

# Automate Knowledge Concept Tagging on Math Questions with LLMs

Hang Li<sup>1,2</sup>, Tianlong Xu<sup>1</sup>, Jiliang Tang<sup>2</sup> and Qingsong Wen<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Squirrel AI, Bellevue, WA, USA

<sup>2</sup>Michigan State University, USA

{lihang4, tangjili}@msu.com, {tianlongxu, qingsongwen}@squirrelai.com

## Abstract

Knowledge concept tagging for questions plays a crucial role in contemporary intelligent educational applications, including learning progress diagnosis, practice question recommendations, and course content organization. Traditionally, these annotations have been conducted manually with help from pedagogical experts, as the task requires not only a strong semantic understanding of both question stems and knowledge definitions but also deep insights into connecting question-solving logic with corresponding knowledge concepts. In this paper, we explore automating the tagging task using Large Language Models (LLMs), in response to the inability of prior manual methods to meet the rapidly growing demand for concept tagging in questions posed by advanced educational applications. Moreover, the zero/few-shot learning capability of LLMs makes them well-suited for application in educational scenarios, which often face challenges in collecting large-scale, expertise-annotated datasets. By conducting extensive experiments with a variety of representative LLMs, we demonstrate that LLMs are a promising tool for concept tagging in math questions. Furthermore, through case studies examining the results from different LLMs, we draw some empirical conclusions about the key factors for success in applying LLMs to the automatic concept tagging task.

## 1 Introduction

Knowledge concept tagging, which targets at generate precise knowledge index to educational materials, has been recognized as an important factor of current intelligent education systems in providing high-quality educational contents to both educators and learners during the practice [Chen *et al.*, 2014]. For example, with well-annotated education materials, teachers will receive great conveniences in organizing coursing contents through searching concept key words index [Sun *et al.*, 2018]. Among the tagging objects, concept tagging over math questions have been greatly emphasised be-

cause of the recent successes of applying intelligent tutoring system (ITS) in mathematical education [Burns and Capps, 2013]. Traditionally, the questions' concept tags are annotated by the pedagogical expertise. However, the rapid growth of the internet has caused that conventional manual methods insufficient to meet the demand for handling large volumes of online question data or updating exist concept tags in a timely fashion. In addition, the size limitation of annotated samples also impedes the wide application of deep learning methods in ITS.

In order to solve the above issues, many pioneering researches have tried to automate the tagging process with different natural language processing (NLP) algorithms [Sun *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2021]. For example, early works use text embedding techniques to convert the text contents of questions into dense vectors, train machine learning models, and then classify them into predefined tag categories [Du *et al.*, 2021]. However, these practices overlook the vital relationship in solutions and knowledge concepts, which leads to unsatisfactory tagging results. Recent studies solve the problem and improve the tagging performance by leveraging pre-trained language models (PLMs) to fuse external information, such as solution text and conceptual ontology, with original question contents [Huang *et al.*, 2023a]. Unfortunately, these new trials introduce additional input data requirements to the knowledge tagging model, which restricts the wide applications of the algorithm to question with limited external resources. In order to solve the above challenges and keep the algorithm scalable to wider question concept tagging cases, we leverage LLMs as backbone models for the automatic knowledge tagging problem.

Leveraging the advanced mathematical and logical inference capabilities inherent in Large Language Models (LLMs), our method eliminates the need for external information, such as solution text, as a mandatory input to link solution-related knowledge concepts with the given question content. Furthermore, LLMs can dynamically generate solutions related to concepts, offering more precise tagging results compared to the static solution texts explored in previous research. Additionally, owing to the strong zero-shot or few-shot learning abilities of LLMs, our approach can be swiftly applied with minimal annotation samples, setting it apart from all previous training-based algorithms. This feature allows our method to be rapidly adapted for annotating works

\*Corresponding author

encompassing nearly all knowledge concepts and questions. To validate the effectiveness of our proposed framework, we have collected over 1,000 expertly annotated concept tagging samples as a test set. Through extensive experiments across various LLMs, we have shown that employing LLMs with appropriate prompt tuning techniques holds promise as tools for concept tagging. Finally, by comparing the results from different LLMs, we have drawn some empirical insights into the crucial factors that ensure success in using LLMs for automated knowledge concept tagging tasks.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Knowledge Concept Tagging

The major challenge of the tagging tasks is how to construct a meaningful link in between the knowledge concepts and the problems, either through the description of the problem themselves or through solutions. The formulation of the task can primarily be categorized into two directions: retrieval and matrix decomposition. The former relies heavily on training a semantic representation. [Sun *et al.*, 2019] employs simple backbone models such as long short term memory (LSTM) and some attention mechanisms to learn short-range dependency embeddings, where the questions are fed into LSTM layers and are ultimately connected to cross entropy functions that indicate whether or not a tagging concept belongs to a given problem. [Liu *et al.*, 2019] devised an exercise-enhanced recurrent neural network with Markov property and Attention mechanism to extract rich knowledge concepts information in the exercise’s content. Similarly but with enriched data source such as text, multi-modal data [Yin *et al.*, 2019] as well as latex formula combined data [Huang *et al.*, 2021], semantic representations learned with LSTM have been improved to capture more implicit contexts. [Huang *et al.*, 2020] fills knowledge graph information into the embedding layers and achieves better mathematical semantic understanding. To take advantage of the robust transformers framework, [Zemlyanskiy *et al.*, 2021] pretrained a BERT model to learn jointly predicting words and entities as movie tags given the reviews of movies. [Huang *et al.*, 2023b] proposes an improved pretrained bidirectional encoder representation from transformers (BERT) for concept tagging with both questions and solutions. This work formulates a next-sentence prediction with question–solution that fits into the BERT encoder, ultimately obtaining the final exercise representation through feature augmentation. The work also conducts a pseudo-siamese training manner to learn the hidden mapping relationships between questions and concepts in mathematics specifically. The latter mostly applies to relatively static concept-problem set (i.e., neither the concept nor the problem change drastically). The can be formulated as a sparse matrix  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K}$  where N and K represent the number of problems and number of concepts respectively. Major techniques include matrix factorization [Desmarais and Naceur, 2013] and Bayesian estimation [Chen *et al.*, 2018], etc. Similarly to retrieval, such Q matrix can aggregate more abundant features [Huang *et al.*, 2019] to augment the power of Q matrix estimation.

