

Context Matters: An Empirical Study of the Impact of Contextual Information in Temporal Question Answering Systems

Dan Schumacher^{1*}, Fatemeh Haji^{1*}, Tara Grey¹ Niharika Bandlamudi¹, Nupoor Karnik¹, Gagana Uday Kumar¹, Jason Cho-Yu Chiang², Paul Rad¹, Nishant Vishwamitra¹, and Anthony Rios¹

¹University of Texas at San Antonio

²Peraton Labs

{dan.schumacher, fatemeh.haji, anthony.rios}.utsa.edu

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) often struggle with temporal reasoning, crucial for tasks like historical event analysis and time-sensitive information retrieval. Despite advancements, state-of-the-art models falter in handling temporal information, especially when faced with irrelevant or noisy contexts. This paper addresses this gap by empirically examining the robustness of temporal question-answering (TQA) systems trained on various context types, including relevant, irrelevant, slightly altered, and no context. Our findings indicate that training with a mix of these contexts enhances model robustness and accuracy. Additionally, we show that the position of context relative to the question significantly impacts performance, with question-first positioning yielding better results. We introduce two new context-rich TQA datasets, ContextAQA and ContextTQE, and provide comprehensive evaluations and guidelines for training robust TQA models. Our work lays the foundation for developing reliable and context-aware temporal QA systems, with broader implications for enhancing LLM robustness against diverse and potentially adversarial information.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) often face challenges in temporal reasoning (Beniwal et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024; Gade and Jetcheva, 2024), which involves understanding and processing time-related information within text. Temporal reasoning is crucial for many applications, such as historical event analysis (Lorenzini et al., 2022), time-sensitive information retrieval, journalism, and real-time data analysis, where precise temporal understanding is key.

Numerous methods have been proposed for temporal question answering, from traditional fine-tuning-based (Tan et al., 2023) to prompt-based




Figure 1: Illustration of non-robust temporal QA. Models trained on relevant contexts will not be robust to irrelevant contexts, causing the model to assume it is correct. Also, training only on irrelevant contexts will result in models ignoring relevant contexts at test time.

solutions (Chen et al., 2023b). Yet, several papers have pointed out the limitations of these methods. For instance, Wallat et al. (2024) identified “temporal blind spots” through comprehensive evaluations across multiple temporal QA datasets, i.e., understanding whether LLMs favor certain time periods or more recent events. Dhingra et al. (2022) suggested a pretraining approach incorporating temporal data, improving LLMs’ recall of facts from different periods. In general, LLMs may be able to answer a question based on their parametric knowledge, e.g., if they saw the information during the pretraining phase. If not, the knowledge must be passed as additional context. Hence, Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) Lewis et al. (2020) is being used to retrieve information to support the internal parametric knowledge of the models. Given that contextual knowledge can be irrelevant, Shaier et al. (2024) highlighted gaps in evaluating how QA systems that use context, such as robustness to noisy contexts, but they did not explore substantial training paradigms.

In addition to TQA, relevant to our paper is the improvement of general QA systems in their han-

*These authors contributed equally on this project.

dling of irrelevant and noisy contexts (Cheng et al., 2024; Yoran et al., 2024). For example, Yoran et al. (2024) evaluate using filters (e.g., natural language inference) to filter out noisy context. They also explore training LLMs for question-answering using relevant and incorrect contextual information. Despite recent advancements, state-of-the-art models still face challenges in handling temporal information effectively (Wallat et al., 2024).

While Yoran et al. (2024) shows that training on a mix of relevant and irrelevant contexts improves performance, it is unknown why this would work. Further understanding on the matter may lead to even more drastic improvements. Intuitively, training with both contexts *may* allow the model to use its parametric knowledge instead of the context if it determines it is irrelevant. This would imply that training on irrelevant contexts alone would cause models to ignore the context completely (relevant or not) at test time. If this is possible, the implication is that LLMs can be trained to ignore information that matches specific patterns, such as hate speech, offensive language, or potentially adversarial examples. We illustrate this idea in Figure 1. If a model can be trained to ignore context, and the information is not within the model’s parametric knowledge, the performance would be low even if the correct context is provided as input for all test instances. Likewise, there are other unknown questions, such as what would happen if models were trained with no context or slightly altered context? Will the model learn to identify the alterations and return a correct answer? Is context needed at all during the training process? What would happen if models were fine-tuned using only question-answer pairs but passed relevant or irrelevant context at test time? We explore these questions in this paper.

To do so, we empirically examine Temporal Question Answering robustness, with the aim of training models to provide accurate responses to queries involving time-related information accompanied by a variety of contexts. For instance, questions like “Which college’s freshmen won the Temple Challenge Cup in 2001?” and “Which country signed an international treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons in 1985?” require models to understand the temporal context and historical facts.

Another distinction between our work and Yoran et al. (2024) is that we explore where the context should be positioned in relation to the question during input to the LLM. It turns out that the position of the context can have a major impact on

model performance, particularly if the context is irrelevant. Finally, rather than general QA, we exclusively focus on temporal question answering, which is highly context-driven, e.g., “Who was the president of the United States in 1994?” Hence, we better understand how LLMs retrieve and answer questions in the presence of altered or irrelevant contextual information for temporal questions.

We focus on explicit temporal question answering, which can be highly sensitive to contextual information. Moreover, focusing on explicit questions with direct answers allows us to control for unknown reasoning processes that may impact answer quality. Our experiments on two temporal QA datasets show that training with a mixture of diverse context types can improve the robustness of LLMs in handling temporal questions. Our approach shows a 7.5% increase in accuracy when comparing purely relevant-trained to our mixture approach when prompted with a combination of contexts during evaluation. This highlights the importance of context-aware temporal reasoning for reliable temporal QA systems.

Overall, we make the following contributions: (i) We investigate the need and procedures to integrate context during the training and testing phases. We explore scenarios with no context, slightly altered context, irrelevant context, relevant context, and context provided at different positions relative to the question. (ii) We specifically target temporal questions, providing insights into how LLMs handle temporally-related information and their robustness to noisy or incorrect contexts. Because of the absence of explicit temporal QA datasets with contexts, we created two new temporal QA datasets, ContextAQA and ContextTQE, where we have added relevant, irrelevant, and slightly-altered contextual information to existing datasets (Wang et al., 2021, 2022). (iii) We comprehensively evaluate many state-of-the-art 2b, 7b, and 8b (see appendix for all numbers) models and GPT-3.5 to various noisy context setups and provide general guidelines for training more robust temporal QA models. Moreover, we perform a comprehensive error analysis, which helps us understand when and why certain training procedures perform well or poorly.

2 Related Work

Temporal QA. Temporal QA encompasses understanding temporal relationships in text, video,

or knowledge bases (Xiao et al., 2021; Jang et al., 2017; Saxena et al., 2021; Zhao and Rios, 2024), including ordering event mentions about specific medications in clinical notes (Zhao and Rios, 2024). This paper focuses on traditional temporal factoid-based QA, e.g., "Who was the president in 1998?" Many datasets have been curated for temporal QA. A common dataset, called TQE, is by Wang et al. (2021) containing both explicit and implicit temporal questions. Prior work curated datasets to address the unique challenges of TQA. For example, Dhingra et al. (2022) created a diagnostic dataset designed to evaluate the temporal knowledge of LLMs, Beniwal et al. (2024) introduced TempUN, a study with state-of-the-art models to reveal LLMs' limitations in handling temporal information. Wang et al. (2022) developed Archival QA, a large-scale open-domain QA dataset based on news archives, expanded upon in this study. Gruber et al. (2024) introduced COMPLEXTEMPQA, a Wikipedia-based dataset similar to TQE.

