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Abstract
Despite their success at many natural language processing (NLP) tasks, large language models (LLMs) still struggle to effectively leverage knowledge for knowledge-intensive tasks, manifesting limitations such as generating incomplete, non-factual, or illogical answers. These limitations stem from inadequate knowledge awareness of LLMs during vanilla fine-tuning. To address these problems, we propose a knowledge-aware fine-tuning (KnowTuning) method to explicitly and implicitly improve the knowledge awareness of LLMs. We devise an explicit knowledge-aware generation stage to train LLMs to explicitly identify knowledge triples in answers. We also propose an implicit knowledge-aware comparison stage to train LLMs to implicitly distinguish between reliable and unreliable knowledge in answers. Extensive experiments on both generic and medical question answering (QA) datasets confirm the effectiveness of KnowTuning, through automatic and human evaluations, across various sizes of LLMs. Finally, we demonstrate that the improvements of KnowTuning generalize to unseen QA datasets.

1 Introduction
Large language models (LLMs) have become a default solution for many natural language processing (NLP) scenarios, including the question answering (QA) task (Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022; Qin et al., 2023). To achieve strong performance, most LLM first accumulate substantial knowledge by pre-training on extensive datasets (Jiang et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023). Then, these LLMs further learn how to exploit the knowledge to answer diverse questions by supervised fine-tuning (SFT) (Wei et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023f; Peng et al., 2023; Kang et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023c).

However, many recent studies indicate that fine-tuned LLMs may struggle to effectively leverage knowledge for question-answering (Yu et al., 2023a; Bai et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023c; Chang et al., 2023), which aims to answer questions that require in-depth explanations and wide-range domain knowledge. In particular, LLMs are susceptible to generating answers that may be incomplete (Singhal et al., 2022; Bian et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023b), non-factual (Wang et al., 2023a; Min et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b), or illogical (Chen et al., 2023c; Zhong et al., 2023; Kang et al., 2023). Incomplete answers offer incomprehensive and insufficient knowledge, non-factual answers deliver factually incorrect knowledge, illogical answers provide incoherent and poorly structured knowledge.

We hypothesize that these limitations stem from the inadequate knowledge awareness of LLMs during vanilla fine-tuning (Bian et al., 2023; Ji et al., 2023; Dou et al., 2023; Hua et al., 2024). Specifically, as shown in Figure 1, vanilla fine-tuning seldom identifies the necessary knowledge to answer a question. In addition, it usually fails to distinguish between reliable knowledge and unreliable knowledge in answers. Consequently, there

Figure 1: Illustrations of vanilla fine-tuned LLMs lacking knowledge awareness. (a) Vanilla fine-tuned LLMs struggle to identify the necessary knowledge to answer a specific question precisely. (b) Vanilla fine-tuned LLMs cannot effectively distinguish between reliable knowledge and unreliable knowledge in answers.
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is a pressing need for designing knowledge-aware fine-tuning methods. This, then, is the overarching research question that motivates our work: how can we effectively improve the knowledge awareness of LLMs for solving knowledge-intensive tasks?

To this end, we propose a novel knowledge-aware fine-tuning method, named KnowTuning, which aims to improve the knowledge awareness of LLMs. KnowTuning consists of two stages: (i) explicit knowledge-aware generation, and (ii) implicit knowledge-aware comparison. In the first stage, we extract knowledge triples from given answers and train LLMs to explicitly generate knowledge triples. In the second stage, we adopt several knowledge-disturbing methods to construct knowledge comparison sets along three dimensions, completeness, factuality, and logicality. Specifically, we generate answers that are worse in terms of completeness, factuality, or logicality, by deleting, revising, and shuffling these knowledge triples. Besides, we rephrase original answers based on the knowledge triples to prevent overfitting. Finally, we combine the rephrased answers and answers with worse completeness, factuality, and logicality as our knowledge comparison sets. We adopt direct preference optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) for optimizing LLMs on our knowledge comparison sets.

We conduct experiments on a generic QA dataset and a medical QA dataset using automatic and human evaluations. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method KnowTuning, assessing completeness, factuality, and logicality across various sizes of LLMs. In addition, we demonstrate the improvement that KnowTuning brought can generalize to unseen QA datasets.

In summary, our main contributions are:
• We focus on improving the knowledge awareness of LLMs via fine-tuning for knowledge-intensive tasks.
• We introduce KnowTuning, a novel method that fine-tunes LLMs to leverage explicit knowledge-aware generation and implicit knowledge-aware comparison to improve knowledge awareness of LLMs.
• We demonstrate the effectiveness of KnowTuning in general and medical domain QA datasets through automatic and human evaluations, across various sizes of LLMs. Furthermore, the improvement of KnowTuning generalizes to unseen QA datasets.