### 2.2 Annotation Tasks with LLMs

With the evolving of LLMs and their strong performance on dealing with unstructured data, some attempts have been leveraging LLMs to directly produce annotations in the question-answering manner. [Dong *et al.*, 2024] leverages GPT series and fine-tuned FLAN-T5 & Llama 2 to insert extracted concepts into a predefined concept ontology graph. [Yan *et al.*, 2023] injected the biomedical domain knowledge graph into LLM by pre-training the model such that difficulties of linking the biomedical entities with LLMs are tackled. [Bacciu *et al.*, 2023] created a reinforcement learning retrieval augmented machine learning framework to enhance LLM’s performance for wider range of relevant entity retrieval. [Wang *et al.*, 2023] performs in-context learning methods and used LLM-ranking to link bio-medical entities (i.e., what’s mentioned as two-stage retrieve and rank framework). [Dunn *et al.*, 2022] finetuned GPT3 with around 500 pairs of prompt-expected json format entities, and achieved meaningful scientific entities annotation (subjects include chemistry, phase, and morphology) in a hierarchical structure. [Xiao *et al.*, 2023] proposed an instructed generative entity linker for precise entity predictions over a large knowledge base, which is composed of a lightweight potential mention retriever and sequence-to-sequence training EL objective with instruction-tuning. [Masson *et al.*, 2023] demonstrates that few-shot learning is superior over fine-tuning on LLMs while performing the thematic concept annotation task in the tourism domain when, in their specific case, the quantity of training data is limited. [Lin and Zeldes, 2024] introduced a novel salient entity annotation (entities that are central to a document’s overall meaning) approach that enhances LLMs’ understanding of the underlying semantics of English sentences. [Ding *et al.*, 2024] formulated a three-step chat entity linking framework to map hidden relationships between concepts and sentence texts: (1) given a sentence, process entity candidate generation step to obtain relevant entities. Then (2) an augmentation step is performed to obtain an auxiliary content of the annotated mention. Finally (3) a multi-choice selection prompt is conducted to decide the corresponding entity of annotated mention.

Overall, leveraging LLMs to perform concept annotations primarily relies on nuanced few-shot prompting, fine-tuning the model, as well as providing extra meaningful data augmentations. The major challenges and opportunities are how to build a semantic link between the text contents and concepts, particularly when only little or none of the domain knowledge is known to LLMs.

## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Overview

The problem of knowledge concept tagging can be articulated as: Given a specific knowledge concept  $k_i$  from a set  $K = \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$  and a question  $q_j$  from a set  $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ , the objective of a concept tagging model is to produce a binary judgment  $y \in \{0, 1\}$ . This judgment indicates whether or not  $q_j$  aligns with  $k_i$ . Previous studies have approached this by encoding both the question and the knowledge text




Figure 1: Overview of our purposed framework.

into dense vectors using various embedding models. Following this, a classifier, typically trained with binary cross-entropy loss, is employed to generate the binary judgment outcomes.

In this paper, we introduce an approach that capitalizes on the zero-shot and few-shot learning capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs), thus eliminating the need for task-specific training data to fine-tune the model’s parameters. Our method involves crafting suitable prompt texts that instruct the LLMs on the objective of the concept tagging task. We determine the judgment by analyzing the positive or negative sentiments expressed in the responses generated by LLMs. To enhance the performance of LLMs on the concept tagging task further, we have developed various prompt optimization strategies. An overview of our proposed framework is depicted in Fig 1.

### 3.2 Zero-shot Prompt Designs

The most significant difference between LLMs and other prior machine learning models is its zero-shot learning capability [Wei *et al.*, 2021]. Contributing to the huge size model parameter and the extensive pre-training on diverse and vast dataset, LLMs have demonstrated on their strengths in comprehending instructions in natural language and applying learned knowledge to new problems without requiring additional training data specific to these tasks. In our case, we first describe the goal of the tagging task as: *You are a knowledge concept annotator. Your job is to judge whether the given Knowledge is matching the Question.* For the convenience of following process, we also add a response format instruction in the prompt: *Your answer should start with 'Yes' or 'No'.* After that, as the prior studies like Chain-of-Thought (COT) [Wei *et al.*, 2022] have discovered that with instructing LLMs to generate step-by-step problem solving solutions will be helpful for the LLMs to draw the correct conclusions while facing some complicated problems. Therefore, we ask LLMs to not only provide its positive or negative sentiments but also present the reason, *You should also provide your reason for your judgment.* At last, since all the question in our test set will only be connected with their own correct knowledge concept, we introduce the prior knowledge to LLMs through the instruction: *If Question covers other Knowledge, your answer should be 'No'.* Overall, the zero-shot task instruction prompt is presented as follows:

**Instruction:** *You are a knowledge concept annota-*

*tor. Your job is to judge whether the given Knowledge is matching the Question. Your answer should start with 'Yes' or 'No'. You should also provide your reason for your judgement. If Question covers other Knowledge, your answer should be 'No'.*

**Knowledge:** The composition of numbers within 20.

**Question:** There are ( ) tens and ( ) ones in 14.

**Judgement:** (Generated by LLMs)

The text marked with underscore is the knowledge text  $k_i$  and question text  $q_j$ . During the practice, we notice that using the original knowledge concept names directly usually yields sub-optimal results, since some descriptions are too ambiguous. To conquer this challenge, we asks expertise to give some specific definitions to those unclear concepts and mark each the covering boundaries of each knowledge concept. With these modifications to the definition of the knowledge concepts, LLMs can achieve satisfying tagging results, and detailed comparison result can be found in Appendix. The detailed knowledge definitions and covering boundary of each knowledge concept are shown in table 1.

### 3.3 Few-shot Demonstration Selection

Although the zero-shot prompt provides a good solution without using any annotated samples, the brief description text sometimes may not be specific enough to cover some complicated cases. For example, there is a knowledge concept named **consecutive carry in multiplication**, which occurs when the product of two digits, along with any carry from the previous calculation, results in a number greater than 9, thus requiring another carry to be added to the next column in the calculation. It will be easier for LLMs to understand and follow the instruction by presenting some demonstration samples, e.g.,  $38 \times 9$ , and their corresponding explaining text:

*There is a consecutive carry starts from the multiplication of the ones place ( $8 \times 9 = 72$ , carry 7), and then a carry from the tens place operation ( $3 \times 9 + 7 = 34$ , carry 3).*

Apart from that, through presenting the example answers as the inputs and instruct LLMs to generate similar form of responses, LLMs will learn and follow the judging steps of demonstrations, which helps it output more relevant responses. We show the comparison details between zero-shot and few-shot responses in Sec. 4.4. During the implementation of few-shot learning prompts, many recent studies found that the final outcomes of LLMs are significantly influenced by the selected demonstration samples [Wei *et al.*, 2023] and many demonstration selecting algorithms have been proposed to fully exploit the potentials of few-shot learning capability of LLMs [Margatina *et al.*, 2023; Su *et al.*, 2022]. However, since we focus on implementing zero-shot and few-shot learning for the knowledge concept tagging task, we do not include the advanced demonstration recommending algorithms, which has the requirements for annotated samples, in this paper. We leave the exploration for this direction in our future work. Following the empirical conclusions drawn from the prior works [Su *et al.*, 2022], we explore three heuristic-based demonstration selecting strategies to enhance the few-shot learning results.