Recent studies highlighted LLMs' limitations in temporal reasoning (Qiu et al., 2023) and proposed frameworks combining LLMs' extraction capabilities with logical reasoning (Li et al., 2023), temporal span extraction, and time-sensitive reinforcement learning (Tan et al., 2023). Gao et al. (2024) introduced a two-stage generative framework for temporal knowledge graph QA using LLMs. Dhingra et al. (2022) propose TEMPLAMA, a dataset of temporally-scoped knowledge probes, and suggested pretraining modifications to facilitate temporal knowledge acquisition. To address TQA limitations, Dhingra et al. (2022) proposed two approaches: training separate models per year and a single model using temporal prefixes.

Our work expands on prior research in two major ways. First, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that explicitly explores 1) quantifying the robustness of large language models for temporal question answering with regard to irrelevant context and 2) methods to train more robust temporal QA systems. Second, most other explicit temporal QA datasets do not have valid contexts to match each question-answer pair. This paper is releasing two new context-matched datasets called ContextTQE and ContextAQA, allowing future researchers to build on our study.

Robust LLM. There has been substantial research focused on measuring and training robust LLMs based on various definitions of "robustness",

such as robustness to adversarial examples (Raina et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024; Kumar et al., 2023; Andriushchenko et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2023a). For example, Raina et al. (2024) show that adversarial attacks can generalize to different LLMs to mitigate safety features. In this paper, we are primarily focused on robustness to slightly altered or completely irrelevant contexts. Shi et al. (2023) investigated how LLMs handle irrelevant context and created the Grade-School Math with Irrelevant Context (GSM-IC) dataset to evaluate this aspect. Their results showed a significant drop in performance when irrelevant information was included. Kannen et al. (2023) explored knowledge base QA limitations by addressing incomplete knowledge bases using temporal fact extraction for bad links and relationship errors. Li et al. (2022) increased model robustness by using knowledge-aware fine-tuning, incorporating counterfactuals during training. Similarly, Cheng et al. (2024) finds that using noisy labels during in-context learning can improve robustness.

Shaier et al. (2024) describes an optimal response to context-based QA systems. Models should: 1) Answer correctly with original context; 2) Answer correctly with noisy or irrelevant context if the knowledge is available within the model's parametric knowledge; 3) Change the answer with conflicting context; 4) Answer correctly with no context and irrelevant context; and 5) Answer 'unanswerable' if you can't answer without context. Yoran et al. (2024) explore how models can be robust to noisy and incorrect contexts. But, they did not explore substantial training paradigms for improvement. Zhang et al. (2024) evaluate fusion of parametric knowledge with retrieved contexts to make new inferences.

Our paper extends on prior work in two major ways. First, our focus is on temporal QA instead of general QA. Temporal QA can be more sensitive to the underlying context and provides a unique testbed to understand context robustness. Second, many assumptions are made in prior work that are speculative without substantial evaluation. Yoran et al. (2024) speculated that the model learns to ignore irrelevant context when trained on relevant/irrelevant contexts, implying training only on irrelevant context would make it incapable of using context. These aspects were not measured before: What happens if we do not use context while training? Likewise, what if the relevant context is slightly altered? Would the model perform simi-

larly to training in relevant and irrelevant contexts? Moreover, what about context location? Should the context be placed before or after the question? Which results in better performance. We address all these questions in this paper.

3 Methodology

At a high level, we perform comprehensive training and evaluation setups to understand and improve the robustness of LLMs for temporal QA. We provide an intuitive figure of our setup in Figure 2. Formally, let Q denote a temporal question, and C denote the context provided to answer the question. We define the LLM as a function \mathcal{M} parameterized by θ . The LLM takes Q and C as input and generates an answer A

$$A = \mathcal{M}_\theta(Q, C)$$

where $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n\}$ is a sequence of tokens representing the temporal question, $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_m\}$ is a sequence of tokens representing the context, $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k\}$ is a sequence of tokens representing the answer. To assess the robustness of the LLM, we evaluate the model under different context conditions. Let C_r represent the relevant context, C_i the irrelevant context, C_a the slightly altered context, and C_0 the absence of context. Furthermore, the context on which the model was trained will impact the predicted answer. Therefore, let $\mathcal{M}_{\theta,r}$ represent a model trained on relevant context, $\mathcal{M}_{\theta,i}$ represent a model trained on irrelevant context, $\mathcal{M}_{\theta,a}$ represent a model trained on slightly altered context, and $\mathcal{M}_{\theta,0}$ represent a model trained in the absence of context. Finally, we will let $\mathcal{M}_{\theta,m}$ represent a model trained on a mixture of all the other contexts mentioned. To list a few examples of answers that will be generated under these conditions $A_{r,r} = \mathcal{M}_{\theta,r}(Q, C_r)$, $A_{i,0} = \mathcal{M}_{\theta,i}(Q, C_0)$, $A_{a,i} = \mathcal{M}_{\theta,a}(Q, C_i)$, and $A_{0,a} = \mathcal{M}_{\theta,0}(Q, C_a)$, respectively.

Intuitively, a model can access a temporal question’s answer in the context C_i or its parametric knowledge stored in θ . Hence, a robust temporal question answering LLM should answer a question correctly if it knows an answer in its parametric knowledge, even if the context C_i is incorrect. To improve the robustness of temporal QA LLMs, we explore two approaches. First, explore where the context should go in the prompt, beginning or end. Specifically, the input to $\mathcal{M}_\theta()$ can process the question and context as $[Q; C]$ or $[C; Q]$. The

impact of location can potentially depend on its location during training; it may also depend on the underlying LLM used, or there may be a framework that generalizes across multiple LLMs. Second, we explore how the LLM should be trained. Specifically, should the model $\mathcal{M}_\theta()$ be trained only with relevant context C_r , or should it be some mixture of all contexts C_r, C_i, C_a , and C_0 . Again, there may be a setup that works best across multiple models, or it may vary from model to model. We describe the different setups in more detail below.

3.1 Context Location

We evaluate two context location setups, putting the context before or after the question. When putting the context before the question, we use the prompt

Given the following context, answer the question.

Here is the context: $\{context\}$

Here is the question: $\{question\}$

The answer is:

where $\{question\}$ represents a specific temporal question and $\{context\}$ is a variable representing the context. For the context after the question, we use the prompt

You must answer the following question given subsequent context.

Here is the question: $\{question\}$

Here is the context: $\{context\}$

The answer is:

where we only slightly modify the initial instruction provided to the LLM.

3.2 Context Generation

Most TQA datasets do not contain contextual information. In our study, the context must generally contain the answer if it is relevant. Hence, simply retrieving similar passages on Wikipedia may not be robust. Instead, we use GPT3.5 to generate the contexts. Specifically, to generate relevant context, we used a few-shot prompting method using gpt-3.5. By passing each question-answer pair into GPT-3.5, we retrieved contexts to help the user answer the questions. The format of the prompt is defined as

Question: $\{Question\ Example\}$

Answer: $\{Answer\ Example\}$

Generated Context: $\{Context\}$




Figure 2: This figure illustrates our overall methodology, including training with different context types and evaluating different context types and locations.

