning.

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000
Ablation	Study				

	Α	R	R	Answer Trigger Sentence $\phi$							
1	~	r	~	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning.							
2	~			Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, and answer the question.							
3		~		Answer: Let's find relevant information, and answer the question.							
4			~	Answer: Let's answer the question with step-by-step reasoning.							
5				Answer:							

Table 8: Ablation study prompts. The answer trigger sentences  $\phi$  used in different ARR ablation study settings.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	00000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000
Ablation	Study				

	Α	blati	on	Rea	ading	Commo	onsense	Wor	ld Knowl	edge	Mu	titask Und	lerstanding	Avo.
	Α	R	R	BoolQ	LogiQA	CSQA	SIQA	SciQ	OBQA	ARC	BBH	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	
1	r	r	r	86.33	39.02	74.94	70.98	94.40	80.00	84.84	59.01	63.51	42.72	69.58
2	٢			86.09	38.40	75.76	70.78	94.30	86.80	85.83	57.08	63.66	42.54	70.12
3		~		85.35	37.79	75.59	68.01	92.80	81.20	85.33	58.27	63.73	43.08	69.12
4			r	85.87	38.86	74.53	68.01	94.50	82.60	85.03	58.96	61.77	41.11	69.12
(5)				84.16	35.79	72.97	69.55	85.90	72.20	82.59	52.19	60.68	38.75	65.48

Table 9: Ablation study results. The accuracy scores (%) of the LLaMA3-8B-Chat model on various multiple-choice QA datasets using different answer trigger sentences  $\phi$  (Analyzing, Retrieving, and

Reasoning ).

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000
Generaliza	bility of A	RR - Model	Sizes		

Size	Method	BBH	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	Avg.
	Baseline	35.88	43.27	21.62	33.59
1B	CoT	36.30	41.10	22.74	33.38
	ARR	39.02	42.70	23.49	35.07
	Baseline	45.65	48.26	30.88	41.60
3B	CoT	46.89	46.80	30.03	41.24
	ARR	51.97	52.82	33.39	46.06
	Baseline	52.19	60.68	38.75	50.54
8B	CoT	58.40	62.08	40.10	53.53
	ARR	59.01	63.51	42.72	55.08

Table 10: **Model size experiments.** The zero-shot performance (Accuracy %) of LLaMA3-Chat models of different sizes on multiple-choice QA datasets.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000
Generaliza	bility of A	RR - Model S	Series		

Series	Method	BBH	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	Avg.
	Baseline	39.21	48.36	32.35	39.97
Qwen	CoT	36.66	44.91	29.26	36.94
	ARR	40.50	50.34	39.10	43.31
	Baseline	40.09	45.46	23.45	36.33
Gemma	CoT	44.39	47.17	26.20	39.25
	ARR	45.31	50.73	26.98	41.01
	Baseline	46.27	55.61	30.68	44.19
Mistral	CoT	53.42	61.16	34.73	49.77
	ARR	53.55	61.49	35.21	50.08

Table 11: LLM series experiments. The zero-shot performance (Accuracy%) of 7B-Chat models of different LLM series on multiple-choice QAdatasets.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	0000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000
C					

#### Generalizability of ARR - Generation Temperatures

Temp.	Method	BBH	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	Avg.
	Baseline	52.19	60.68	38.75	50.54
0.0	CoT	58.40	62.08	40.10	53.53
	ARR	59.01	63.51	42.72	55.08
	Baseline	50.19	59.35	36.88	48.81
0.5	CoT	56.58	60.82	37.82	51.74
	ARR	aseline         50.19         59.35         36.8           CoT         56.58         60.82         37.3           ARR         58.87         62.87         42.0           aseline         46.33         54.80         33.3           CoT         51.46         55.57         32.0	42.64	54.79	
	Baseline	46.33	54.80	33.10	44.74
1.0	CoT	51.46	55.57	33.00	46.68
	ARR	52.90	56.58	36.73	48.74
	Baseline	40.84	45.03	26.85	37.57
1.5	CoT	42.53	44.85	25.61	37.66
	ARR	42.65	45.16	27.44	38.42

Table 12: Generation temperature experiments. The zero-shot performance (Accuracy %) of the LLaMA3-8B-Chat model on multiple-choice QA datasets using different generation temperatures (default: 0.0).