2 Related work

2.1 LLMs for knowledge-intensive Tasks

Large language models (LLMs) have been applied to various knowledge-intensive tasks (Moi-seev et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2023b; Khattab et al., 2022; Tian et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023a; Xu et al., 2023c; Mishra et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2023). Liu et al. (2022b) use few-shot demonstrations to elicit relevant knowledge statements from LLMs for QA tasks. Liu et al. (2022a) train a neural model to generate relevant knowledge through reinforcement learning for QA tasks. Liu et al. (2023) propose a unified model for generating relevant knowledge and solving QA tasks.

However, these approaches mainly focus on multiple-choice QA instead of complex knowledge-intensive QA tasks (Krishna et al., 2021; Kadamath et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022a, 2023; Kang et al., 2023), which aim to solve questions that require in-depth explanations and wide-range domain knowledge. Recent research indicates that LLMs face challenges in tackling complex knowledge-intensive QA tasks (Yu et al., 2023a; Bai et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023c; Chang et al., 2023). In particular, they are prone to generating responses that are non-factual (Lee et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2023; Su et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2023b), incomplete (Singhal et al., 2022; Bian et al., 2023), or illogical (Chen et al., 2023c; Zhong et al., 2023; Kang et al., 2023). These limitations stem from the inadequate knowledge awareness of LLMs, hindering their ability to effectively utilize knowledge for solving complex knowledge-intensive QA tasks.

Consequently, there is a need for designing methods to improve the knowledge awareness of LLMs for solving knowledge-intensive tasks.

2.2 Fine-tuning for LLMs

Fine-tuning is a kind of methods to optimize pre-trained LLMs for better understanding and answering to natural language questions (Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022). Previously, fine-tuning is mainly focused on enhancing general-purpose QA abilities of LLMs (Wang et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022; Longpre et al., 2023). These approaches mainly adopt human-annotated datasets to build the QA dataset. Recently, an alternative strategy involves generating QA datasets through the utilization of advanced LLMs to create answers to a variety of questions (Wang et al., 2023f; Shumailov et al., 2023).
Recent studies on fine-tuning fuse information about the quality of the generated answers into the supervision signals (Zhao et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Dong et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024). Rafailov et al. (2023) propose direct preference optimization (DPO) to directly optimize LLMs on the pair-wise comparison set. Song et al. (2023) propose Preference Ranking Optimization (PRO) to fine-tune LLMs on list-wise comparison sets. Yuan et al. (2023) propose a margin-rank loss to optimize the LLMs on comparison sets.

However, these methods are not designed to improve knowledge awareness of LLMs. In this paper, we aim to leverage explicit knowledge-aware generation and implicit knowledge-aware comparison to improve knowledge awareness of LLMs for solving knowledge-intensive QA tasks.

3 Method

In this section we detail the KnowTuning method. First, we introduce the preliminaries. Then, we introduce the explicit knowledge-aware generation. Next, we introduce implicit knowledge-aware comparison in detail. Finally, a training process for KnowTuning is explained.

3.1 Preliminaries

**Supervised fine-tuning.** Supervised fine-tuning (SFT) aims to train pre-trained LLMs to understand and answer natural language questions. Formally, given a QA dataset $D = \{(q_i, a_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where $q_i$ denotes a question and a corresponding answer. The training objective of SFT is to minimize the following loss:

$$L_{SFT} = -\sum_{j=1}^{[a_i]} \log P_{\pi_{SFT}}(a_{i,j}|a_{i,<j}, q_i),$$  

where $a_{i,j}$ denotes the $j$-th token of $a_i$.

**Knowledge triples.** Since subject-predicate-object knowledge triples can well cover the necessary knowledge for QA (Yahya et al., 2016; ElSahar et al., 2018; Ouyang et al., 2021), we denote the knowledge in the answer as subject-predicate-object knowledge triples set $K_i = \{S_i, P_i, O_i\}$, where $S_i$, $P_i$ and $O_i$ refer to subject set, predicate set and object set of answer $a_i$.

3.2 Explicit Knowledge-aware Generation

To improve the explicit knowledge awareness of LLMs, we fine-tune LLMs to explicitly generate knowledge triples relevant to the question, as illustrated in Figure 2. Specifically, we extract knowledge triples set $\mathcal{K}$ from the original answers $a$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}_i = \{S_i, P_i, O_i\} = \text{Extract}(a_i),$$  

where $\text{Extract}(\cdot)$ is implemented by prompting OpenAI models to extract knowledge triples, fol-
lowing Bai et al. (2023). Then, we construct the knowledge triples generation dataset $D_{tk}$ as follows:

$$D_{tk} = \{q_i, a_i^{k}\}_{i=1}^{N},$$

where $a_i^{k}$ denotes the text of knowledge triples set $K_i$. Finally, we combine the original QA dataset $D$ and the knowledge triples generation dataset $D_{tk}$ as the explicit knowledge-aware generation dataset $D_{kg}$ as:

$$D_{kg} = D \cup D_{tk}. \quad \text{(4)}$$

### 3.3 Implicit Knowledge-aware Comparison

To improve implicit knowledge awareness of LLMs in terms of completeness, factuality and logicality, we construct three comparison sets by deleting, revising, and shuffling knowledge triples.