Question: {*New Question*}

Answer: {*New Answer*}

Generated Context:

where each of the context examples {Context} was manually curated.

To evaluate the robustness of our models against temporally altered data, we implemented a method to generate falsified date contexts. This process transforms the relevant context into a *slightly-altered* version by extracting all dates and replacing them with falsified days, months, and years. We exclude the actual date info from the generations when changing the dates. For example, for years, we have used a predefined range of 1850 to 2024 to randomly replace each date and exclude the year in the context from the random sample. The days and months are generated completely at random.

Overall, we add context to two existing datasets: Temporal Question (TQE) Answering (Wang et al., 2021) and Archival Question Answering (AQA) (Wang et al., 2022), to create the versions ContextTQE and ContextAQA, respectively. ContextTQE has two sub-datasets: one with implicit questions where the date information must be inferred by the reader and the other with explicit date information. We use the latter. Of the meager 500 total rows in the dataset, we use 75 rows for development and testing and the remaining 350 for training. AQA, by comparison, is a much larger dataset with 60,000 observations, of which 7,500 are reserved for development and 7,500 for testing. In comparing the two datasets, we believe that the AQA dataset presents much tougher questions. Due to the substantial size difference, ContextAQA will be the focus of this paper, but our ContextTQE results can be found in the appendix.

To confirm the validity of our GPT-generated context, we manually reviewed a sample of 100 contexts. Only three examples were not entirely correct. A full example of our prompt can be found in the appendix.

4 Experiments

This section describes our evaluation metrics, results, implications, and error analysis.

4.1 Evaluation Metrics.

We used the same metrics as Wallat et al. (2024) to evaluate our models. Specifically, the evaluation uses three main metrics: 1. **Standard F1 Score**, which measures how well the model’s answers match the correct answers, taking into account both precision and recall; 2. **Contains Accuracy**, which checks if the correct answer is contained within the model’s generated text; and 3. **BERT-based Answer Equivalence Metric (BEM)**, which uses a BERT model to detect if the model’s answer is semantically equivalent to the correct answer. Because of limited space, for detailed BEM scores and analysis, please see Appendix D.

4.2 Results.

For our experiments, we address important research questions, such as “How do different training setups impact model robustness?” and “Does context location matter?” For space considerations, we focus on the results of the ContextAQA dataset, which is much larger than ContextTQE. See the appendix for ContextTQE numbers.

First, how do different training setups impact TQA model robustness? When fine-tuning a model with only questions and answers—without any

Model	No Test Set		Rel Test Set		SA Test Set		Irr Test Set		Average Scores	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Average Acc	Average F1
Baselines										
GPT-3.5	.292	.089	.857	.243	.745	.179	.247	.075	.535	.147
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	.138	.119	.640	.353	.476	.236	.370	.039	.406	.187
gemma-1.1-7b-it	.135	.048	.766	.288	.150	.408	.000	.016	.263	.190
llama-3-8b-Instruct	.189	.201	.644	.595	.561	.466	.160	.161	.389	.356
Fine-tuned Models										
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + No	.273	.143	.678	.342	.626	.315	.221	.133	.450	.233
gemma-1.1-7b-it + No	.108	.052	.739	.592	.696	.568	.158	.174	.425	.347
llama-3-8b-Instruct + No	.226	.295	.326	.396	.285	.350	.101	.156	.235	.299
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rel	.226	.231	.832	.379	.800	.382	.012	.024	.468	.254
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Rel	.081	.043	.815	.714	.768	.671	.076	.094	.435	.381
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Rel	.216	.284	.807	.870	.725	.788	.013	.027	.440	.492
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + SA	.226	.244	.825	.387	.822	.386	.012	.024	.471	.260
gemma-1.1-7b-it + SA	.098	.046	.830	.741	.820	.729	.008	.023	.439	.385
llama-3-8b-Instruct + SA	.211	.278	.799	.867	.797	.865	.015	.032	.456	.511
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Irr	.257	.140	.222	.129	.207	.122	.259	.140	.236	.133
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Irr	.078	.044	.552	.615	.403	.467	.172	.258	.301	.346
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Irr	.239	.308	.195	.256	.197	.260	.240	.310	.218	.284
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	.259	.141	.821	.360	.813	.357	.252	.139	.536	.249
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Mixed	.210	.270	.790	.840	.770	.830	.200	.270	.493	.553
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Mixed	.240	.310	.797	.861	.787	.853	.230	.301	.514	.581

Table 1: ContextAQA Question-first performance of different model configurations on temporal QA across four context types: no context (No), relevant (Rel), slightly-altered (SA), irrelevant (Irr). Models include base LLMs (Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, llama-3-8b-Instruct) and fine-tuned variants trained on various context setups (+No, +Rel, +SA, +Irr, +Mixed). Results highlight the impact of context types and fine-tuning strategies on model robustness and accuracy.

context—we see that the effectiveness of training depends on the fine-tuned model. For example, in Table 1, when the Llama baseline is evaluated on relevant context, it scores an accuracy of .644 (F1 .595), however after fine-tuning on no-context, the accuracy is cut in half to .326 (F1 .396). These results are juxtaposed by the small boost that Mistral gets after training on no context. In that case, we can see the accuracy increase from .640 (F1 .353) up to .678 (F1 .342). Overall, it seems that fine-tuning without any context—again, only QA pairs—does not seem to be too useful and, in some scenarios, can adversely affect results, assuming the context is related to the question. We do want to point out that our results show that even if models are trained without context, they can still take advantage of relevant context at training time. Examine gemma + No evaluated on no context with an accuracy of .081 (F1 .043) to the same model evaluated on relevant context with an accuracy of .815 (F1 .714). So, if you train without the context, the model does not completely lose that ability, though it is diminished compared to the baseline (non-fine-tuned) scores for each model.

Next, training on relevant context significantly boosts performance when evaluating Relevant and slightly-altered contexts. Looking at the Relevant

trained and Relevant evaluated results in Table 1, we can see that *all* of our models are at or above an accuracy of .800. Likewise, the slightly-altered evaluations are up by at least .200 (20%) higher than their baseline counterparts. This result is intuitive, meaning that the models learn to rely on the contextual information better, extracting the results precisely. However, models trained on relevant contexts alone result in worse performance when evaluated on irrelevant data, when compared to both the models trained on no context and most of the baseline models (except for gemma, yet it is still low). This result suggests that relevant-trained models will generally result in non-robust performance, and should be limited if possible.

Due to slightly-altered context being a child of relevant context (the only change being the fabrication of the dates), the slightly-altered trained results are very similar to the relevant context trained results, with some minor differences. For instance, the relevant trained models’ average accuracy of .468, .435, and .440 increases to .471, .439, and .456, showing that adding some noise to the context can allow models to become robust, particularly when evaluated on context that is also partially correct. In Table 1, we see a very similar performance when comparing the relevant trained models (.832,

.815, .807) to the slightly-altered trained models (.825, .830, .799). When comparing the slightly-altered evaluations, however, the difference in results isn’t so subtle. To highlight this, compare llama + Rel results of .807 (F1 .870) with the llama + SA results of .799 (F1 .867). This demonstrates that including noise in training data does not diminish the accuracy of a model when it encounters data without noise.