- **Knowledge Relevance:** In this strategy, we consider the relevance between the knowledge concept definition text  $k_i$  of different samples  $x_i = (k_i, q_i) \in \mathcal{X}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  is the test sample set. By selecting the samples sharing the same of similar  $k_i$  as demonstrations, we hope the LLMs can follow the correct judging steps and generate the accurate results.
- **Question Diversity:** The idea behind this strategy is inspired by prior work [Mavromatis *et al.*, 2023], which demonstrates that through including diverse few-shot samples, LLMs present stronger general capabilities while facing some margin samples during the test. In our work, we use the sentence-level embedding generated by LLMs and perform K-means clustering to find the diverse cluster groups within the question representation manifold. Finally, we choose one question for each cluster, which is closest to the cluster center, as demonstrations.
- **Label Distribution:** The label distribution of demonstration samples could also influence the performance of few-shot learning responses of LLMs, as different categories of labels provide support information from their own perspectives [Yao *et al.*, 2023]. For example, in this paper, the match demonstrations ( $y_i = 1$ ) present LLMs the correct question example  $q_i$  which matches all the requirement of the given knowledge  $k_i$ . And the mismatch samples ( $y_i = 0$ ) could display the common errors of the task and help LLMs to avoid making similar errors during the generation.

### 3.4 Self-reflection Revision

A class of methods that leverages LLMs’ ability to self-reflect based on feedback from the environment has shown their superiority compared to algorithms that do not have an awareness of doing the task a second time [Zhao *et al.*, 2023]. In our framework, we ask LLMs to make a deterministic statement given the original instructional prompt and the last round responses generated by LLMs. During the implementation, we found it essential to tune the deterministic instruction prompt into a neutral tone. For example, we try to avoid using some biased expression such as ”please double check”, ”are you sure”, otherwise the LLMs will be misguided to always giving reverse judgement to the original response. Here is an example of our self-reflection prompt for the later experiment.

*(Start with the instruction, knowledge and question prompt presented in Sec 3.2)*

**Judgement:** Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question is asking for the number of tens and ones in a given two-digit number (14) which falls within the range specified in the knowledge (up to 20, inclusive).

**Instruction:** *Check the knowledge and question and confirm whether the prior answer is correct or wrong.*

**Confirmation:** (Generated by LLMs)

The text marked with underscore is the last response text generated by LLMs. In addition, as concept tagging results

are used as the searching index for many downstream education applications, the requirement to the the precision of generated tagging results usually receive more attentions compared to the recall. Based on this fact, we apply the self-reflection revision only to the test samples which receive the positive response. By incorporating such strategy, our framework not only achieve a much higher precision, but also receive a huge boost over the execution efficiency.

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Dataset Overview

In order to testify the effectiveness of our proposed framework, we collect a knowledge concept tagging dataset, Math-KnowCT, from the online K-12 math education materials. The dataset contains 12 knowledge concepts, spreading from the study requirements of grade 1 to grade 3 students in elementary schools. For each knowledge concept, we collect more than 80 candidate questions and ask a pedagogical expert to annotate whether the question and knowledge pair is match. The ratio between matching and mismatching categories is 1:8. More details about the dataset statistics and knowledge concept definitions can be found in Table 1.

### 4.2 Experiment Settings

To fully exploit the potentials of leveraging LLMs for knowledge concept tagging task, we experiment with 5 representative LLMs, including GPT [Brown *et al.*, 2020], LLAMA2[Touvron *et al.*, 2023], Mixtral [Jiang *et al.*, 2024], Qwen1.5 [Bai *et al.*, 2023], and InternLM2 [Ying *et al.*, 2024]. To be noticed, in this paper, we only experiment with each LLM’s instruct-tuned version, since we observe that the instruct-tuned LLMs can better follow the given instruction and generate the correct format responses. When conducting zero-shot or few-shot learning with the raw versions, LLMs will commonly generate question solutions instead of the matching judgments. To convert the generated text response into the binary judgements, we use the regular expression to find the positive and negative pattern of the text. The evaluation metrics used in our experiments are accuracy, precision, and recall. We use 8\*40G Nvidia A100 GPUs for all of our experiments. And the LLMs are implemented with huggingface packages<sup>1</sup>.

### 4.3 Zero-Shot Learning Results

We first experiment with the zero-shot performance of LLMs over the different prompt designs and the results are shown as table 2. From the table, we observe that by refining the task instructing prompt text with additional output format and reasons requests (Instruct Prompt\_v2), the performance of LLMs is improved, which demonstrates the effectiveness of our prompt optimizations. On the other hand, after enriching the original knowledge concept terms with specific definition words and knowledge boundary descriptions, all LLMs receive another round of significant boost in their performance, which also indicates the importance of the knowledge concept interpretations. At last, by comparing different LLMs,

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/>

Table 1: Details of knowledge concept definitions and dataset statistics.

Knowledge Concept	Definition & Boundary	Number of Questions	Number of Match	Number of Mismatch
The composition of numbers within 20	Directly give a two-digit number within 20 (including 20) and read out how many tens or ones it contains, or give several tens and several ones and fill in the corresponding two-digit number. There are no pictures to represent numbers, and numbers above 20 and above are not involved.	117	15	102
Comparison of numbers within 5	Comparison between integer numbers within 5, which can be between two numbers or arranged in order of numerical value; the question stem needs to provide specific numbers or present numbers within a situational description; a comparison of numerical values is required. Does not include calculations.	116	13	103
Reciprocal	Directly write the reciprocal of a fraction, an integer or a decimal. Otherwise, find the number whose product with a given number is 1. no letters involved.	109	26	83
Use of reciprocals	Given two or three algebraic expressions (where the expressions are in the form of a number multiplied by a single letter) are equal, assuming the value is 1, use the method of finding a number's reciprocal to determine and compare the values of the letters; or if it is known that two algebraic expressions are equal and their value is 1, find the value of the letters and then substitute this value into another expression to calculate its value. The problem must include letters. The letter index can only be 1, and does not involve squares and other higher orders.	148	9	139
Use the properties of decimals to simplify decimals	Utilize the properties of decimals (adding 0 to the end of a decimal or removing 0 does not change the value of the decimal) to simplify decimals. The requirement is to simplify to the simplest form, meaning there are no longer any zeros at the end of the decimal part. Without calculation.	71	13	58
Use the properties of decimals to rewrite decimals	Utilize the properties of decimals (adding 0 to the end or removing 0 from the end of a decimal does not change its value) to rewrite decimals as required. The requirement is to rewrite them as decimals with a specific number of decimal places (one, two, three, etc.) or as decimals in units of one-tenth, one-hundredth, or one-thousandth. Without calculation	113	19	94
The rules of decimal point movement -calculation	Obtain the calculation result based on the movement of the decimal point when a decimal is multiplied by 10, 100, 1000, or divided by 10, 100, or 1000; or, given the result of the decimal point movement, determine whether the decimal was multiplied or divided by a certain number (10, 100, or 1000); all calculations are done in one step. No two-step calculations or multiple moves	101	17	84
Understanding and Classification of Numbers	Understanding of numbers, including the definitions of integers, fractions, decimals, positive numbers, negative numbers, and natural numbers; needing to select numbers of a specified type from a set of numbers; determining whether a number falls within a defined range; judging the truth or falsehood of propositions related to the classification of numbers. Does not include number operations and irrational numbers;	95	30	65
Adding and subtracting whole tens - word problems	One-step application problems involving the addition of whole tens to whole tens or the subtraction of whole tens from whole tens; the calculation result is less than 100. There are no whole hundreds, only two-digit whole tens.	142	4	138
Adding and subtracting integer tens - Comparison of formulas	Comparing the result of adding two whole tens with another number; or comparing the size of expressions involving the addition or subtraction of two whole tens; the calculation requires a one-step addition or subtraction of two whole tens; there needs to be a step for comparing sizes. There are no whole hundreds, only two-digit whole tens.	97	11	86
Two-step operation of adding and subtracting integer tens	Calculate the result of adding and subtracting three whole tens; or first present the addition and subtraction of three single-digit numbers, then give the result of adding and subtracting the corresponding whole tens of these three single-digit numbers; the result needs to be within 100. There are no whole hundreds, only two-digit whole tens.	103	10	93
Area unit–unit conversion	Unit conversion between square meters, square decimeters, square centimeters, and square millimeters; conversions are made directly according to the conversion rate between area units, including conversions from larger units to smaller units and from smaller units to larger units. Does not include word problems; does not include square kilometers	147	19	128
Overall		1359	186	1173