**Knowledge completeness comparison.** To improve knowledge completeness awareness of LLMs, we construct the knowledge completeness comparison set by randomly deleting the knowledge triples and rewriting the answers. Specifically, we first randomly delete the subject, predicate and object in the knowledge triples set $K_i$ as follows:

$$K_{ic}^{i} = \{S_{ic}, P_{ic}, O_{ic}\},$$

where $S_{ic}, P_{ic}$ and $O_{ic}$ refer to the incomplete sets after randomly deleting $\alpha$ percent of $S_i, P_i$ and $O_i$, respectively. Then, we rewrite the answer based on the incomplete knowledge triples set as:

$$a_{ic}^{i} = \text{Rewrite}(K_{ic}^{i}), \quad \text{(6)}$$

where $\text{Rewrite}()$ is implemented by prompting OpenAI models. In addition, to avoid overfitting on the original answers (Jain et al., 2023), we rephrase the original answers based on knowledge triples.

$$a_{i}^{rep} = \text{Rewrite}(K_{i}). \quad \text{(7)}$$

Finally, we combine the rephrase answer $a_{i}^{rep}$ and the incomplete answer $a_{ic}^{i}$ into knowledge completeness comparison set as follows:

$$D_{kcc} = \{(q_i, (a_{i}^{rep}, a_{ic}^{i}))\}_{i=1}^{N}. \quad \text{(8)}$$

**Knowledge factuality comparison.** To improve the knowledge factuality awareness of LLMs, we construct the knowledge factuality comparison set by randomly revising the knowledge triples as nonfactual knowledge triples and rewriting the answers. Specifically, we first randomly revise the knowledge triples set $K_i$ as follows:

$$K_{nf}^{i} = \text{Revise}(K_{i}), \quad \text{(9)}$$

where $\text{Revise}()$ is implemented by prompting OpenAI models to revise the knowledge triples to the wrong knowledge triples. Then, we rewrite the answer based on the nonfactual knowledge triples set as:

$$a_{i}^{nf} = \text{Rewrite}(K_{nf}^{i}). \quad \text{(10)}$$

Finally, we combine the rephrased answer $a_{i}^{rep}$ and the nonfactual answer $a_{i}^{nf}$ into knowledge factuality comparison set as follows:

$$D_{kfc} = \{(q_i, (a_{i}^{rep}, a_{i}^{nf}))\}_{i=1}^{N}. \quad \text{(11)}$$

**Knowledge logicality comparison.** To improve the knowledge logicality awareness of LLMs, we construct the knowledge logicality comparison set by randomly shuffling the knowledge triples and rewriting the answers. Specifically, we first randomly shuffle the subject, predicate and object in the knowledge triples set $K_i$ as follows:

$$K_{il}^{i} = \{S_{il}^{i}, P_{il}^{i}, O_{il}^{i}\},$$

where $S_{il}^{i}, P_{il}^{i}$ and $O_{il}^{i}$ refer to the illogical sets after random shuffling $\beta$ percent of $S_i, P_i$ and $O_i$, respectively. Then, we rewrite the answer based on the illogical knowledge triples set as:

$$a_{il}^{i} = \text{Rewrite}(K_{il}^{i}), \quad \text{(13)}$$

We combine the rephrased answer $a_{i}^{rep}$ and the illogical answer $a_{il}^{i}$ into knowledge logicality comparison set as follows:

$$D_{klc} = \{(q_i, (a_{i}^{rep}, a_{il}^{i}))\}_{i=1}^{N}. \quad \text{(14)}$$

Finally, we combine the knowledge completeness comparison set, the knowledge factuality comparison set, and the knowledge logicality comparison set as the implicit knowledge-aware comparison set:

$$D_{kc} = D_{kcc} \cup D_{kfc} \cup D_{klc}. \quad \text{(15)}$$

### 3.4 Training

To improve the knowledge awareness of LLMs for solving complex knowledge-intensive tasks, KnowTuning includes explicit knowledge-aware generation training and implicit knowledge-aware comparison training. Specifically, we first train LLMs on explicit knowledge-aware generation dataset $D_{kg}$, resulting in a model denoted as $\pi_{kg}$. Then, KnowTuning aims to further improve the implicit knowledge awareness of the model $\pi_{kg}$.
in completeness, factuality, and logicality. To accomplish this, we rewrite the DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023) loss to obtain the implicit knowledge-aware comparison loss as follows:

\[ L_{kc} = \mathbb{E}_{(q, (a_w, a_l)) \sim D_{kc}} \left[ \log \sigma \left( \beta \log \frac{\pi_{kc}(a_w|q)}{\pi_{kg}(a_w|q)} - \beta \log \frac{\pi_{kc}(a_l|q)}{\pi_{kg}(a_l|q)} \right) \right], \tag{16} \]

where \((a_w, a_l)\) denotes the answer pair of the question \(q \in D_{kc}\), and \(a_w\) is the better answer.

4 Experiments

4.1 Research questions

We aim to answer the following research questions in our experiments: 

RQ1: How does KnowTuning perform on general and medical domain QA under automatic evaluation? 

RQ2: What is the performance of KnowTuning on general and medical domain QA under human evaluation? 

RQ3: How do explicit knowledge-aware generation and implicit knowledge-aware comparison affect the performance of KnowTuning? 

RQ4: How effective is KnowTuning at generalizing to unseen QA datasets?

4.2 Datasets

We divide the datasets in our experiments into two groups: general domain and domain-specific. We conduct experiments on general domain and domain-specific knowledge-intensive question-answering datasets:

- **LIMA** (Zhou et al., 2023) is a carefully curated general domain QA dataset. The dataset is collected from three community QA websites: Stack Exchange, wikiHow, and the Pushshift Reddit Dataset (Baumgartner et al., 2020). The dataset includes 1000 QA pairs for training and 300 questions for testing.

- **MedQuAD** (Abacha and Demner-Fushman, 2019) is a medical domain QA dataset, which is collected from 12 National Institutes of Health websites. The dataset covers 37 different question types. In this paper, following (August et al., 2022), we filter the questions of the category “Information” for giving definitions and information about medical terms. Specifically, we filter 1000 QA pairs for training and 100 questions for testing. 

In addition, to evaluate the ability of methods to generalize to unseen questions, we employed two diverse test sets: Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023) and WizardLM (Xu et al., 2023a). These test sets totally contain 298 real-world human questions from diverse sources and diverse difficulties.

4.3 Baselines

We compare our model with the following baselines:

- **Base** denotes that testing the Llama2-base model (Touvron et al., 2023) under zero-shot setting.

- **SFT** (Ouyang et al., 2022) represents vanilla fine-tuning backbone LLMs on QA datasets according to Eq. 1.

- **DPO** (Rafailov et al., 2023) fine-tunes LLMs on comparison sets by increasing the likelihood of generating good answers while decreasing the likelihood of bad ones. Following Cui et al. (2023), we first collect candidate answers from different sizes of vanilla fine-tuned LLMs and golden answers, and then use GPT-4 scoring to construct comparison sets with the same size as the knowledge comparison set.

4.4 Evaluation Metrics

We present our experimental results using two evaluation metrics: automatic evaluation and human-based evaluation. Since ROUGE (ROUGE, 2004) and BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) can not effectively evaluate the quality of answers for complex questions (Krishna et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2023b; Chen et al., 2023a), recent studies propose to use GPT-4 for evaluating the quality of LLMs answers (Zheng et al., 2023; Dubois et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2023). Consequently, we employ GPT-4 to rate generated answers on three aspects: completeness, factuality, and logicality, on a range of 1 to 10. Following Singhal et al. (2022); Zheng et al. (2023); Zhang et al. (2023b), we define completeness, factuality and logicality as: (i) **Completeness**: it examines whether the answers provide comprehensive and sufficient knowledge to the questions. (ii) **Factuality**: it examines whether the knowledge in the answers is factually correct. (iii) **Logicality**: it examines whether the knowledge in the answers is logically rigorous and structured. To avoid positional bias (Ko et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2023e), we evaluate each answer in both positions during two separate runs. Following Li et al. (2023); Chen et al. (2023b), we define “Win-Tie-Lose” as: (i) **Win**: KnowTuning wins twice, or wins once and ties once. (ii) **Tie**: KnowTuning ties twice, or wins
Completeness Factuality Logicality
Model Dataset Win Tie Lose Win Tie Lose Win Tie Lose Avg. gap
Backbone Language Model: Llama2-7b-base
KnowTuning vs Base 95.00∗ 3.67 1.33 88.33∗ 10.34 1.33 92.00∗ 6.67 1.33 90.45
KnowTuning vs SFT LIMA 72.67∗ 17.66 9.67 48.33∗ 43.67 8.00 61.33∗ 29.67 9.00 51.89
KnowTuning vs DPO 68.67∗ 22.66 8.67 41.00∗ 51.00 8.00 61.67∗ 29.66 8.67 48.67
KnowTuning vs Base 87.00∗ 11.00 2.00 70.00∗ 20.00 10.00 73.00∗ 20.00 7.00 70.33
KnowTuning vs SFT MedQuAD 56.00∗ 28.00 16.00 49.00∗ 32.00 19.00 52.00∗ 30.67 18.00 47.00
KnowTuning vs DPO 43.00∗ 32.00 25.00 48.00∗ 29.00 23.00 45.00∗ 34.00 21.00 22.33