Models trained on irrelevant context perform worse when evaluated on relevant context compared to baseline and all other trained models. This reduction is perhaps most striking when comparing the relevant evaluations in Table 1 of Llama3-8b baseline (.644) to its Irrelevant trained version (.195). We see that the irrelevant-trained and relevant-evaluated results for Mistral accuracy of .222 (F1 .129) and Llama accuracy of .195 (F1 .256) have been reduced down to the magnitude of the accuracy of .259 (F1 .14) and .240 (F1 .310), respectively. The Gemma + Irr model has a relatively high accuracy of .552 (F1 .615) compared to the other models’ results. However, this score is still Gemma’s lowest relevant context evaluated score. These results support our hypothesis that training on Irrelevant context can teach a model to ignore the context in which it is presented.

Finally, Training with mixed context improves model performance, especially if your goal is to produce a robust model. Notably, models trained on mixed context handle irrelevant context on par with models trained on Irrelevant context. Looking at Table 1, In the case of gemma-1.1-7b-it, training on irrelevant and evaluating on Irrelevant reaches an accuracy of .172 (F1 .258), which is not quite as good as when trained on mixed and evaluated on irrelevant context accuracy .200 (F1 .270). Another case that highlights the effectiveness of mixed context training is the difference in mistral-7b + Rel score of .012 on Irrelevant context, whereas mistral-7b+ mixed scored almost three times higher with a .252. Finally, the average accuracy of our mixed context-trained models dominates the average accuracy for all models, with scores of .536, .493, and .514. for Mistral, Gemma, and LLaMa, respectively. Notably, no baseline or trained models’ average accuracy passes the .500 mark except for mixed models.

Second, Does context location matter? Yes, context location matters. To our surprise, we find that placing the question first allows the model to ignore irrelevant context more easily, enhancing its

Model	Context Location	Average Scores	
		Average Acc	Average F1
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	C-Last/ Q-First	.536	.249
	C-First/ Q-Last	.492	.229
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Mixed	C-Last/ Q-First	.514	.581
	C-First/ Q-Last	.453	.518
gemma1.1-7b-it + Mixed	C-Last/ Q-First	.493	.553
	C-First/ Q-Last	.460	.520
gemma1.1-2b-it + Mixed	C-Last/ Q-First	.455	.485
	C-First/ Q-Last	.420	.455

Table 2: The table shows results for two experimental setups: context first and question last (C-First/Q-Last) and context last and question first (C-Last/Q-First). The average accuracy and F1 score across all four context types are reported for each configuration.

robustness. In Table 2, we see that Q-First always outperforms C-First when comparing the context location pairs.

4.3 Implications

There are several implications of our study. First, training with mixed contexts does improve model performance. This confirms some of the findings of Yoran et al. (2024) for general question answering. However, our work extends this study to understand that 1) model performance improves across models of different types (they only tested LLaMa-2 13B); and 2) this works for temporal question answering. Second, training on random data *can* makes the model learn to ignore the information. For context, we even find that if the model is trained with a question first and the context is added first instead, the model can still completely ignore it (see appendix for all numbers). This is an implicit assumption in many papers (Yoran et al., 2024) when training on mixed context, but we are the first to quantify it to the best of our knowledge. This can have implications for future work that may want to train models to ignore certain types of information, e.g., offensive language or hate speech.

4.4 Error Analysis

We conducted a qualitative analysis on the llama-3-8B model to examine error patterns in our best-performing relevant-tuned model and how the mixed-tuned model addresses these errors across various contexts. Our analysis involved carefully examining individual instances to identify recurring error types. We observed similar error patterns across different models used in our study. Specifically, we first gathered instances where the mixed model answered correctly, but the relevant-tuned model, our best-fine-tuned model for another base

LLMs, responded incorrectly. From there, we sampled 200 instances and analyzed the causes of errors for the relevant-tuned model.

Incorrect Entity/Fact Identification. A prominent issue we observed with the relevant-tuned model was the incorrect identification of entities or facts mentioned in the questions, mostly when the context is irrelevant. Here is an example:

Q: What college did Tom Heinsohn lead to a National Invitation Tournament title in 1954?

Context: James B. Longley, a businessman and politician, ran for governor of Maine in 1974. He was a successful candidate and became the 69th Governor of Maine, serving from 1975 to 1979 ...

Relevant-tuned Model Answer: fordham

Mixed-tuned Model Answer: holy cross

Correct Answer: holy cross

Interestingly, the incorrect answer “fordham” is not completely random. Tom Heinsohn frequently mentioned his high school coach, who played basketball for Fordham, suggesting the model does have some parametric knowledge about Tom Heinsohn.

Incorrect Contextual Understanding. Instances where the model lacked factual understanding led to incorrect answer (e.g., when no context is provided). For instance, the example below is from a model with now context passed to it:

Q: What country’s troops did General Waller argue were not ready to fight by the Jan. 15, 1991, deadline?

Relevant Answer: iraqi

Mixed Answer: american

Correct: american

Since no context was provided in this setting, the error can be attributed to the model’s inability to access and effectively use the appropriate factual knowledge needed to answer the question accurately.

Misidentification of Specific Entities. In some instances, the relevant-tuned model demonstrated difficulties in precisely identifying specific entities. For example, when asked about which country the 1988 Free Trade Agreement favored, the relevant-tuned model answered “american” instead of the more specific “the united states,” despite the context indicating the latter as the correct entity. This error type highlights the model’s need for improved entity resolution capabilities.

Our qualitative analysis highlights that the mixed-tuned model consistently outperformed the relevant-tuned model by providing more accurate, complete, and contextually aligned answers. The mixed model’s superior performance can be attributed to its enhanced ability to effectively understand and integrate diverse contexts, accurately recognize entities, and reason over temporal and historical information. These findings underscore the effectiveness of our mixed-tuned model, which leverages contextual information, thereby confirming our hypothesis that integrating diverse contexts is crucial for temporal question-answering systems.

5 Conclusion

This study examined how contextual information impacts the performance of temporal question-answering (TQA) systems. Our experiments showed that integrating and fine-tuning contextual information significantly improves the accuracy and reliability of these systems. The most effective strategy was training on a mixture of relevant and slightly noisy contexts, resulting in robust performance across various context types during testing.

The superior performance of our fine-tuned models underscores the crucial role of context-aware training in enhancing temporal QA capabilities. By effectively utilizing diverse contextual information, our models demonstrated improved entity grounding, a better understanding of temporal relations, and more accurate, context-aligned responses. Training with different context types also appeared to enhance the model’s ability to ignore irrelevant context when answering questions, thereby increasing robustness.

Future research should explore advanced methods for generating and integrating context and further investigate the effects of context placement on model performance. Understanding how contextual information impacts temporal reasoning is essential for developing more sophisticated and pre-

cise QA systems capable of effectively answering complex temporal questions. Moreover, there are natural extensions to other tasks in this work. For instance, we find it possible to target specific types of information during training to make the model ignore it. This can have implications in other areas, e.g., hate speech or offensive language.

6 Limitations

While our study provides valuable insights into the robustness of temporal question-answering systems, several limitations should be acknowledged. Our experiments are constrained by the quality and variety of the datasets used. Although we introduced two new datasets, ContextAQA and ContextTQE, these datasets may not encompass the full range of temporal question types and contextual variations encountered in real-world applications. Additionally, the contexts generated by GPT-3.5, while generally accurate, may not perfectly reflect the complexity and diversity of naturally occurring contexts.