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000	0000000000	00000000000000000000
C				- 4 <sup>1</sup>	

#### Generalizability of ARR - Few-shot Generation

Shot	Method	BBH	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	Avg.
	Baseline	52.19	60.68	38.75	50.54
0	CoT	58.40	62.08	40.10	53.53
	ARR	59.01	63.51	42.72	55.08
	Baseline	35.68	44.80	28.62	36.37
1	CoT	47.39	48.36	31.07	42.27
	ARR	47.22	49.29	34.33	43.61
	Baseline	34.39	42.08	25.92	34.13
3	CoT	42.84	48.21	26.69	39.25
	ARR	40.19	49.68	37.04	42.30
	Baseline	34.11	41.14	25.76	33.67
5	CoT	39.92	47.48	26.12	37.84
	ARR	40.68	49.19	36.62	42.16

Table 13: **Few-shot experiments.** The few-shot performance (Accuracy %) of the LLaMA3-8B-Chat model on multiple-choice QA datasets using 1, 3, and 5 few-show examples with rationales.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	•000		000000000000000000

- Our Method
- **3** Experiments

## **4** Conclusion

6 More Cases

#### 6 References

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini



• **Contribution 1**: This paper proposes **ARR**, an intuitive, general, and effective zero-shot prompting method to improve LLM performance in various question-answering tasks.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	○●○○	00000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000
Conclusio	on				

- **Contribution 1**: This paper proposes **ARR**, an intuitive, general, and effective zero-shot prompting method to improve LLM performance in various question-answering tasks.
- **Contribution 2**: Comprehensive experiments across diverse QA tasks demonstrate that ARR consistently outperforms the Baseline and CoT methods. Ablation and case studies further validate the positive contributions of each component.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	00000000000	00000000000000000000
Conclusio	on				

- **Contribution 1**: This paper proposes **ARR**, an intuitive, general, and effective zero-shot prompting method to improve LLM performance in various question-answering tasks.
- **Contribution 2**: Comprehensive experiments across diverse QA tasks demonstrate that ARR consistently outperforms the Baseline and CoT methods. Ablation and case studies further validate the positive contributions of each component.
- **Contribution 3**: Additional extensive experiments on various settings solidify the effectiveness and generalizability of ARR across different model sizes, LLM series, and generation configurations.

- - **Contribution 1**: This paper proposes **ARR**, an intuitive, general, and effective zero-shot prompting method to improve LLM performance in various question-answering tasks.
  - **Contribution 2**: Comprehensive experiments across diverse QA tasks demonstrate that ARR consistently outperforms the Baseline and CoT methods. Ablation and case studies further validate the positive contributions of each component.
  - **Contribution 3**: Additional extensive experiments on various settings solidify the effectiveness and generalizability of ARR across different model sizes, LLM series, and generation configurations.
  - Paper: https://huggingface.co/papers/2502.04689 Code: https://github.com/YuweiYin/ARR Current Work: Intent for planning & reasoning (Coming soon)

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000	0000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000

Q

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	000●		000000000000000000000000000000000000

Thanks

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	•0000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000

- **2** Our Method
- **3** Experiments
- **4** Conclusion



#### 6 References

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	○●○○○○○○○○○	000000000000000000000000000000000000
More Cas	es - BoolC	)			

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Passage: Feather – Contour feathers are not uniformly distributed on the skin of the bird except in some groups such as the penguins, ratites and screamers. In most birds the feathers grow from specific tracts of skin called pterylae; between the pterylae there are regions which are free of feathers called apterylae (or apteria). Filophumes and down may arise from the apterylae. The arrangement of these feather tracts, pterylosis or pterylography, varies across bird families and has been used in the past as a means for determining the evolutionary relationships of bird families. Question: Do penguins have feathers arising from the epidermis?
<b>Baseline</b> $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: No, penguins have feathers arising from specific tracts of skin called pterylae. The pterylae are the areas of skin where the feathers grow. The pterylae are not uniformly distributed on the skin of the penguin. The feathers grow from the pterylae, and the areas between the pterylae are free of feathers and are called apterylae. The arrangement of these feather tracts, pterylosis or pterylography, varies across bird families. In penguins, the feathers are uniformly distributed on the skin, but they arise from specific tracts of skin called pterylae. The feathers do not arise from the epidermis. The epidermis is the outermost layer of the skin, and in most birds, the feathers grow from the dermal layer of the skin, not the epidermis.
CoT $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step. Penguins are a group of birds that have feathers uniformly distributed on their skin. The passage states that in most birds, feathers grow from specific tracts of skin called pterylae, and between these tracts, there are regions called apterylae that are free of feathers. However, it also mentions that in some groups, such as penguins, ratites, and screamers, feathers are not uniformly distributed on the skin. This suggests that penguins do not have feathers arising from the epidermis. Therefore, the answer is no. Penguins do not have feathers arising from the epidermis.
<b>ARR</b> $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning. The question asks about the distribution of feathers on penguins. The passage states that in most birds, feathers grow from specific tracts of skin called pterylae, but penguins are an exception. The passage does not mention the epidermis, but it does mention that in penguins, feathers are uniformly distributed on the skin. This suggests that feathers in penguins may arise from the epidermis, as there are no specific tracts of skin called pterylae. Therefore, the answer is yes.