Backbone Language Model: Llama2-13b-base
KnowTuning vs Base 90.67∗ 8.33 1.00 68.00∗ 28.00 4.00 74.00∗ 23.00 3.00 74.89
KnowTuning vs SFT LIMA 66.67∗ 19.67 13.66 48.67∗ 40.67 10.66 60.67∗ 29.00 10.33 47.12
KnowTuning vs DPO 60.33∗ 22.00 17.67 37.00∗ 49.00 14.00 49.67∗ 36.67 13.67 33.89
KnowTuning vs Base 94.00∗ 4.00 2.00 70.00∗ 25.00 5.00 72.00∗ 23.00 5.00 74.67
KnowTuning vs SFT MedQuAD 51.00∗ 26.00 23.00 37.00∗ 45.00 18.00 40.00∗ 46.00 14.00 24.33
KnowTuning vs DPO 51.00∗ 27.00 22.00 35.00∗ 44.00 21.00 39.00∗ 44.00 17.00 21.67

Table 1: Main results on general QA and medical QA datasets evaluated by GPT-4. The scores marked with ∗ mean KnowTuning outperforms the baseline significantly with p-value < 0.05 (sign. test), following Guan et al. (2021).

LIMA MedQuAD Model Avg. length Avg. length
Backbone Language Model: Llama2-7b-base
Base 377.84 328.43
SFT 387.66 287.88
DPO 405.47 367.21
KnowTuning 426.13

Backbone Language Model: Llama2-13b-base
Base 255.01 223.52
SFT 369.96 287.88
DPO 391.12 368.58
KnowTuning 444.57 392.62

Table 2: Average length of generated answers.

once and loses once. (iii) Lose: KnowTuning loses twice, or loses once and ties once.

In addition, we employ human judgments as the gold standard for assessing the quality of answers. Specifically, human evaluators perform pair-wise comparisons of the top-performing models identified in automatic evaluations. They are presented with a question and two answers and asked to judge on three aspects: completeness, factuality, and logicality. More details of the evaluation are in Appendix A.

4.5 Implementation details

We employ Llama2-base models of different sizes (7b and 13b) as our backbone models for training. We adopt the Alpaca template (Taori et al., 2023) for training and inference. The OpenAI model used for Extract(·), Rewrite(·) and Revise(·) is gpt-3.5-turbo-16k. More details of the implementation are in Appendix B.

5 Experimental results and analysis

To answer our research questions, we conduct general domain and medical domain QA experiments, ablation studies, and unseen QA experiments. In addition, we conducted a case study to gain further understanding of the effectiveness of KnowTuning.

5.1 Main results (RQ1)

Table 1 presents the GPT-4 evaluation results for both general and medical domain QA datasets. Across all metrics, KnowTuning outperforms the baseline models in these domains. Based on the results, we have three main observations:

• KnowTuning consistently surpasses baselines in terms of completeness, factuality and logicality. Compared with Base and SFT, KnowTuning focuses on explicitly and implicitly improving knowledge awareness of LLMs, which significantly improves the performance of LLMs on knowledge-intensive QA tasks. Compared with DPO, KnowTuning is more effective in improving the performance of LLMs on complex knowledge-intensive QA in multiple aspects. Although DPO improves the performance of vanilla fine-tuned LLMs by distinguishing between general good and bad answers, it ignores improving the knowledge awareness of LLMs in multiple essential aspects. In contrast, KnowTuning improves knowledge awareness of LLMs in terms of completeness, factuality and logicality, simultaneously. These improvements of KnowTuning are observed across general and medical domain QA datasets, which indicate the
importance of improving explicit and implicit knowledge awareness of LLMs.

- **KnowTuning demonstrates effectiveness on LLMs across different sizes.** We observe that KnowTuning consistently improves the performance of QA tasks on different scales (7b and 13B) LLMs. This finding aligns with Bian et al. (2023): LLMs learn a lot of knowledge during the pre-training stage but still need to learn how to effectively leverage knowledge for solving knowledge-intensive QA tasks.