The context generation process relied on GPT-3.5, which can introduce biases and inaccuracies. A manual review of the contexts revealed a small percentage of errors, which could impact model training and evaluation. Future work should consider using more robust methods for context generation or augmenting generated contexts with human verification to ensure higher accuracy and relevance.

While more than prior research, our findings are based on limited models, including various GEMMA, Mistral, and LLaMA versions. While these models represent a range of state-of-the-art architectures, the conclusions drawn may not generalize to all large language models (LLMs). Further research is needed to validate the robustness of our findings across a broader array of models, including those with different architectures and training paradigms.

While we used standard metrics such as F1 score, accuracy, and BERT-based Answer Equivalence Metric (BEM), these metrics may not fully capture the nuances of temporal reasoning and contextual understanding. Developing more nuanced evaluation metrics that better reflect the complexity of temporal question answering would provide a more comprehensive assessment of model performance.

Our study found that training in a mix of relevant and irrelevant contexts improves robustness. However, the effectiveness of this approach may

vary depending on the context’s nature and degree of irrelevance. Further exploration is needed to understand the boundaries of this robustness and to identify the optimal mix of context types for training.

Finally, the training and evaluation of large language models require substantial computational resources. This limitation may restrict the ability to conduct more extensive experiments and test additional hypotheses. Moreover, it restricts our use of larger models, which is why we focused on 2b, 7b, and 8b models because of this. Future research could benefit from more efficient training techniques and the availability of greater computational power.

References

- AI@Meta. 2024. [Llama 3 model card](#).
- Maksym Andriushchenko, Francesco Croce, and Nicolas Flammarion. 2024. Jailbreaking leading safety-aligned llms with simple adaptive attacks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02151*.
- Himanshu Beniwal, Mayank Singh, et al. 2024. Remember this event that year? assessing temporal information and reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11997*.
- Yuyan Chen, Qiang Fu, Yichen Yuan, Zhihao Wen, Ge Fan, Dayiheng Liu, Dongmei Zhang, Zhixu Li, and Yanghua Xiao. 2023a. Hallucination detection: Robustly discerning reliable answers in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 245–255.
- Ziyang Chen, Dongfang Li, Xiang Zhao, Baotian Hu, and Min Zhang. 2023b. Temporal knowledge question answering via abstract reasoning induction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09149*.
- Chen Cheng, Xinzhi Yu, Haodong Wen, Jingsong Sun, Guanzhang Yue, Yihao Zhang, and Zeming Wei. 2024. [Exploring the robustness of in-context learning with noisy labels](#). In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Reliable and Responsible Foundation Models*.
- Bhuvan Dhingra, Jeremy R Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W Cohen. 2022. Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:257–273.
- Anoushka Gade and Jorjeta Jetcheva. 2024. It’s about time: Incorporating temporality in retrieval augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13222*.

- Yifu Gao, Linbo Qiao, Zhigang Kan, Zhihua Wen, Yongquan He, and Dongsheng Li. 2024. Two-stage generative question answering on temporal knowledge graph using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16568*.
- Raphael Gruber, Abdelrahman Abdallah, Michael Färber, and Adam Jatowt. 2024. [Complextempqa: A large-scale dataset for complex temporal question answering](#). Preprint, arXiv:2406.04866.
- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yunseok Jang, Yale Song, Youngjae Yu, Youngjin Kim, and Gunhee Kim. 2017. Tgif-qa: Toward spatio-temporal reasoning in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2758–2766.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Nithish Kannen, Udit Sharma, Sumit Neelam, Dinesh Khandelwal, Shajith Iqbal, Hima Karanam, and L Subramaniam. 2023. Best of both worlds: Towards improving temporal knowledge base question answering via targeted fact extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4729–4744.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Aounon Kumar, Chirag Agarwal, Suraj Srinivas, Soheil Feizi, and Hima Lakkaraju. 2023. Certifying llm safety against adversarial prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02705*.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Daliang Li, Ankit Singh Rawat, Manzil Zaheer, Xin Wang, Michal Lukasik, Andreas Veit, Felix Yu, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2022. Large language models with controllable working memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05110*.
- Xingxuan Li, Liying Cheng, Qingyu Tan, Hwee Tou Ng, Shafiq Joty, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Unlocking temporal question answering for large language models using code execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15014*.
- Lei Liu, Shuo Yu, Runze Wang, Zhenxun Ma, and Yanming Shen. 2024. How can large language models understand spatial-temporal data? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14192*.
- Jasmine Lorenzini, Hanspeter Kriesi, Peter Makarov, and Bruno Wüest. 2022. [Protest event analysis: Developing a semiautomated nlp approach](#). *American Behavioral Scientist*, 66(5):555–577.
- Yifu Qiu, Zheng Zhao, Yftah Ziser, Anna Korhonen, Edoardo M Ponti, and Shay B Cohen. 2023. Are large language models temporally grounded? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08398*.
- Vyas Raina, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. 2024. Is llm-as-a-judge robust? investigating universal adversarial attacks on zero-shot llm assessment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14016*.
- Apoorv Saxena, Soumen Chakrabarti, and Partha Talukdar. 2021. Question answering over temporal knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6663–6676.
- Sagi Shaiyer, Lawrence E Hunter, and Katharina von der Wense. 2024. Desiderata for the context use of question answering systems. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 777–792, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed H Chi, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 31210–31227. PMLR.
- Qingyu Tan, Hwee Tou Ng, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Towards benchmarking and improving the temporal reasoning capability of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08952*.
- Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Rivière, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. 2024. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*.
- Jonas Wallat, Adam Jatowt, and Avishek Anand. 2024. Temporal blind spots in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 683–692.
- Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, Michael Färber, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2021. Improving question answering for event-focused questions in temporal collections of news articles. *Information Retrieval Journal*, 24:29–54.

Jiexin Wang, Adam Jatowt, and Masatoshi Yoshikawa. 2022. Archivalqa: a large-scale benchmark dataset for open-domain question answering over historical news collections. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 3025–3035.

Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. 2019. Huggingface’s transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.

Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9777–9786.

Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. 2024. Making retrieval-augmented language models robust to irrelevant context. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. Tel Aviv University, Allen Institute for AI.

Lifan Yuan, Yangyi Chen, Ganqu Cui, Hongcheng Gao, Fangyuan Zou, Xingyi Cheng, Heng Ji, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. Revisiting out-of-distribution robustness in nlp: Benchmarks, analysis, and llms evaluations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Hao Zhang, Yuyang Zhang, Xiaoguang Li, Wenxuan Shi, Haonan Xu, Huanshuo Liu, Yasheng Wang, Lifeng Shang, Qun Liu, Yong Liu, et al. 2024. Evaluating the external and parametric knowledge fusion of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19010*.