Table 2: Evaluation result of LLMs under zero-shot settings. The best result is marked with **bold**, the second best is marked with underline.

Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
<b>Instruction Prompt_v1</b>				
GPT-3.5-Turbo	<u>.8433</u>	.2319	.4215	.2992
GPT-4	<b>.8792</b>	<b>.4079</b>	.9430	<b>.5695</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.5812	.1603	<u>.9437</u>	.2740
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	.7661	<u>.2468</u>	.8811	<u>.3856</u>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.7477	.2413	.9365	.3837
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6063	.1691	<b>.9455</b>	.2869
InternLM2-20B-Math	.4193	.1165	.8824	.2058
<b>Instruction Prompt_v2</b>				
GPT-3.5-Turbo	<u>.8626</u>	.2679	.3529	.3046
GPT-4	<b>.8887</b>	<b>.4309</b>	<b>.9529</b>	<b>.5934</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.6058	.1709	.9412	.2893
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	.7886	<u>.2727</u>	.8846	<u>.4169</u>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.7643	.2596	<b>.9529</b>	.4080
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6329	.1800	.9294	.3016
InternLM2-20B-Math	.4584	.1202	.8471	.2105
<b>Instruction Prompt_v2 + Knowledge Interpretation</b>				
GPT-3.5-Turbo	<u>.8325</u>	.2230	.3882	.2833
GPT-4	<b>.9097</b>	<b>.4839</b>	.8824	<b>.6250</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.5968	.1691	<u>.9529</u>	.2872
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	.8313	<u>.3208</u>	.8718	<u>.4690</u>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.7914	<u>.2857</u>	<b>.9647</b>	.4408
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6941	.2059	.9059	.3355
InternLM2-20B-Math	.4985	.1179	.7529	.2039

we find the performance gaps between different LLMs are quite large. For example, the most advanced LLMs such as GPT-4 can achieve nearly 90% accuracy even under the zero-shot scenario, while some other open-source LLMs, such as LLAMA2-70B-Chat, only achieves around 60% result.

#### 4.4 Demonstration Selecting Results

Based on the conclusion we draw in Sec 4.3, we choose to use InstructionPrompt\_v2 with knowledge interpretations as the basic instructions for the following few-shot learning experiment. In order to present the different influences brought by each demonstration selection strategy, we use the random sampled demonstrations as the baselines for all the following comparisons. The complete evaluation results of different demonstration selecting strategies are shown in Table 3. From the comparisons, we can draw the following conclusions: (1) the random sampled demonstrations have different effects to LLMs. For advanced LLM like GPT-4, which achieves satisfying performance even in the zero-shot scenario, the few-shot learning samples may bring negative influence. On the other hand, for other LLMs, such as Mixtral-8\*7-Instruct and InternLM2-20B-Math, those demonstrations bring a significant boost to their overall performances. (2) The number of demonstration samples brings marginal beneficial influence to LLMs’ performance; (3) The knowledge relevance strategy does not help, and it even causes great degradation in the performance of several LLMs, e.g., Mixtral-8\*7B-Instruct; (4) The label distribution of demonstrations plays an important role in the few-shot learning scenario. From the results, we can observe a consistent improvement in all LLMs by using the all-matching demonstrations. Meanwhile, the

Table 3: Evaluation result of LLMs under few-shot settings. The number (2) and (4) denote the number of demonstrations used in prompt. The best result is marked with **bold**, and the second best is marked with underline.

Model	Accuracy	Precision	Recall	F1
<b>Random Sample (2)</b>				
GPT-3.5-turbo	.6572	.1916	.9359	.3181
GPT-4	.8401	<u>.3426</u>	<b>.9487</b>	<u>.5034</u>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.5432	.1205	.8623	.2115
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	<b>.8894</b>	<b>.4094</b>	.6667	<b>.5073</b>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.8231	.3207	<u>.9374</u>	.4779
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6921	.2063	.9176	.3369
InternLM2-20B-Math	<u>.8546</u>	.2945	.5059	.3723
<b>Random Sample (4)</b>				
GPT-3.5-turbo	.6597	.2166	<b>.9463</b>	.3525
GPT-4	<u>.8543</u>	<b>.3659</b>	<u>.9615</u>	<b>.5301</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.5521	.1369	.8790	.2369
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	.8280	.3163	.8718	.4642
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.8299	<u>.3307</u>	.9498	<u>.4906</u>
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.7013	.2130	.9034	.3447
InternLM2-20B-Math	<b>.8671</b>	.3056	.5290	.3874
<b>Same Knowledge Sample (2)</b>				
GPT-3.5-turbo	.7820	.1730	.4103	.2434
GPT-4	<b>.9025</b>	<b>.4626</b>	.8718	<b>.6045</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.5892	.1547	<b>.9603</b>	.2665
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	.8083	<u>.2954</u>	.8974	<u>.4445</u>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.7927	.2913	<u>.9242</u>	.4430
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6680	.1873	.8563	.3074
InternLM2-20B-Math	<u>.8180</u>	.2532	.6772	.3686
<b>Match Sample (2)</b>				
GPT-3.5-turbo	<u>.8883</u>	.3537	.3718	.3625
GPT-4	.8850	<u>.4182</u>	.8846	<b>.5679</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.6375	.2083	<b>.9420</b>	.3412
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	<b>.8916</b>	<b>.4286</b>	.8077	<u>.5600</u>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.8587	.3401	.8913	.4923
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.7244	.2310	<u>.9055</u>	.3681
InternLM2-20B-Math	.8792	.3476	.6413	.4508
<b>Mismatch Sample (2)</b>				
GPT-3.5-turbo	.6166	.1731	<u>.9231</u>	.2915
GPT-4	<b>.8346</b>	<b>.3333</b>	<b>.9359</b>	<b>.4915</b>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.4774	.1029	.7837	.1819
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	.7831	<u>.2674</u>	.8846	<u>.4107</u>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.7363	.2043	.8473	.3292
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6341	.1476	.8207	.2502
InternLM2-20B-Math	<u>.7832</u>	.2471	.4470	.3183
<b>Diverse Question Sample (2)</b>				
GPT-3.5-turbo	.6613	.2104	<u>.9057</u>	.3415
GPT-4	.8576	<u>.3700</u>	<b>.9487</b>	<u>.5324</u>
LLAMA2-70B-Chat	.5251	.1104	.8379	.1951
Mixtral-8*7B-Instruct	<b>.8664</b>	<b>.3778</b>	.8718	<b>.5272</b>
Qwen1.5-72B-Chat	.8032	.2951	.8573	.4391
InternLM2-20B-Chat	.6785	.1830	.8798	.3030
InternLM2-20B-Math	<u>.8634</u>	.3176	.5145	.3928