- **KnowTuning tends to generate longer answers with better completeness, factuality, and logicality.** As shown in Table 2, KnowTuning mostly generates longer answers than the baselines and achieves better completeness, factuality and logicality. An exception is observed in the medical QA domain, where DPO based on llama7b-base generates longer answers than KnowTuning. Nonetheless, these answers from DPO are worse in completeness, factuality and logicality. It further demonstrates the importance of improving knowledge awareness of LLMs, as opposed to more surface-level aspects.

### 5.2 Human evaluation (RQ2)

Human evaluations are crucial for accurately assessing the quality of answers. As shown in Table 3, to facilitate human annotation processes, we focus on comparing KnowTuning with the key baseline DPO:

- Our findings indicate that KnowTuning consistently surpasses DPO in terms of completeness, factuality, and logicality performance across various sizes of LLMs when assessed through human evaluation.

- KnowTuning demonstrates superior performance over QA in both general and medical domain QA evaluated by human, in terms of completeness, factuality, and logicality.

### 5.3 Ablation studies (RQ3)

To analyze the effect of the different knowledge-aware stages in KnowTuning, we conduct an ablation study. Table 4 shows the results on KnowTuning with five settings: (i) **-KG**: KnowTuning without explicit knowledge generation. (ii) **-KCC**: KnowTuning without the implicit knowledge completeness comparison set. (iii) **-KFC**: KnowTuning without the implicit knowledge factuality comparison set. (iv) **-KLC**: KnowTuning without the implicit knowledge logicality comparison set. (v) **-KC**: KnowTuning without any implicit knowledge comparison sets.

Table 4 shows that all knowledge-aware stages help KnowTuning as removing any of them decreases performance:

- **Removing the explicit knowledge-aware generation.** We observe that removing explicit knowledge-aware generation (−KG) decreases the performance of KnowTuning, especially in terms of completeness and logicality. This indicates that explicit knowledge-aware generation helps LLMs to be aware of complete knowledge information and the logical structure of knowledge.

- **Removing the implicit knowledge-aware com-
We observe that the model without the implicit knowledge-aware comparison faces a huge performance degradation in knowledge-intensive QA. Specifically, removing knowledge completeness comparison (-KCC) negatively impacts completeness, removing knowledge factuality comparison (-KFC) negatively impacts factuality, and removing knowledge logicality comparison (-KLC) negatively impacts logicality. In addition, when removing all implicit knowledge-aware comparison sets (-KC), there is a substantial drop in the performance on the knowledge-intensive QA task on all three aspects. As a result, although the model still explicitly generates knowledge, the absence of distinguishing reliable and unreliable knowledge leads to poor knowledge-intensive QA performance.

5.4 Unseen QA datasets results (RQ4)

To evaluate the ability of methods to generalize to unseen questions, we conduct experiments on LLMs trained on the general domain QA dataset. Figure 3 demonstrates that KnowTuning can effectively generalize to unseen questions:

- Compared to baselines, KnowTuning can generalize the improvement to unseen questions across different sizes of LLMs.
- We observe that the factuality improvement of KnowTuning is harder to generalize to unseen questions than completeness and logicality. This difficulty arises because factuality requires specific and detailed knowledge that might not be covered during the training phase (Wang et al., 2023b; Xu et al., 2024).

5.5 Case study

We also conduct a detailed case study to intuitively show how KnowTuning improves knowledge awareness of LLMs for solving knowledge-intensive tasks, compared to SFT and DPO. In the case study, KnowTuning answers the question logically in multiple aspects, while SFT and DPO answer with incomplete knowledge and lack of logicality. In addition, SFT and DPO both introduce incorrect knowledge in answers. More details of our case study results are in Appendix C.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we focus on improving the knowledge awareness of LLMs via fine-tuning for knowledge-intensive tasks. We have proposed KnowTuning to fine-tune LLMs through explicit knowledge-aware generation and implicit knowledge-aware comparison stages. We have conducted comprehensive experiments on general and medical domain QA datasets, demonstrating the effectiveness of KnowTuning through automatic and human evaluations, across various sizes of LLMs. Moreover, we have shown that the improvements achieved with KnowTuning can generalize to unseen QA datasets. Our code and dataset are available at https://github.com/youganglyu/KnowTuning.
Limitations
In this study, KnowTuning is mainly aimed at knowledge-intensive tasks, leaving its applicability to other tasks for future research, such as weak-to-strong generalization task (Burns et al., 2023) and legal reasoning tasks (Lyu et al., 2022, 2023; Deng et al., 2023). Moreover, our efforts have been concentrated on enhancing the knowledge awareness of LLMs during the fine-tuning stage. Future studies will aim to explore improving knowledge awareness of LLMs in the pre-training stage (Rosset et al., 2020).