Introduction 000000		r Method	Experiments 0000000000	Conclusion 0000	More Cases 0000000000	References 000000000000000000
More	Cases	- LogiQ	QA			
=		Passage: There	are five stations set up from we	est to east along a section	of the high-speed railway along the	e river.
_	Task Input $x_i$	It is known that Jiushang Station Question: If Ha (A) Yinling Stat (B) Haoyun Stat (C) Jiushang Sta (D) Yinling Stat	ruy station is east of naoyun is adjacent to Yinling Station. oyun stands to the east of Jiush ion is adjacent to Haoyun Stati ion is adjacent to Fuyi Station ittion is adjacent to Fuyi Station	ang Station, you can get on and west of Haoyun S and west of Fuyi Station; ion and west of Haoyun 3 and west of Fuyi Station;	tation; Station;	3 station,
	Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:				
	Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(C) Jiushang Sta (Explanation) Si Jiushang Station and Yinling Stat Therefore, Jiush	tion is adjacent to Haoyun Stat ince Jiushang Station is adjacen is adjacent to Haoyun Station, ion is west of Haoyun Station, ang Station is adjacent to Haoy	ton and west of Haoyun S at to Yinling Station, and Since Jiushang Station i Jiushang Station is west of un Station and west of H	station; Yinling Station is adjacent to Hao s east of Yinling Station, of Haoyun Station. aoyun Station.	yun Station,
	$\mathbf{CoT}\;\phi_i$	Answer: Let's th	nink step by step.	a II and i		
	Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	Since Jiushang S Since Fuyi Statio Since Huyao Sta Since Jiushang S	Station is adjacent to Yinling Station Station is adjacent to Yinling St on is east of Haoyun Station, Fi tion is west of Fuyi Station, Hu Station is adjacent to Yinling St	ation, Haoyun Station is ation, Haoyun Station is uyi Station is east of Yinl uyao Station is west of Yi ation, Huyao Station is a	adjacent to Yinling Station. ing Station. nling Station. djacent to Jiushang Station	
-	$\mathbf{ARR}\;\phi_i$	Answer: Let's a	nalyze the intent of the question	n, find relevant information	on, and answer the question with s	ep-by-step reasoning.
	Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The question ask We are told that This means that Additionally, we The question als This implies tha Option (B) state: This is consister	ss us to determine the correct n Fuyi Station is between Haoyu Khow that Jiushang Station is o states that Haoyun stands to t Haoyun Station is to the east s that Haoyun Station is adjace with with the given information th	Station and west of Huys Station and Huyao Stat adjacent to Yinling Statio the east of Jiushang Station. Int to Fuyi Station and we at Fuyi Station is east of	tations oased on the given informa ion. m. m. st of Fuyi Station. Haovun Station.	uon. 9 Station.
		Therefore, the co	prrect answer is option (B)		-	