all-mismatching samples selecting strategy cause LLMs receive a significant drop in performance. Based on these facts, we draw the conclusion that the matching samples are more informative than the mismatching ones during the few-shot learning scenario, and it will be more efficient to teach LLM with correct samples compared to the wrong cases; (5) the diversity selecting strategy does not behave consistently with different LLMs. Overall, GPT-4 is still the best LLMs, which receives the most first place results. Mixtral-8\*7B-Instruct behave surprisingly well with the help of few-shot learning demonstrations. InternLM2-20B-Math is another LLM which receive huge performance boost from the few-shot learning samples and it consistently outperform InternLM2-20B-Chat demonstrate the importance in domain-knowledge for knowledge tagging problems.

#### 4.5 Self-Reflection Results

In the last experiment, we evaluated the effectiveness of self-reflection using the optimal prompt and demonstration settings identified in the preceding sections. The contrasting results between w/ non-reflective and w/o reflective processes are presented in Figure 2. From the figure, we can observe that incorporating a self-reflection step significantly improves the precision of outcomes generated by various LLMs. This result is aligning with our objective of achieving high precision in knowledge concept tagging tasks. Notably, the extent of improvement varies across different LLMs, where more advanced models, such as GPT-4, show greater benefits from reflection, whereas less advanced ones, like LLAMA2-70B-Chat and InternLM2-20B-Chat, exhibit minimal performance changes. This observation aligns with findings from previous research [Zhao *et al.*, 2023]. Importantly, since self-reflection was applied only to samples with a first match response, there was a potential decrease in recall. However, evaluation of the balanced recall-precision metric, the F1 score, indicates that the self-reflection step enhances performance across all LLMs. Consequently, we conclude that self-reflection is a beneficial process for implementing LLMs in knowledge concept tagging tasks.

### 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate how to leverage large language models to automate knowledge concept tagging for math questions, which is a crucial aspect of intelligent and personalized educational systems. By utilizing the mathematical and logical inference capabilities of LLMs, we show effectiveness in this domain without requiring extensive expert annotations. Our experiments with various LLMs demonstrate promising performance and underscore the importance of prompt design and knowledge interpretation. Our research contributes to the integration of LLMs into education, offering an effective solution for automating knowledge-intensive tasks in education applications.

#### A Zero-shot Examples

We present the judgement results of representative LLMs, including GPT-4, LLAMA2 and Mixtral in Table 4. From the




Figure 2: Evaluation result of LLMs with self-reflection revisions, where 0 denotes non-reflect and 1 denotes reflect.

table, we can observe the characteristics of the answers generated by different LLMs. For example, GPT-4’s answers are usually precise and accurate and LLAMA2’s replies are always verbose and contains some hallucination results.

### B Reflective Examples

We present the reflective judgment results of GPT-4 in Table 5. From the table, we find that given the prior generated judgment reasons, GPT-4 can discern the wrong concepts and conclusions generated within the intermediate deduction process and fix them automatically. Contributing to this behavior, the model’s precision performance gets boosted by a great margin.

### References

[Bacciu *et al.*, 2023] Andrea Bacciu, Florin Cuconasu, Federico Siciliano, Fabrizio Silvestri, Nicola Tonellotto, and Giovanni Trappolini. Rraml: Reinforced retrieval augmented machine learning, 2023.

[Bai *et al.*, 2023] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.

[Brown *et al.*, 2020] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.

Table 4: Sample predictions of LLMs. The wrong results are marked with the Red color.