Ethics Statement
KnowTuning mainly focuses on completeness, factuality, and logicality, but not social bias (Pitoura et al., 2017; Lyu et al., 2023) or the potential for generating harmful or toxic content (Song et al., 2024; Hewitt et al., 2024). It is imperative to exercise caution when implementing our model in real-world applications, particularly in scenarios involving critical decision-making or direct interactions with users.
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Appendix

A Details of Evaluation

A.1 GPT-4 Evaluation

This section provides specifics of the GPT-4 prompt utilized for evaluation, employing gpt4-turbo. Figure 4 illustrates the adapted prompt from Zheng et al. (2023), aimed at assessing the completeness, factuality, and logicality of answers.

A.2 Human Evaluation

Instructions for human evaluation are depicted in Figure 5.

B Details of Implementation

B.1 Prompts for Extracting, Rewriting, and Revising

Details for the prompts used in Extract(·), Rewrite(·), and Revise(·) are provided. Figures 6, 7, and 8 display the prompts for Extract(·), Rewrite(·), and Revise(·), respectively.

B.2 Training

During the training phase, the AdamW optimizer (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2019) is utilized with initial learning rates of $5 \cdot 10^{-5}$ for SFT and $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ for DPO. The batch sizes for SFT and DPO are set to 16 and 8, respectively, with SFT undergoing 3 epochs of training and DPO 1 epoch. The deletion and shuffling percentages, $\alpha$ and $\beta$, are both fixed at 0.5. Training leverages PEFT (Mangrulkar et al., 2022), LLaMA-Factory (Hiyouga, 2023) and LoRA (Hu et al., 2022). All training hyperparameters for SFT and DPO are recommended by LLaMA-Factory (Hiyouga, 2023).
We would like to request your feedback on the performance of two AI assistants in response to the user question displayed above.

Please rate the Knowledge Completeness, Knowledge Factuality and Knowledge Logicality of their responses. Each aspect of each assistant receives a score on a scale of 1 to 10, where a higher score indicates better performance.

Please generate Knowledge Completeness, Knowledge Factuality and Knowledge Logicality scores for each assistant in order.

Please first output two lines containing values indicating the Knowledge Completeness, Knowledge Factuality and Knowledge Logicality scores for Assistant 1 and 2, respectively. In the subsequent line, please provide a comprehensive explanation of your evaluation, avoiding any potential bias and ensuring that the order in which the responses were presented does not affect your judgment.

Figure 4: Prompts for GPT-4 evaluation.

You’ll be presented with a series of questions. For each question, two answers will be provided. Your task is to read both answers carefully and decide which one you believe is better.

When judging, consider:
Completeness: It examines whether the answers provide comprehensive and sufficient knowledge relevant to the questions.
Factuality: It examines whether the knowledge in the answers is factually correct
Logicality: it examines whether the knowledge in the answers is logically rigorous and structured.

Question:
{Q}
Answer A:
{A1}
Answer B:
{A2}

Comparing these two answers, in terms of completeness, factuality and logicality, respectively. Give the win-tie-lose of Answer A compared to Answer B in each of the three aspects.

Figure 5: Instructions for human evaluation.
You are an expert in extracting knowledge triples (Subject, Predicate, Object).

Please follow the following requirements to extract knowledge triples:
1. Please extract all #Knowledge Triples# from the #Given Text#.
2. Please generate answers in JSON format.

```json
{
  "Triplets": [
    {
      "Subject": "...",
      "Predicate": "...",
      "Object": "...
    }
  ]
}
```
3. Please extract the knowledge triples according to the following definition.
Subject: In a triplet, the subject represents the primary entity or concept that the statement is about. It's akin to the focal point of the information being conveyed. The subject is usually a distinct entity identifiable within a given domain of knowledge.

Predicate: The predicate in a triplet functions as the relationship or property that connects the subject to the object. It defines the nature of the link or association between the two. Predicates are often verbs or verb phrases in natural language but can also be relationship terms in a database.

Object: The object in a triplet is the entity or concept that is linked to the subject through the predicate. It can be seen as the target or endpoint of the relationship initiated by the subject. The object can be a concrete entity, a value, or another abstract concept.

#Given Text#: {A}

#Knowledge Triples#: Figure 6: Prompts for extracting.

You are an assistant skilled in writing an fluent answer based on given knowledge triples.

Please rewrite the #Answer# based on the #Given Knowledge Triples#, and #Answer# should follow the content and logical order in the #Given Knowledge Triples#.

#Given Knowledge Triples#: {Knowledge Triples}
#Answer#: Figure 7: Prompts for rewriting.

You are an expert at revising knowledge triples (Subject, Predicate, Object).