Xingmeng Zhao and Anthony Rios. 2024. Utsa-nlp at chemotimelines 2024: Evaluating instruction-tuned language models for temporal relation extraction. In *Proceedings of the 6th Clinical Natural Language Processing Workshop*. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

B Model Training Details

We train eight total models, including gemma-2b (Team et al., 2024), gemma-1.1-2b-it (Team et al., 2024), Mistral-7B-v0.1 (Jiang et al., 2023), Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 (Jiang et al., 2023), llama-3-8b (AI@Meta, 2024), and llama-3-8b-Instruct (AI@Meta, 2024). These models are fine-tuned on five types of context: no context, relevant context, Irrelevant context, slightly-altered (context with falsified dates), and mixed context. This process gives us a total of 40 fine-tuned models.

All models are fine-tuned using Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2021). For Mistral models, a HuggingFace trainer is utilized, while for other models, we used a Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) trainer from HuggingFace (Wolf et al., 2019) to adapt the base models for the respective context types. Furthermore, for LLaMA3 models, the Unsloth framework, a technique designed to optimize fine-tuning efficiency for large language models, is utilized. All models are trained for one epoch using the 8-bit Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with a learning rate $2e-5$. After manual experimentation on the validation datasets, we found these parameters work well across different models.

Overall, for each of the 40 fine-tuned models, answers are generated for the four context types: no context, relevant context, Irrelevant context, and slightly-altered context. On our test set, this results in 160 generated outputs for evaluation. The context is used by placing it after the input question during generation. Additionally, an experiment is conducted where the context is placed before the question instead to investigate whether providing the context before the question improves generated answers.

C Generation Parameters

To obtain high-quality responses, we carefully tuned the generation parameters for our fine-tuned and base models separately. The parameters were optimized to achieve a balance between coherence, diversity, and relevance of the generated outputs. The key parameters include the maximum number of tokens to generate (`max_new_tokens`), sampling technique (`do_sample`, `temperature`), repetition penalty (`repetition_penalty`), search settings (`num_beams`, `top_p`, `top_k`), and length penalty (`length_penalty`). The specific parameter values are as follows:

- `max_new_tokens`: Set to 16 due to the short nature of answers our dataset.
- `do_sample`: Determines whether to use sampling or greedy decoding.
- `temperature`: Controls randomness in sampling.
- `repetition_penalty`: Discourages token repetition.
- `num_beams`: Utilized beam search with multiple beams, especially for the more complex ContextAQA dataset.

- `top_p`: Cumulative probability mass for top-p sampling.
- `top_k`: Limits the number of highest probability tokens considered.
- `length_penalty`: Adjusted to handle the typically short answers.

Initially, we set these parameters based on our knowledge of the models, and then iteratively refined them to determine the optimal configuration for each dataset. They are optimized for every model.

D Prompt used to make relevant context

Here is the prompt we used for generating relevant context:

*You will be provided with a question and an answer. Let's play a game where you pretend that all of the answers are correct. Your job is to output a ***Generated Context*** section. In this section, generate some relevant context that would help answer the question. The context should be in the same style and format as a wikipedia article.*

Question: What Movie won seven Oscars in 1994?

Answer: Schindler's List

Generated Context: Schindler's List premiered on November 30, 1993, in Washington, D.C., and was released on December 15, 1993, in the United States. Often listed among the greatest films ever made, the film received widespread critical acclaim for its tone, acting (particularly Neeson, Fiennes, and Kingsley), atmosphere, score, cinematography, and Spielberg's direction; it was also a box office success, earning \$322.2 million worldwide on a \$22 million budget. It was nominated for twelve awards at the 66th Academy Awards, and won seven, including Best Picture, Best Director (for Spielberg), Best Adapted Screenplay, and Best Original Score. The film won numerous other awards, including seven BAFTAs and three Golden Globe Awards. In 2007, the American Film Institute ranked Schindler's List 8th on its list of the 100 best American films

of all time. The film was designated as "culturally, historically or aesthetically significant" by the Library of Congress in 2004 and selected for preservation in the United States National Film Registry.

Question: ***plug in question***

Answer: ***plug in answer***

Generated Context: ***GPT starts generation here***

E Additional Results

Table 3 shows the BERT-based Answer Equivalence Metric (BEM). We found this metric to be more correlated with the length of the answer rather than its semantic meaning, which is why it was not included in our main findings. Additionally, the BEM scores never fall below 0.6, which can be misleading.

Table 4 presents our focused results for the question-first ContextTQE. This table is in the same format as Table 1, allowing readers to compare our findings across multiple datasets easily. Table 6 expands upon Table 1 by including all our results on the ContextTQE dataset. It is important to note that the ContextTQE dataset is much smaller than the AQA dataset, so not all aspects can easily be learned (e.g., with the mixed data), but we still see many of the important findings show up. Adding some noise with a slightly altered context improves performance. Moreover, training on irrelevant context causes poor performance because the model still can learn to ignore it, though not at the magnitude of the AQA dataset because of the limited size. Table 7 provides a focused look at ContextAQA, similar to Table 1, but with a context-first approach rather than question-first.

Model	No Test Set	Rel Test Set	WD Test Set	Irr Test Set	Average BEM
	BEM	BEM	BEM	BEM	BEM
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + No	.743	.772	.769	.739	.756
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rel	.788	.779	.777	.676	.755
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + SA	.796	.782	.781	.674	.758
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Irr	.743	.743	.741	.743	.743
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	.744	.773	.774	.744	.759
Llama-3-8B-Instruct + No	.822	.836	.832	.767	.814
Llama-3-8B-Instruct + Rel	.818	.955	.929	.692	.849
Llama-3-8B-Instruct + SA	.817	.955	.955	.693	.855
Llama-3-8B-Instruct + Irr	.823	.816	.816	.825	.820
Llama-3-8B-Instruct + Mixed	.824	.952	.951	.824	.888
Mistral-7B + No	.741	.786	.782	.750	.765
Mistral-7B + Rel	.814	.869	.832	.689	.801
Mistral-7B + SA	.814	.814	.814	.685	.782
Mistral-7B + Irr	.769	.765	.767	.772	.768
Mistral-7B + Mixed	.775	.796	.795	.763	.782
Llama-3-8B + No	.822	.798	.797	.742	.790
Llama-3-8B + Rel	.818	.955	.915	.688	.844
Llama-3-8B + SA	.817	.955	.955	.689	.854
Llama-3-8B + Irr	.822	.817	.817	.826	.821
Llama-3-8B + Mixed	.823	.953	.952	.823	.888

Table 3: Performance of mixed models on various test sets. The table shows BEM scores for different context types and their averages across four test sets. "Average BEM" represents the average of all BEM scores for each model configuration.