Knowledge	Question	GPT-4	LLAMA-2-70B-Chat	Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct
Adding and subtracting integer tens - Comparison of formulas	To build a road, Team A will complete it in 8 days alone, and Team B will complete it in 7 days. The working time ratio of Team A and Team B is _____, and the work efficiency ratio is _____.	No, the knowledge provided does not match the question. The question is discussing a problem related to work efficiency and time management between two teams working on a project, while the knowledge provided is about mathematical calculations and operations involving whole tens.	No, the given Knowledge does not match the Question. The Knowledge provided is about comparing the result of adding two whole tens with another number, or comparing the size of expressions involving the addition or subtraction of two whole tens, which requires a one-step addition or subtraction of two whole tens. However, the Question is about finding the working time ratio and work efficiency ratio of two teams, which is not related to adding or subtracting whole tens. Therefore, the Knowledge does not match the Question.	No, the given knowledge is not matching the question. The knowledge is about comparing the result of adding two whole tens with another number or comparing the size of expressions involving the addition or subtraction of two whole tens. However, the question is asking about the working time ratio and work efficiency ratio of two teams working on building a road. The question covers other knowledge that is not related to the given knowledge.
Area unit-unit conversion	If a bag of dolls is divided equally among 4 children, 3 are left. If it is divided equally among 8 children, 1 is missing. If it is divided equally among 10 children, 1 is missing. This bag of dolls has at least _____ individual.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The question is about simple arithmetic and finding the least common multiple, while the knowledge provided pertains to unit conversion between different area units, which is not relevant to the question.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The question is asking for a numerical answer to a word problem, whereas the knowledge provided is about unit conversion between different units of area. The knowledge does not include word problems or provide any information that can be used to solve the problem in the question. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the number of individual dolls in the bag using the provided knowledge.	No, the given knowledge is not matching the question. The question is about dividing a bag of dolls equally among children and determining the minimum number of dolls in the bag, while the knowledge is about unit conversion between square meters, square decimeters, square centimeters, and square millimeters.
Comparison of numbers within 5	Written calculation: $8.49 - 2.45 = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$	No, the knowledge does not match the question. While the knowledge talks about comparison between integer numbers within 5, the question is asking for a calculation involving decimal numbers.	No, this question does not match the given knowledge. The question asks for a written calculation, which is not within the scope of the provided knowledge. The knowledge only covers comparisons between integer numbers, and does not include calculations. Therefore, this question cannot be answered using the given knowledge.	No, the knowledge provided is not matching the question. The question requires a written calculation to determine the difference between two decimal numbers, while the knowledge provided is about comparing integer numbers within 5.
The composition of numbers within 20	The adjacent numbers of a number consisting of 1 tens and 9 ones are _____ and _____ (Case from smallest to uppercase)	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question asks about identifying the adjacent numbers of a two digit number, which is formed from 1 tens and 9 ones. This fits within the knowledge scope of giving several tens and ones and filling in the corresponding two-digit number.	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question asks for the adjacent numbers of a number consisting of 1 tens and 9 ones, which is 19. The knowledge states that the number 19 can be broken down into 1 tens and 9 ones. Therefore, the adjacent numbers of 19 are 18 and 20, which answers the question.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The question asks for the adjacent numbers of a specific number (1 ten and 9 ones), while the knowledge is about directly giving a two-digit number and reading out how many tens or ones it contains, or giving several tens and several ones and filling in the corresponding two-digit number. The knowledge does not provide any information about the adjacent numbers of a specific number.
The rules of decimal point movement calculation	The bookstore has newly shipped 100 storybooks, with a total thickness of 1.32m. One such storybook is _____m thick, and 10,000 such storybooks are _____m thick.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The question is about finding the thickness of one storybook and then calculating the total thickness of 10,000 such storybooks, which involves division and multiplication respectively. However, the knowledge specifically refers to moving decimal points when multiplying or dividing by 10, 100, or 1000, rather than an application of division and multiplication in a context.	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question asks for the thickness of one storybook and 10,000 storybooks. The knowledge provides a method to calculate the thickness of a decimal by multiplying or dividing it by 10, 100, or 1000. To answer the question, we can use the method provided in the knowledge to calculate the thickness of one storybook and 10,000 storybooks. For example, to find the thickness of one storybook, we can multiply 1.32m by 1000 (since there are 1000 storybooks in the shipment) to get 1320mm. To find the thickness of 10,000 storybooks, we can divide 1320mm by 1000 to get 1.32m. Therefore, one storybook is 1.32mm thick, and 10,000 storybooks are 1.32m thick. The knowledge provides the necessary information to answer the question, so the answer is	No, the knowledge provided does not match the question. The knowledge is about the movement of the decimal point when multiplying or dividing decimals by 10, 100, or 1000. However, the question is asking about the thickness of a storybook and the total thickness of 10,000 storybooks. The knowledge provided does not give any information about the thickness of a single storybook or the total thickness of 10,000 storybooks. Therefore, the knowledge cannot be used to answer the question.
Two-step operation of adding and subtracting integer tens	Use vertical calculation: $303 \div 10 = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The question is asking for a division calculation to be performed, specifically dividing 303 by 10. However, the knowledge provided only covers the topics of addition and subtraction of whole tens, not division.	No, the question does not match the given knowledge. The question asks for a division problem, while the knowledge provided is about adding and subtracting whole tens. The knowledge does not cover division, and therefore, it cannot be used to answer the question.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The knowledge is about adding and subtracting whole tens, while the question is about dividing a two-digit number by ten.
Understanding and Classification of Numbers	There are _____ ten thousand and _____ ones in 70200090.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The question is asking about place value in a specific number which is not covered in the knowledge statement. The knowledge provided pertains to the understanding of various types of numbers, their definitions, and the classification of these numbers. However, it does not cover concepts related to the decomposition of numbers into place values.	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question asks about the number of ten thousands and ones in a given number, which falls under the category of understanding numbers and their classification. The knowledge specified mentions the definition of integers, which includes the concept of ten thousands and ones. Additionally, the knowledge mentions the ability to select numbers of a specified type from a set of numbers and determine whether a number falls within a defined range, which are both relevant to answering the question. Therefore, the knowledge provided matches the question and would be useful in answering it correctly.	Yes, the Knowledge does match the Question. The Knowledge includes understanding of numbers, including the definitions of integers and positive numbers. The Question is asking about the classification of numbers, specifically the place value of a given number.
Use the properties of decimals to rewrite decimals	There are _____ 0.01s in 0.69; rewriting 0.3 into two decimal places with the same size is _____	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question addresses two aspects of the provided knowledge: the conversion of decimals to units of one-hundredth (there are _____ 0.01s in 0.69) and the rewriting of decimals to have a specific number of decimal places (rewriting 0.3 into two decimal places). Both of these tasks require understanding and applying the properties of decimals.	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The knowledge states that we can rewrite decimals as required by adding or removing zeroes from the end, and this will not change their value. The question asks us to rewrite 0.3 into two decimal places with the same size, which can be done by adding zeroes to the end, making it 0.30. Therefore, the answer to the question is Yes, the knowledge matches the question.	No, the question does not match the knowledge provided. The knowledge is about adding or removing zeros from the end of a decimal number to change its representation, while the question asks about the number of tenths and hundredths in a decimal number and rewriting another decimal number to a specific number of decimal places.
Use the properties of decimals to simplify decimals	The product of two prime numbers is 35 and the difference is 2. The smaller of the two numbers is _____ and the larger number is _____.	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The knowledge is about simplifying decimals, while the question is about finding two prime numbers that multiply to 35 and have a difference of 2. This question does not require knowledge about decimals or their properties.	No, the given Knowledge does not match the Question. The Question is asking for the values of two prime numbers, while the Knowledge is about simplifying decimals. The two concepts are unrelated, and the Knowledge does not provide any information that can help answer the Question. Therefore, the answer is No.	No, the given knowledge is not relevant to the question. The question asks about the properties of prime numbers and their product, while the knowledge is about simplifying decimals.
reciprocal	Known: $\frac{6}{13}x = \frac{4}{5}y = 1$ , then $6x + 4y = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$	No, the knowledge does not match the question. The knowledge talks about writing the reciprocal of a number and calculating the value of a number which yields the product as 1. However, the question involves solving equations with fractions and includes addition of terms to find the answer.	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question asks for the value of $6x + 4y$ when $\frac{6}{13}x = \frac{4}{5}y = 1$ . Using the given information, we can write: $6x + 4y = 6 \left(\frac{13}{6}\right) + 4 \left(\frac{5}{4}\right) = 13 + 5 = 18$ Therefore, the answer is 18.	No, the knowledge provided does not directly give the value of $6x + 4y$ . The knowledge states that the reciprocal of a fraction, integer, or decimal should be directly written, or the number whose product with a given number is 1 should be found (with no letters involved). However, the question asks for the value of an expression based on the given equation. The knowledge does not provide enough information to directly determine the value of $6x + 4y$ from the given equation.



Table 5: Reflection predictions generated by GPT-4. The discovered error in original results are marked with the **Red** color.