Please revise the following knowledge triples to be factually incorrect according to the following rules:
1. Revise the knowledge triple to try to have the same word count as the original knowledge triple

#Given Knowledge Triples#: (Knowledge Triples)
#Revised Knowledge Triples#: Figure 8: Prompts for revising.
Question:
What is the difference between the potato masala for Dosa and the one that is served with poori?

SFT:
There are two ways of preparing potato masala for dosa. The first one is to make a paste of boiled potatoes, grated coconut, green chilies, and coriander. This paste is then mixed with grated carrots, ginger, garlic, and some salt. This mixture is then fried until the potatoes are cooked.

The second way of preparing potato masala for dosa is to make a paste of boiled potatoes, grated coconut, green chilies, and coriander. This paste is then mixed with grated carrots, ginger, garlic, and some salt. This mixture is then fried until the potatoes are cooked.

DPO:
There are a few key differences between the potato masala for dosa and the one served with poori.

The potato masala for dosa is usually made with less spices than the one served with poori. This is because the dosa is already spicy enough on its own, and the potato masala is meant to complement the spice level of the dosa.

The potato masala for dosa is usually made with more potatoes than the one served with poori. This is because the dosa is a more filling dish than the poori, and the potato masala helps to add more volume to the dish. The potato masala for dosa is usually made with more coconut milk than the one served with poori. This is because the dosa is a creamier dish than the poori, and the coconut milk helps to add more creaminess to the dish.

The potato masala for dosa is usually made with more coriander leaves than the one served with poori. This is because the dosa is a more flavorful dish than the poori, and the coriander leaves help to add more flavor to the dish.

The potato masala for dosa is usually made with more cumin seeds than the one served with poori. This is because the dosa is a more aromatic dish than the poori, and the cumin seeds help to add more aroma to the dish.

### Potato Masala for Dosa

The potato masala for dosa is a simple yet flavorful dish that is perfect for a quick and easy meal. The dish is made with potatoes, onions, tomatoes, and a few spices. The potatoes are boiled and then mashed, and then the onions, tomatoes, and spices are added to the mashed potatoes. The dish is then simmered until the potatoes are tender and the flavors have melded together. The potato masala for dosa is a delicious and easy dish that can be made in just a few minutes.

### Potato Masala for Poori

The potato masala for poori is a popular dish in Indian cuisine. The dish is made.

KnowTuning:
There are two types of potato masala commonly served in India, one with dosa and the other with poori. Here are the key differences between the two:

1. Ingredients: The dosa potato masala is typically prepared with grated potatoes, onions, tomatoes, coriander, green chilies, ginger, garlic, turmeric powder, red chili powder, cumin powder, coriander powder, salt, and water. The poori potato masala, on the other hand, is made with grated potatoes, onions, tomatoes, green chilies, ginger, garlic, red chili powder, coriander powder, salt, and water. While both recipes call for the same ingredients, the dosa masala has a distinct flavor profile due to the addition of turmeric powder and cumin powder.

2. Texture: The dosa masala has a creamy texture, while the poori masala has a chunky texture. The dosa masala is more of a dip or sauce that you can scoop up with the dosa, while the poori masala is a more substantial side dish that goes well with the soft and fluffy texture of the poori.

3. Taste: The dosa masala is typically spicier and more flavorful than the poori masala. The dosa masala is aromatic and has a tangy flavor from the tomatoes and the green chilies. The poori masala, on the other hand, is more subtle in flavor and is slightly sweet due to the addition of turmeric powder.

4. Serving: The dosa masala is usually served as a dip or side dish to be scooped up with the dosa. The poori masala, on the other hand, is served as a side dish to be eaten with the poori.

In conclusion, while both potato masalas are delicious and popular dishes in India, they are different in terms of their ingredients, texture, taste, and serving.
C Details of Case Study

As shown in Figure 9, this case study presents answers provided by three methods: SFT, DPO, and KnowTuning. Generally, the observations are as follows:

- The answer of KnowTuning is the most complete, providing detailed information on ingredients, texture, taste, and how dosa and poori masalas are served differently. The answer of SFT describes only one type of potato masala and does not compare the differences between the two types of potato masala. And the answer of DPO does not describe poori masala comprehensively, making it bad completeness.

- KnowTuning leads in factuality, with specific, accurate details that match traditional recipes. The answer of SFT describes incorporates elements (like grated coconut and carrots) that are not typically found in the most traditional or widely recognized versions of potato masala for dosa. DPO emphasizes coconut milk, which is not a standard ingredient in either dish.

- KnowTuning also excels in logicality, methodically comparing the two masalas in a way that’s easy to understand. SFT does not logically address the question, offering a non-comparative, repetitive analysis. DPO encounters problems in maintaining a coherent structure; it does not follow through with a detailed description of poori masala, which undermines the logicality.