Introduction Our Method Experiments Conclusion More Cases References

#### More Cases - Commonsense QA

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Question: What do people aim to do at work? (A) complete job (B) learn from each other (C) kill animals (D) wear hats (E) talk to each other
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning <i>r</i> <sub>i</sub>	(B) learn from each other. In best answer is B. Step 1: Understand the context of the question: The question is asking about the purpose or goal of people at work. Step 2: Analyze the options given Option (A) "complete job" is a task-oriented answer, but it doesn't necessarily imply learning or personal growth. Option (D) "wear hast" is a superficial aspect of work attire and not a goal. Option (E) "talk to each other" is a common aspect of work but doesn't necessarily imply learning. Step 3: Identify the most appropriate answer: Option (B) "learn from each other" is a goal that aligns with personal and professional development, which is a common aim in many workplaces. It suggests a focus on growth, improvement, and collaboration, which are key aspects of many work environments. The final answer is: B
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(b) reque go to work to carn a fiving, but they also go to learn from each other and to be part of a community. Choice (A) is incorrect because people do not go to work to complete a job. They go to work to do a job. Choice (D) is incorrect because people do not go to work to war hats. Choice (D) is incorrect because people do not go to work to talk to each other. They go to work to do a job. The best answer is B.
ARR $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The question asks what people aim to do at work. In erelevant information is that people go to work to earn a living. The answer is that people aim to complete their jobs at work. Choice (C) is incorrect because people may learn from each other at work, but that is not the main purpose of going to work. Choice (C) is incorrect because people do not go to work to kill animals. Choice (C) is incorrect because people do not go to work to wear hats. Choice (C) is incorrect because people do not go to work to talk to each other. The best answer is A.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Context: Alex grew closer to their significant other after they vacationed together. Question: How would Alex feel afterwards?
	(A) in love (B) nappy (C) back from vacation
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(B) happy Reasoning Skill: Empathy And Perspective Taking This question requires the test-taker to put themselves in Alex's shoes and understand how they would feel after a positive experience like vacationing with their significant other. The correct answer, "happy", is a natural emotional response to a pleasant experience. The other options are not directly related to the emotional state of Alex after the vacation. "In love" is a more intense and long-term feeling, "back from vacation" is a factual statement rather than an emotional response, and "happy" is the most appropriate answer given the context.
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	Alex grew closer to their significant other after they vacationed together. This implies that the vacation strengthened their relationship. Therefore, Alex would likely feel happy after the vacation. Reasoning skill: Empathy And Perspective Taking. This question requires the reader to consider the context of the situation and how it would impact Alex's emotions. The best answer is (B)
<b>ARR</b> $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning. Step 1: Identify the context of the question. The context is about Alex growing closer to their significant other after a vacation. Step 2: Determine the emotional state of Alex after the vacation. The question asks how Alex would feel afterwards. Step 3: Analyze the relationship between Alex and their significant other. The question implies that the vacation strengthened their bond. Step 4: Determine the emotional state of Alex based on the context. Given that the vacation brought them closer together, it is likely that Alex would feel happy or in love. Step 5: Choose the most appropriate answer. Between "happy" and "in love," "in love" is a more intense emotion that aligns with the context of growing closer to someone. The final answer is: (A) in love.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction 000000	Our Method	Experiments 0000000000	Conclusion 0000	More Cases	References 000000000000000000000000000000000000
More Ca	ses - SciO				

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Question: Rupture can cause fragments of what to travel via the bloodstream and become lodged in other arteries? (A) red blood cells (B) white blood cells (C) plaque (D) enamel				
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:				
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	Rupture of an atherosclerotic plaque can cause fragments of the plaque to travel via the bloodstream and become lodged in other arteries. This is known as an embolus. Choice (B) is incorrect because white blood cells are not typically associated with atherosclerosis. Choice (C) is incorrect because plaque is the substance that ruptures. Choice (D) is incorrect because enamel is the hard, outer layer of the teeth. The best answer is (A).				
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.				
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The question is asking about the consequences of a ruphure, which implies a physical injury or damage to a structure. The correct answer should be related to the physical structure that can be damaged and cause fragments to travel through the bloodstream. Option (A) red blood cells are a type of cell that carries oxygen throughout the body via the bloodstream, and they can be damaged or ruptured in the event of a physical injury or damage to a blood vessel. Option (B) white blood cells are part of the immune system and help fight infections, but they are not a physical structure that can rupture and cause fragments to travel through the bloodstream. Option (C) plaque is a sticky film of bacteria that can cause dental problems, but if's not a physical structure that can rupture and cause fragments to travel through the bloodstream. Option (D) enamel is a hard, outer layer of teeth, which is not directly related to the bloodstream or arteries. Therefore, the correct answer is (A) red blood cells.				
ARR $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning.				
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The question is asking about the consequences of a rupture, which is likely referring to a rupture of an aneurysm or an atherosclerotic plaque. In the context of aneurysms or atherosclerosis, a rupture can lead to the release of fragments into the bloodstream. These fragments can then travel to other parts of the body and become lodged in other arteries, potentially causing blockages or other complications. Considering the options provided, the most relevant choice is (C) plaque, as a atherosclerotic plaque is a common cause of arterial blockages and can rupture, releasing fragments into the bloodstream. The other options are not directly related to the consequences of a rupture in the context of aneurysms or atherosclerosis.				