Knowledge	Problem	Origin Result	Reflection Result
Comparison of numbers within 5	Fill in “ $\lt$ ”, “ $\gt$ ” or “ $=$ ” on the horizontal lines. 37800____37,800; 6590000____659,000	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question is asking for a comparison between numerical values without including any calculations. In accordance with the knowledge, the mentioned numbers are presented and require assigning of comparative symbols.	No, the prior answer is incorrect. Although the question does involve comparison of numerical values, it doesn't match the knowledge because the knowledge specifically states the comparison is between integer numbers smaller than 5. <b>However, the numbers in the question are far larger than 5.</b>
Use the properties of decimals to rewrite decimals	79 0.1&#39;s are ____ and 600 0.001&#39;s are ____ (fill in decimals)	Yes, the question matches the knowledge. The question focuses on converting specific quantities of decimals to larger or smaller decimal amounts, adhering to the concept of decimal precision requirements. There is no explicit arithmetic calculation involved, so it complies with the conditions given in the knowledge.	No, the prior answer is incorrect. The question <b>does involve explicit arithmetic calculation</b> as it asks for the multiplication of 79 by 0.1 and 600 by 0.001, which isn't consistent with the condition mentioned in the knowledge.
Adding and subtracting integer tens - Comparison of formulas	Fill in “ $\lt$ ”, “ $\gt$ ”, “ $=$ ” or “ $\neq$ ”. 18+7____33 67-8____59	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question involves comparing two expressions involving addition and subtraction of two digit numbers. And there is a comparing step as asked in the question.	The prior answer is wrong. Although the question involves comparing two expressions, it does not follow the knowledge provided because <b>it includes numbers that are not multiples of tens</b> . For example, '18+7' and '67-8' are not composed of two-digit multiples of tens. Therefore, the knowledge does not match with the question.
Use the properties of decimals to rewrite decimals	Rewrite 128091 as a number using “ten thousand” as the unit, which is ____ ten thousand, and then keep three decimal places to get ____ ten thousand.	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question refers to converting a given number into a new number with specific decimal precision, in this case three decimal places, and the unit used for conversion is “ten thousand”. The knowledge explains exactly this process without involving any mention of an explicit arithmetic calculation.	No, the prior response is incorrect. The knowledge point describes the process of converting numbers into new numbers with specific decimal precision requirements (tenth, hundredth, or thousandth place). However, the question is seeking a conversion of the number into “ten thousands” and then asking to keep three decimal places. <b>The question involves a place value unit conversion not covered in the given knowledge</b> . Therefore, these two do not match perfectly.
The rules of decimal point movement-calculation	Calculation: $14 \times 0.016 = \dots$	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question is asking for a simple one-step arithmetic calculation involving a multiplication operation. There are no multiple points movement involved here and it also involves a multiplication with a decimal number which is allowed according to the given knowledge.	No, the prior answer is incorrect. The knowledge does not match the question. Based on the provided knowledge, it specifically refers to “Calculate arithmetic expression based on the moving of the decimal point”. The question “ $14 \times 0.016 = \dots$ ” is a typical arithmetic operation, <b>but it doesn't involve any 'moving of the decimal point' problem that is mentioned in the knowledge</b> .
Adding and subtracting whole tens - word problems	$58 - 20 = \dots$	Yes, the question matches the knowledge. This question is a one-step application problem involving the subtraction of whole tens from whole tens. Both numbers, 58 and 20, are two-digit multiples of tens. And the calculated result, 38, is less than 100. There is no comparing step in this question, so it does not cover other knowledge.	No, the prior answer is incorrect. The numbers in the question, <b>58 and 20, are not multiples of tens</b> . The problem is a simple subtraction operation rather than a scenario involving the subtraction of whole tens from whole tens.
Adding and subtracting whole tens - word problems	There are 52 ducks and 38 geese in the pond. How many more ducks than geese are there in the pond? Column expression and calculation: ____ (only)	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question involves the subtraction of whole tens from whole tens, and the calculation result is less than 100. The question also has a comparing step, which is comparing the number of ducks to the number of geese. Moreover, although the numbers involved are not multiples of tens, they are two-digit numbers, which is consistent with the specification in the knowledge that there are only two-digit numbers in expressions.	No, the prior response is not correct. The knowledge pertains to the addition or subtraction of multiples of tens only, <b>while the problem in the question uses the numbers 52 and 38, which are not multiples of tens</b> . Therefore, the knowledge does not match the question.
Area unit-unit conversion	420,000 square centimeters = ____ square meters 64 meters = ____ centimeters	Yes, the knowledge matches the question because the question is asking for the conversion of area units between square centimeters and square meters, and length units between meters and centimeters, which falls under the provided knowledge concerning conversion between these units.	No, the prior response is incorrect. <b>The knowledge given only pertains to the conversions of area units, and does not cover the conversion of length units</b> . Therefore, the portion of the question asking to convert 64 meters to centimeters does not match the given knowledge. Only the part of the question asking to convert 420,000 square centimeters to square meters matches the knowledge.
Understanding and Classification of Numbers	The difference between a natural number and its reciprocal is $\frac{50}{51}$ . This natural number is ____	Yes, the knowledge matches the question. The question is asking to identify a natural number based on a given condition. The knowledge point refers to understanding definitions of numbers including natural numbers and involves judging propositions related to the classification of numbers. This pertains to the content of the question.	No, the prior answer is incorrect. While the question does involve the understanding of numbers and natural numbers, which is part of the knowledge, <b>it also involves number operations to solve the difference between a natural number and its reciprocal which is explicitly stated as not included in the provided knowledge</b> .
Adding and subtracting integer tens - Comparison of formulas	In the following calculations, the numbers less than 40 are ____ (fill in the letters in order, connected with commas) A: 25+14; B: 68-27; C: 13+36; D: 83-52	Yes, the given knowledge matches the question. The question has a comparing step which is to find the numbers less than 40. It involves only addition or subtraction between two-digit numbers which can be multiples of tens.	No, the prior answer is incorrect. <b>The question involves operations with numbers that are not multiples of tens</b> , contrary to the requirement of the Knowledge that only multiples of tens should be involved.
Adding and subtracting integer tens - Comparison of formulas	In the following formula, there are ____ numbers that are more than eighty: A: $8 + 21$ ; B: $46 + 35$ ; C: $92 - 5$ ; D: 95-14	Yes, the knowledge is matching with the question. The question is about comparing expression results (involving addition or subtraction) with an external number 80. The expressions mentioned involves only two digits and all numbers involved are multiples of tens. Also, the question process involves a comparing step, which fits with the knowledge point.	The prior answer is wrong. The knowledge does not match the question. The knowledge specifies that the expressions should involve only two-digit multiples of tens. In the question, <b>the numbers used are not all multiples of tens</b> . For instance, 21, 5, and 14 are used, and these are not multiples of tens. Hence, the question does not align fully with the knowledge.