Model	No Test Set		Rel Test Set		SA Test Set		Irr Test Set		Average Scores	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Average Acc	Average F1
Baselines										
GPT-3.5	.760	.153	.890	.147	.850	.119	.640	.097	.785	.129
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	.413	.329	.880	.592	.666	.333	.186	.157	.536	.353
gemma-1.1-7b-it	.360	.231	.867	.555	.613	.376	.080	.060	.480	.306
llama-3-8b-Instruct	.560	.505	.866	.868	.786	.707	.493	.477	.676	.639
Fine-tuned Models										
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + No	.480	.510	.720	.754	.546	.556	.386	.417	.533	.559
gemma-1.1-7b-it + No	.387	.245	.853	.524	.533	.283	.053	.049	.457	.275
llama-3-8b-Instruct + No	.560	.617	.813	.892	.786	.841	.493	.566	.663	.729
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rel	.520	.530	.840	.886	.826	.787	.240	.249	.607	.613
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Rel	.373	.242	.840	.478	.453	.223	.040	.039	.427	.245
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Rel	.573	.629	.880	.945	.840	.918	.346	.402	.660	.724
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + SA	.573	.623	.880	.916	.880	.927	.373	.439	.677	.726
gemma-1.1-7b-it + SA	.400	.258	.867	.518	.773	.455	.107	.077	.537	.327
llama-3-8b-Instruct + SA	.573	.650	.880	.948	.880	.949	.400	.457	.683	.751
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rand	.480	.502	.386	.344	.306	.293	.453	.456	.406	.399
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Irr	.387	.258	.867	.572	.707	.413	.333	.220	.573	.366
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Irr	.560	.625	.666	.719	.666	.719	.546	.607	.610	.668
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	.506	.538	.866	.802	.773	.720	.426	.452	.643	.628
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Mixed	.400	.259	.867	.538	.747	.438	.280	.179	.573	.354
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Mixed	.540	.610	.840	.920	.840	.920	.600	.660	.705	.778

Table 4: ContextTQE performance of different model configurations on temporal QA across four context types: no context (No), relevant (Rel), slightly-altered (SA), irrelevant (Irr). Models include base LLMs (Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, llama-3-8b-Instruct) and fine-tuned variants trained on various context setups (+No, +Rel, +SA, +Irr, +Mixed). Results highlight the impact of context types and fine-tuning strategies on model robustness and accuracy.

Model	No Test Set		Rel Test Set		SA Test Set		Irr Test Set		Average Scores	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Average Acc	Average F1
Baselines										
GPT-3.5	.760	.153	.890	.147	.850	.119	.640	.097	.785	.129
gemma-2b	.320	.220	.707	.554	.680	.531	.080	.084	.447	.347
gemma-1.1-2b-it	.200	.110	.747	.458	.680	.386	.040	.024	.417	.244
gemma-7b	.453	.298	.827	.682	.747	.611	.387	.321	.603	.478
gemma-1.1-7b-it	.360	.231	.867	.555	.613	.376	.080	.060	.480	.306
Mistral-7B-v0.1	.533	.571	.293	.237	.173	.131	.253	.223	.313	.291
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	.413	.329	.880	.592	.666	.333	.186	.157	.536	.353
llama-3-8b	.493	.485	.786	.785	.786	.794	.333	.371	.600	.609
llama-3-8b-Instruct	.560	.505	.866	.868	.786	.707	.493	.477	.676	.639
Fine-tuned Models										
gemma-2b + No	.333	.244	.760	.625	.693	.561	.133	.124	.480	.389
gemma1.1-2b-it + No	.227	.161	.787	.473	.720	.432	.040	.026	.443	.273
gemma-7b + No	.440	.305	.827	.687	.773	.627	.413	.357	.613	.494
gemma1.1-7b-it + No	.387	.245	.853	.524	.533	.283	.053	.049	.457	.275
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + No	.560	.622	.733	.762	.626	.664	.386	.449	.576	.624
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + No	.480	.510	.720	.754	.546	.556	.386	.417	.533	.559
llama-3-8b + No	.546	.633	.826	.896	.800	.862	.480	.533	.663	.731
llama-3-8b-Instruct + No	.560	.617	.813	.892	.786	.841	.493	.566	.663	.729
gemma-2b + Rel	.307	.213	.747	.587	.747	.589	.133	.128	.483	.379
gemma1.1-2b-it + Rel	.187	.104	.733	.421	.653	.366	.040	.023	.403	.228
gemma-7b + Rel	.507	.368	.840	.700	.800	.679	.387	.314	.633	.515
gemma1.1-7b-it + Rel	.373	.242	.840	.478	.453	.223	.040	.039	.427	.245
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Rel	.560	.574	.853	.918	.840	.905	.426	.492	.670	.722
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rel	.520	.530	.840	.886	.826	.787	.240	.249	.607	.613
llama-3-8b + Rel	.546	.606	.880	.949	.866	.935	.306	.347	.650	.709
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Rel	.573	.629	.880	.945	.840	.918	.346	.402	.660	.724
gemma-2b + Irr	.293	.232	.733	.586	.707	.563	.173	.149	.477	.383
gemma1.1-2b-it + Irr	.213	.152	.787	.479	.760	.424	.080	.036	.460	.273
gemma-7b + Irr	.493	.344	.840	.702	.813	.668	.480	.404	.657	.529
gemma1.1-7b-it + Irr	.387	.258	.867	.572	.707	.413	.333	.220	.573	.366
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Irr	.586	.640	.333	.399	.346	.402	.533	.590	.450	.508
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Irr	.480	.502	.386	.344	.306	.293	.453	.456	.406	.399
llama-3-8b + Irr	.600	.662	.506	.573	.520	.585	.613	.669	.560	.622
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Irr	.560	.625	.666	.719	.666	.719	.546	.607	.610	.668
gemma-2b + SA	.320	.224	.773	.621	.747	.589	.147	.122	.497	.389
gemma1.1-2b-it + SA	.200	.108	.733	.421	.693	.391	.040	.023	.417	.236
gemma-7b + SA	.533	.358	.840	.705	.800	.682	.387	.320	.640	.516
gemma1.1-7b-it + SA	.400	.258	.867	.518	.773	.455	.107	.077	.537	.327
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + SA	.573	.623	.880	.916	.880	.927	.373	.439	.677	.726
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + SA	.533	.548	.853	.882	.813	.831	.253	.260	.613	.630
llama-3-8b + SA	.520	.586	.840	.925	.853	.927	.280	.322	.623	.690
llama-3-8b-Instruct + SA	.573	.650	.880	.948	.880	.949	.400	.457	.683	.751
gemma-2b + Mixed	.333	.226	.760	.618	.733	.576	.147	.136	.493	.389
gemma1.1-2b-it + Mixed	.227	.141	.760	.451	.733	.417	.080	.041	.450	.262
gemma-7b + Mixed	.507	.354	.827	.698	.773	.698	.453	.355	.640	.526
gemma1.1-7b-it + Mixed	.400	.259	.867	.538	.747	.438	.280	.179	.573	.354
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Mixed	.400	.259	.867	.538	.747	.438	.280	.179	.573	.354
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	.600	.656	.826	.891	.800	.876	.506	.570	.683	.748
llama-3-8b + Mixed	.506	.538	.866	.802	.773	.720	.426	.452	.643	.628
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Mixed	.546	.616	.840	.926	.840	.926	.600	.666	.707	.784

Table 5: ContextTQE Performance of different model configurations on various context types: no context (No), relevant (Rel), slightly-altered (SA), Irrelevant (Irr). Models include base LLMs (Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, llama-3-8b-Instruct) and fine-tuned variants trained on various context setups (+No, +Rel, +SA, +Irr, +Mixed). Results highlight the impact of context types and fine-tuning strategies on model robustness and accuracy.