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000	○○○○○●○○○○	
More Ca	uses - Open	BookOA			

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Fact: force causes the speed of an object to decrease. Question: The amount of friction and the speed of an object have what kind of relationship? (A) inverse (B) reverse (C) direct (D) equal
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(C) Direct Explanation: The more friction an object has, the slower it will move. The less friction an object has, the faster it will move. This is a direct relationship. The amount of friction and the speed of an object are directly related.
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	Step 1: Understand the relationship between friction and speed The relationship between friction and speed is that as friction increases, the speed of an object decreases. Step 2: Determine the type of relationship Since an increase in friction leads to a decrease in speed, this is a direct relationship. A direct relationship means that as one variable increases, the other variable also increases. Step 3: Choose the correct answer Based on the understanding of the relationship between friction and speed, the correct answer is (C) direct.
ARR $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The question asks about the relationship between the amount of friction and the speed of an object. The relevant information is that force causes the speed of an object to decrease. The intent of the question is to determine the relationship between the amount of friction and the speed of an object. The correct answer is (A) inverse. The amount of friction and the speed of an object have an inverse relationship. The more friction, the slower the object moves. The less friction, the faster the object moves.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000
More Ca	ses - ARC				

Task Input <i>x<sub>i</sub></i>	Question: A scientist maps a long region in which earthquakes originate and determines this region is a transform plate boundary.           Which evidence would cause the scientist to reevaluate this determination?         (A) Volcanism also characterizes the region.           (B) Earthquake centers in the region occur at shallow depths.         (C) The region shows extensive faulting of sediments.           (D) Equal crust densities are found on opposite sides of the region.         (B) Equal crust densities are found on opposite sides of the region.
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The best answer is C. Transform plate boundaries are characterized by horizontal motion and faulting, but the faulting is not necessarily extensive. Volcanism is characteristic of divergent and convergent plate boundaries, not transform plate boundaries. Shallow earthquake foci are characteristic of transform plate boundaries. Equal crust densities on opposite sides of the region would indicate that the region is a transform plate boundary. (B), and (D) are incorrect. (C) is correct because extensive faulting is characteristic of transform plate boundaries.
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	Transform plate boundaries are characterized by horizontal motion of the Earth's crust, which is evidenced by faulting. Volcanism is characteristic of divergent and convergent plate boundaries, or transform plate boundaries. Therefore, (A) is incorrect. Earthquakes at transform plate boundaries can occur at any depth, so (B) is incorrect. (C) is correct because faulting is a characteristic of transform plate boundaries. (D) is incorrect because transform plate boundaries are characterized by horizontal motion of the Earth's crust, not by equal crust densities.
<b>ARR</b> $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning. The question asks for evidence that would cause a scientist to reevaluate the determination that a region is a transform plate boundary. A transform plate boundary is a region where two plates slide past one another horizontally. The evidence that would cause a scientist to reevaluate this determination would be evidence that is characteristic of a different type of plate boundary. A divergent plate boundary is a region where two plates move apart from one another, and a convergent plate boundary is a region where two plates move apart from one another,
	Volcanism is characteristic of a divergent plate boundary, so (A) is correct.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	0000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000
More Cas	es - BBH				

Task Input <i>x<sub>i</sub></i>	Question: The following paragraphs each describe a set of three objects arranged in a fixed order.         The statements are logically consistent within each paragraph. A fruit stand sells three fruits: peaches, mangoes, and apples.         The paches are more expensive than the apples. The mangoes are the cheapest.         (A) The paches are the second-most expensive         (B) The mangoes are the second-most expensive         (C) The apples are the second-most expensive
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The peaches are the second-most expensive. The mangoes are the cheapest. The apples are the least expensive of the three fruits. The peaches are more expensive than the apples. The mangoes are the cheapest. The peaches are the second-most expensive. The mangoes are the cheapest. The apples are the least expensive of the three fruits. The peaches are more expensive than the apples. The mangoes are the cheapest
CoT $\phi_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	The peaches are more expensive than the apples. The mangoes are the cheapest. Therefore, the mangoes are the least expensive of the three fruits. The peaches are more expensive than the apples, so the peaches are the second-most expensive of the three fruits. Choice (B) is incorrect. The mangoes are the chaptest of the three fruits. Choice (C) is incorrect. The apples are less expensive than the peaches. The best answer is A.
<b>ARR</b> $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning. The question asks for the second-most expensive fruit. The peaches are more expensive than the apples, and the mangoes are the cheapest. Therefore, the second-most expensive fruit is the apples. Choice A is incorrect. The peaches are more expensive than the apples, and the mangoes are the cheapest. Therefore, the peaches are the most expensive fruit, not the second-most expensive. Choice B is incorrect. The mangoes are the cheapest fruit.