- [Burns and Capps, 2013] Hugh L Burns and Charles G Capps. Intelligent tutoring systems: an introduction. *Foundations of intelligent tutoring systems*, 1, 2013.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2014] Jun-Ming Chen, Meng-Chang Chen, and Yeali S Sun. A tag based learning approach to knowledge acquisition for constructing prior knowledge and enhancing student reading comprehension. *Computers & Education*, 70:256–268, 2014.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2018] Y. Chen, S. A. Culpepper, Y. Chen, and J. Douglas. Bayesian estimation of the dina q matrix. *Psychometrika*, 83(1):89–108, 2018.
- [Desmarais and Naceur, 2013] M. C. Desmarais and R. Naceur. A matrix factorization method for mapping items to skills and for enhancing expert-based q-matrices. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education*, volume 7926, pages 441–450, 2013.
- [Ding *et al.*, 2024] Yifan Ding, Qingkai Zeng, and Tim Weninger. Chatel: Entity linking with chatbots, 2024.
- [Dong *et al.*, 2024] Hang Dong, Jiaoyan Chen, Yuan He, Yongsheng Gao, and Ian Horrocks. A language model based framework for new concept placement in ontologies, 2024.
- [Du *et al.*, 2021] Wei Du, Haiyan Zhu, and Teeraporn Saeheaw. Application of the lda model to semantic annotation of web-based english educational resources. *Journal of web engineering*, 20(4):1113–1136, 2021.
- [Dunn *et al.*, 2022] Alexander Dunn, John Dagdelen, Nicholas Walker, Sanghoon Lee, Andrew S. Rosen, Gerbrand Ceder, Kristin Persson, and Anubhav Jain. Structured information extraction from complex scientific text with fine-tuned large language models, 2022.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2019] Wei Huang, Enhong Chen, Qi Liu, Yuying Chen, Zai Huang, Yang Liu, Zhou Zhao, Dan Zhang, and Shijin Wang. Hierarchical multi-label text classification: An attention-based recurrent network approach. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM '19*, page 1051–1060, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2020] Zhenya Huang, Qi Liu, Weibo Gao, Jinze Wu, Yu Yin, Hao Wang, and Enhong Chen. Neural mathematical solver with enhanced formula structure. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '20*, page 1729–1732, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2021] T. Huang, M. Liang, H. Yang, Z. Li, T. Yu, and S. Hu. Context-aware knowledge tracing integrated with the exercise representation and association in mathematics. In *Proceedings of the International Educational Data Mining Society*, volume 1, pages 360–366, 2021.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2023a] Tao Huang, Shengze Hu, Huali Yang, Jing Geng, Sannyuya Liu, Hao Zhang, and Zongkai Yang. Pqsc: Pseudo-siamese bert for concept tagging with both questions and solutions. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 2023.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2023b] Tao Huang, Shengze Hu, Huali Yang, Jing Geng, Sannyuya Liu, Hao Zhang, and Zongkai Yang. Pqsc: Pseudo-siamese bert for concept tagging with both questions and solutions. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 16(5):831–846, 2023.
- [Jiang *et al.*, 2024] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [Lin and Zeldes, 2024] Jessica Lin and Amir Zeldes. Gumsley: Evaluating entity salience in summarization for 12 english genres, 2024.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2019] Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Yu Yin, Enhong Chen, Hui Xiong, Yu Su, and Guoping Hu. Ekt: Exercise-aware knowledge tracing for student performance prediction, 2019.
- [Margatina *et al.*, 2023] Katerina Margatina, Timo Schick, Nikolaos Aletras, and Jane Dwivedi-Yu. Active learning principles for in-context learning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14264*, 2023.
- [Masson *et al.*, 2023] Maxime Masson, Rodrigo Agerri, Christian Sallaberry, Marie-Noelle Bessagnet, Annig Le Parc Lacayrelle, and Philippe Roose. Optimal strategies to perform multilingual analysis of social content for a novel dataset in the tourism domain, 2023.
- [Mavromatis *et al.*, 2023] Costas Mavromatis, Balasubramaniam Srinivasan, Zhengyuan Shen, Jiani Zhang, Huzefa Rangwala, Christos Faloutsos, and George Karypis. Which examples to annotate for in-context learning? towards effective and efficient selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20046*, 2023.
- [Su *et al.*, 2022] Hongjin Su, Jungo Kasai, Chen Henry Wu, Weijia Shi, Tianlu Wang, Jiayi Xin, Rui Zhang, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A Smith, et al. Selective annotation makes language models better few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.01975*, 2022.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2018] Bo Sun, Yunzong Zhu, Yongkang Xiao, Rong Xiao, and Yungang Wei. Automatic question tagging with deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 12(1):29–43, 2018.
- [Sun *et al.*, 2019] Bo Sun, Yunzong Zhu, Yongkang Xiao, Rong Xiao, and Yungang Wei. Automatic question tagging with deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 12(1):29–43, 2019.
- [Touvron *et al.*, 2023] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

- [Wang *et al.*, 2023] Qinyong Wang, Zhenxiang Gao, and Rong Xu. Exploring the in-context learning ability of large language model for biomedical concept linking, 2023.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2021] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2022] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [Wei *et al.*, 2023] Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, et al. Larger language models do in-context learning differently. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03846*, 2023.
- [Xiao *et al.*, 2023] Zilin Xiao, Ming Gong, Jie Wu, Xingyao Zhang, Linjun Shou, Jian Pei, and Daxin Jiang. Instructed language models with retrievers are powerful entity linkers, 2023.
- [Yan *et al.*, 2023] Xi Yan, Cedric Möller, and Ricardo Usbeck. Biomedical entity linking with triple-aware pre-training, 2023.
- [Yao *et al.*, 2023] Bingsheng Yao, Guiming Chen, Ruishi Zou, Yuxuan Lu, Jiachen Li, Shao Zhang, Sijia Liu, James Hendler, and Dakuo Wang. More samples or more prompt inputs? exploring effective in-context sampling for llm few-shot prompt engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09782*, 2023.
- [Yin *et al.*, 2019] Yu Yin, Qi Liu, Zhenya Huang, Enhong Chen, Wei Tong, Shijin Wang, and Yu Su. Quesnet: A unified representation for heterogeneous test questions. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '19*. ACM, July 2019.
- [Ying *et al.*, 2024] Huaiyuan Ying, Shuo Zhang, Linyang Li, Zhejian Zhou, Yunfan Shao, Zhaoye Fei, Yichuan Ma, Jiawei Hong, Kuikun Liu, Ziyi Wang, et al. Internlm-math: Open math large language models toward verifiable reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06332*, 2024.
- [Zemlyanskiy *et al.*, 2021] Yury Zemlyanskiy, Sudeep Gandhe, Ruining He, Bhargav Kanagal, Anirudh Ravula, Juraj Gottweis, Fei Sha, and Ilya Eckstein. Docent: Learning self-supervised entity representations from large document collections, 2021.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2021] Xiao Zhang, Meng Liu, Jianhua Yin, Zhaochun Ren, and Liqiang Nie. Question tagging via graph-guided ranking. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 40(1):1–23, 2021.
- [Zhao *et al.*, 2023] Andrew Zhao, Daniel Huang, Quentin Xu, Matthieu Lin, Yong-Jin Liu, and Gao Huang. Expel: Llm agents are experiential learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10144*, 2023.