Model	No Test Set		Rel Test Set		SA Test Set		Irr Test Set		Average Scores	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Average Acc	Average F1
Baselines										
GPT-3.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
gemma-2b	.110	.048	.703	.338	.610	.278	.091	.069	.378	.183
gemma-1.1-2b-it	.008	.020	.744	.579	.466	.307	.001	.022	.305	.232
gemma-7b	.178	.062	.740	.454	.610	.338	.166	.112	.424	.242
gemma-1.1-7b-it	.041	.028	.760	.584	.555	.310	.009	.028	.341	.238
Mistral-7B-v0.1	.158	.178	.618	.574	.524	.488	.140	.163	.360	.351
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	.138	.119	.688	.401	.485	.242	.062	.059	.343	.205
llama-3-8b	.140	.164	.565	.565	.449	.426	.113	.133	.317	.322
llama-3-8b-Instruct	.183	.196	.714	.643	.551	.440	.139	.143	.397	.356
Fine-tuned Models										
gemma-2b + No	.091	.049	.544	.405	.433	.328	.066	.083	.259	.131
gemma1.1-2b-it + No	.117	.154	.747	.586	.465	.387	.089	.122	.227	.251
gemma-7b + No	.125	.055	.510	.419	.398	.336	.085	.100	.165	.128
gemma1.1-7b-it + No	.210	.280	.720	.790	.600	.680	.170	.230	.426	.419
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + No	.263	.199	.730	.489	.643	.437	.221	.180	.079	.076
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + No	.273	.143	.752	.349	.592	.274	.230	.130	.286	.151
llama-3-8b + No	.231	.301	.621	.698	.452	.525	.200	.270	.215	.275
llama-3-8b-Instruct + No	.227	.297	.584	.668	.425	.500	.198	.263	.175	.234
gemma-2b + Rel	.116	.052	.647	.364	.502	.244	.059	.053	.331	.178
gemma1.1-2b-it + Rel	.109	.096	.745	.748	.697	.710	.038	.087	.397	.410
gemma-7b + Rel	.110	.052	.568	.354	.431	.260	.058	.059	.292	.181
gemma1.1-7b-it + Rel	.173	.054	.815	.770	.681	.671	.076	.094	.436	.397
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Rel	.214	.275	.716	.713	.690	.627	.112	.137	.433	.438
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rel	.226	.231	.757	.370	.712	.338	.154	.108	.462	.262
llama-3-8b + Rel	.219	.286	.772	.826	.728	.782	.134	.184	.463	.520
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Rel	.217	.283	.746	.803	.664	.721	.097	.143	.431	.488
gemma-2b + Irr	.114	.048	.515	.247	.330	.166	.077	.062	.259	.131
gemma1.1-2b-it + Irr	.118	.116	.444	.440	.278	.319	.069	.129	.227	.251
gemma-7b + Irr	.072	.045	.333	.238	.198	.156	.057	.071	.165	.128
gemma1.1-7b-it + Irr	.189	.058	.800	.793	.543	.583	.172	.243	.426	.419
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Irr	.235	.214	.032	.033	.038	.037	.011	.019	.079	.076
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Irr	.257	.140	.485	.237	.360	.188	.041	.039	.286	.151
llama-3-8b + Irr	.237	.307	.285	.347	.237	.295	.100	.151	.215	.275
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Irr	.240	.308	.203	.261	.168	.227	.088	.138	.175	.234
gemma-2b + SA	.115	.051	.593	.311	.539	.269	.044	.045	.323	.169
gemma1.1-2b-it + SA	.105	.096	.743	.654	.737	.660	.027	.071	.403	.370
gemma-7b + SA	.149	.059	.540	.243	.549	.245	.071	.065	.327	.153
gemma1.1-7b-it + SA	.181	.055	.838	.800	.824	.793	.075	.116	.480	.441
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Sa	.215	.274	.718	.625	.720	.613	.096	.110	.437	.406
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + SA	.226	.244	.751	.388	.743	.370	.158	.112	.470	.279
llama-3-8b + SA	.220	.288	.762	.822	.755	.815	.084	.124	.455	.512
llama-3-8b-Instruct + SA	.215	.281	.749	.810	.737	.798	.085	.127	.447	.504
gemma-2b + Mixed	.170	.120	.800	.320	.790	.320	.160	.100	.480	.215
gemma1.1-2b-it + Mixed	.140	.200	.700	.770	.690	.750	.150	.100	.420	.455
gemma-7b + Mixed	.250	.150	.810	.370	.810	.370	.240	.180	.528	.268
gemma1.1-7b-it + Mixed	.210	.270	.750	.810	.730	.800	.150	.200	.460	.520
Mistral-7B-v0.1 + Mixed	.221	.243	.752	.557	.744	.539	.190	.180	.477	.380
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	.259	.141	.777	.342	.769	.340	.161	.092	.492	.229
llama-3-8b + Mixed	.239	.310	.760	.829	.735	.806	.194	.257	.482	.551
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Mixed	.237	.307	.732	.799	.711	.780	.133	.186	.453	.518

Table 6: ContextAQA Context-First Performance of different model configurations on various context types: no context (No), relevant (Rel), wrong dates (WD), random (Rand). Models include base LLMs (Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, llama-3-8b-Instruct) and fine-tuned variants trained on various context setups (+No, +Rel, +WD, +Rand, +Mixed). Results highlight the impact of context types and fine-tuning strategies on model robustness and accuracy.

Model	No Test Set		Rel Test Set		SA Test Set		Irr Test Set		Average Scores	
	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Acc	F1	Average Acc	Average F1
Baselines										
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2	.138	.119	.688	.401	.485	.242	.062	.059	.343	.205
gemma-1.1-7b-it	.041	.028	.760	.584	.555	.310	.009	.028	.341	.238
llama-3-8b-Instruct	.180	.190	.710	.640	.550	.440	.130	.140	.393	.353
Fine-tuned Models										
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + No	.270	.140	.750	.340	.590	.270	.230	.130	.460	.220
gemma-1.1-7b-it + No	.210	.280	.720	.790	.600	.680	.170	.230	.425	.495
llama-3-8b-Instruct + No	.220	.290	.580	.660	.420	.500	.190	.260	.353	.428
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Rel	.220	.230	.750	.370	.710	.330	.150	.100	.458	.258
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Rel	.173	.054	.815	.770	.681	.671	.076	.094	.436	.397
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Rel	.210	.280	.740	.800	.660	.720	.090	.140	.425	.485
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + SA	.220	.240	.750	.380	.740	.370	.150	.110	.465	.275
gemma-1.1-7b-it + SA	.181	.055	.838	.800	.824	.793	.075	.116	.480	.441
llama-3-8b-Instruct + SA	.210	.280	.740	.810	.730	.790	.080	.120	.440	.500
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Irr	.250	.140	.480	.230	.360	.180	.040	.030	.283	.145
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Irr	.189	.058	.800	.793	.543	.583	.172	.243	.426	.419
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Irr	.300	.240	.200	.260	.160	.220	.080	.130	.185	.213
Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2 + Mixed	.250	.140	.770	.340	.760	.340	.160	.090	.485	.228
gemma-1.1-7b-it + Mixed	.210	.270	.750	.810	.730	.800	.150	.200	.460	.520
llama-3-8b-Instruct + Mixed	.230	.300	.730	.790	.710	.780	.130	.180	.450	.513

Table 7: ContextQA Context-first performance of different model configurations on temporal QA across four context types: no context (No), relevant (Rel), slightly-altered (SA), irrelevant (Irr). Models include base LLMs (Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.2, llama-3-8b-Instruct) and fine-tuned variants trained on various context setups (+No, +Rel, +SA, +Irr, +Mixed). Results highlight the impact of context types and fine-tuning strategies on model robustness and accuracy.