Introduction 000000	Our Method 000000	Experiments 0000000000	Conclusion 0000	More Cases 000000000000	References 000000000000000000000000000000000000
More Ca	ses - MML	U			

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Question: Select the best translation into predicate logic. David teaches Chris, (c: Chris; d: David; Txy: x teaches y) (A) Tde (B) Ted (C) Tec (D) dTe
Baseline $\phi_i$	Answer:
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(B) The translation of the sentence into predicate logic is Tcd, where Txy means x teaches y. The subject of the sentence is David, the object is Chris, and the predicate is teaches. The correct translation is Tcd, not Tdc, because the subject comes before the predicate in a predicate logic statement. Choice (C) is incorrect because it reverses the subject and object. Choice (D) is incorrect because it reverses the subject and predicate.
CoT $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's think step by step. (B) The predicate logic translation of the sentence is Tcd, where Txy means x teaches y. The best answer is B.
ARR $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning. The question asks for the best translation into predicate logic. The relevant information is the statement "David teaches Chris." The statement is in the active voice, so the subject is the student, and the object is the student. The predicate logic translation is Tdc, where Txy means x teaches y, ci s Chris, and d is David. Choice (B) is incorrect. This is the translation of "Chris teaches David." Choice (C) is incorrect. This is the translation of "Chris teaches Chris." Choice (D) is incorrect. This is the translation of "Chris teaches Chris." Choice (D) is incorrect. This is the translation of "David is taught by Chris." The best answer is A.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References			
000000	000000	0000000000	0000	0000000000●	000000000000000000000000000000000000			
More Cas	More Cases - MMLU-Pro							

Task Input x <sub>i</sub>	Question: Which type of research methods are designed to elicit responses to predetermined, standardized questions from many respondents? (A) Non-probability. (B) Cross-sectional. (C) Qualitative. (D) Ethnographic. (E) Longitudinal. (F) Experimental. (G) Probability. (H) Observational. (I) Case Study. (J) Quantitative.
Baseline $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: The best answer is G. Probability sampling is a type of research method that is designed to elicit responses to predetermined, standardized questions from many respondents. Probability sampling is a type of sampling method that is used to select a sample of natricinative from a larger rowulation. Probability sampling methods include simple random sampling
CoT $\phi_i$	Server: Let's think stee by stee.
Reasoning r <sub>i</sub>	(G) Probability sampling is a method of selecting a sample from a population in which every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected. Probability sampling is used in research to ensure that the sample is representative of the population.
ARR $\phi_i$ Reasoning $r_i$	Answer: Let's analyze the intent of the question, find relevant information, and answer the question with step-by-step reasoning. The question asks about research methods that are designed to elicit responses to predetermined, standardized questions from many respondents. This is a clue that the research method is quantitative. Quantitative research methods are designed to elicit responses to predetermined, standardized questions from many respondents. The correct answer is (J). The other choices are incorrect because they are not quantitative research methods.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000		•000000000000000000000000000000000000

- Our Method
- **3** Experiments
- **4** Conclusion
- **6** More Cases



Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenin

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	000000000	0000		000000000000000000000000000000000000

 Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models.

*arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.

[2] Bonan Min, Hayley Ross, Elior Sulem, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Thien Huu Nguyen, Oscar Sainz, Eneko Agirre, Ilana Heintz, and Dan Roth.

Recent advances in natural language processing via large pre-trained language models: A survey.

ACM Computing Surveys, 56(2):1–40, 2023.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

 [3] Shervin Minaee, Tomas Mikolov, Narjes Nikzad, Meysam Chenaghlu, Richard Socher, Xavier Amatriain, and Jianfeng Gao.

Large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06196*, 2024.

[4] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al.

Gpt-40 system card.

Our Method

arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276, 2024.

## [5] Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku, 4 Mar 2024.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

References

OutcionOur MethodExperimentsConclusionMore CasesReferences[6]Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell,<br/>Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent,<br/>Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, et al.<br/>Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across<br/>millions of tokens of context.

*arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.

[7] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, Wei Ye, Yue Zhang, Yi Chang, Philip S. Yu, Qiang Yang, and Xing Xie.

A survey on evaluation of large language models.

ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, 15(3), March 2024.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

........

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000		0000000000	0000	0000000000	O

[8] Joshua Robinson and David Wingate.

Leveraging large language models for multiple choice question answering.

In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

[9] Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge.

*arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*, 2018.

[10] Jian Liu, Leyang Cui, Hanmeng Liu, Dandan Huang, Yile Wang, and Yue Zhang.

Logiqa: A challenge dataset for machine reading comprehension with logical reasoning.

In Christian Bessiere, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-20*, pages 3622–3628. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 7 2020. Main track.

[11] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt.
Measuring massive multitask language understanding.
In 9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021.
OpenReview.net, 2021.

Our Method

References

00000

Experin 00000

Our Method

Conclusio 0000 More Cases

References

 [12] Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models.

Transactions on Machine Learning Research, 2023.

[13] Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei.

Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them.

In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 13003–13051, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

[14] Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhranil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyan Jiang, et al.

Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark.

arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01574, 2024.

[15] Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal.

Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering.

In Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun'ichi Tsujii, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2381–2391, Brussels, Belgium, October-November 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Introduction	Our Method	Experiments	Conclusion	More Cases	References
000000	000000	0000000000	0000		O

### [16] Frederick Adams.

Intention and intentional action: The simple view. *Mind & Language*, 1(4):281–301, 1986.

#### [17] Alfred R Mele.

Intention, belief, and intentional action. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 26(1):19–30, 1989.

[18] Alfred R Mele and Paul K Moser. Intentional action. Nous, 28(1):39–68, 1994.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Our Method 000000 Experiments 0000000000 Conclusion 0000 More Cases

## [19] Erik Jones and Jacob Steinhardt.

Capturing failures of large language models via human cognitive biases.

In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 11785–11799. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.

[20] Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed H. Chi, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context.

In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine* 

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

ion Our Method Experiments Conclus 0 000000 00000000 0000

*Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 31210–31227. PMLR, 23–29 Jul 2023.

## [21] Herbert H Clark.

Linguistic processes in deductive reasoning.

Psychological review, 76(4):387, 1969.

## [22] Philip N Johnson-Laird.

Deductive reasoning.

Annual review of psychology, 50(1):109–135, 1999.

## [23] Evan Heit.

Properties of inductive reasoning.

Psychonomic bulletin & review, 7:569–592, 2000.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

ntroduction Our Method Experiments Conclusion More Cases References

#### [24] Brett K Hayes and Evan Heit. Inductive reasoning 2.0.

*Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 9(3):e1459, 2018.

[25] Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova.BoolQ: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions.

In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 2924–2936, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Introduction 000000	Our Method 000000	Experiments 000000000	Conclusion 0000	More Cases	References

## [26] Alon Talmor, Jonathan Herzig, Nicholas Lourie, and Jonathan Berant.

CommonsenseQA: A question answering challenge targeting commonsense knowledge.

In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), pages 4149–4158, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

[27] Maarten Sap, Hannah Rashkin, Derek Chen, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi.

Social iqa: Commonsense reasoning about social interactions.

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), pages 4463–4473, Hong Kong, China, November 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.

 [28] Johannes Welbl, Nelson F. Liu, and Matt Gardner.
 Crowdsourcing multiple choice science questions.
 In Leon Derczynski, Wei Xu, Alan Ritter, and Tim Baldwin, editors, *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 94–106, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Our Method

References

Introduction 000000	Our Method 000000	Experiments 000000000	Conclusion 0000	More Cases	References

[29] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783, 2024.

[30] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al.

Qwen2.5 technical report.

arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115, 2024.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Introduction Our Method Experiments Conclusion More Cases Conclusion October Conclusion October Conclusion October Conclusion October Conclusion October Cases October Conclusion October Cases October Conclusion October Cases October Conclusion October Cases October Ca

[31] Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology.

*arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024.

[32] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00118, 2024.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

 [33] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al.
 Mistral 7b.

arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825, 2023.

[34] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa.

Large language models are zero-shot reasoners.

In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 -December 9, 2022, 2022.

Yuwei Yin and Giuseppe Carenini

Our Method

ARR: Question Answering with Large Language Models via Analyzing, Retrieving, and Reasoning

References