

GraphCheck: Breaking Long-Term Text Barriers with Extracted Knowledge Graph-Powered Fact-Checking

Yingjian Chen^{1*}, Haoran Liu^{2*}, Yinhong Liu³, Jinxiang Xie¹, Rui Yang⁴, Han Yuan⁴, Yanran Fu¹, Peng Yuan Zhou⁵, Qingyu Chen⁶, James Caverlee², Irene Li^{1†},

¹University of Tokyo, ²Texas A&M University, ³University of Cambridge,
⁴Duke-NUS Medical School, ⁵Aarhus University, ⁶Yale University.

irene.li@weblab.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) are widely used, but they often generate subtle factual errors, especially in long-form text. These errors are fatal in some specialized domains such as medicine. Existing fact-checking with grounding documents methods face two main challenges: (1) they struggle to understand complex multihop relations in long documents, often overlooking subtle factual errors; (2) most specialized methods rely on pairwise comparisons, requiring multiple model calls, leading to high resource and computational costs. To address these challenges, we propose **GraphCheck**, a fact-checking framework that uses extracted knowledge graphs to enhance text representation. Graph Neural Networks further process these graphs as a soft prompt, enabling LLMs to incorporate structured knowledge more effectively. Enhanced with graph-based reasoning, GraphCheck captures multihop reasoning chains that are often overlooked by existing methods, enabling precise and efficient fact-checking in a single inference call. Experimental results on seven benchmarks spanning both general and medical domains demonstrate up to a 7.1% overall improvement over baseline models. Notably, GraphCheck outperforms existing specialized fact-checkers and achieves comparable performance with state-of-the-art LLMs, such as DeepSeek-V3 and OpenAI-o1, with significantly fewer parameters.¹

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) (Hurst et al., 2024; Dubey et al., 2024), have demonstrated powerful generative capabilities in various domains (Yang et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023a; Yang et al., 2024c). However, due to limitations in




Figure 1: Comparison of fact-checking methods. **Naive Check** performs a single-pass evaluation but often misses detailed factual errors. **Atomic Check** ensures fine-grained verification by checking atomic facts individually but is inefficient due to multiple LLM calls. In contrast, our **GraphCheck** achieves fine-grained fact-checking in a single call, significantly improving efficiency while maintaining accuracy.

training data and the lack of integration of domain-specific knowledge, LLMs often “hallucinate” factual errors or inaccurate information (McKenna et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023). As LLMs prioritize linguistic fluency and contextual relevance in their generation processes, the generated content may appear convincing while lacking factuality (Huang et al., 2023; Ramprasad et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024b). This issue is particularly concerning in specialized domains like medicine, where factual errors can compromise patient safety, leading to misdiagnoses, inappropriate treatments, and, in severe cases, life-threatening consequences (Ahsan et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2024b). Therefore, ensuring the reliability and factual accuracy of LLM outputs is essential (Liu et al., 2024c).

We consider the task of fact-checking claims against grounding documents, where the goal is to assess factual consistency based on provided textual evidence (Tang et al., 2024b). Given the high cost and time demands of manual verifica-

*Equal contributions

†Corresponding author

¹Our code is available at <https://github.com/Yingjian-Chen/GraphCheck>.

tion, modern fact-checking methods have shifted to automated approaches using LLMs or natural language inference (NLI) models (Fu et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024). Standard LLM-based checking methods take a straightforward approach by directly feeding documents and claims into LLM for fact-checking judgment (Figure 1, left). However, when dealing with long-form documents, they often struggle to capture complex entity relations and overlook subtle inconsistencies given large volumes of information. Additionally, long prompts may exceed the LLM’s context window, causing potential loss of relevant details and limiting the model from effective fact-checking. To address this, specialized methods (Zha et al., 2023; Min et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024b) decompose long documents into smaller chunks and break claims into atomic facts, enabling fine-grained evaluation at the price of computational cost and efficiency (Figure 1, middle).

To address the problem of long text fact-checking, we propose ***GraphCheck*** (Figure 1, right), a graph-enhanced framework using extracted knowledge graphs (KGs) to capture multi-hop logical relations between entities, enhancing both global coherence and fine-grained understanding in long texts. We employ Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) (Veličković et al., 2017; Yun et al., 2019) to encode these graph structures and integrate the graph embeddings into LLM inputs (He et al., 2024; Tian et al., 2024; Jin et al., 2024). The direct comparison between the extracted document and claim graphs enables fine-grained factual verification in an LLM inference. The GNNs are trained on our curated general-domain synthetic graph data based on MiniCheck (Tang et al., 2024b) training set, while the LLMs remain frozen. Empirically, we find that despite being trained on general-domain data, our model achieves improved performance not only on general-domain datasets but also on medical-domain datasets, demonstrating that its graph-enhanced reasoning ability generalizes across domains. We also provide this dataset as a benchmark for future research, allowing the training and evaluation of graph-based fact-checking.

In summary, our contributions are:

- **Pioneering Graph Reasoning for LLM Fact-Checking.** We propose GraphCheck, the first graph reasoning-enhanced LLM framework for fact-checking with grounding documents, ensuring fine-grained factual ac-

curacy with high efficiency.

- **Enabling Fine-grained Explainability.** Our method enhances explainability by identifying the key entity relationships the model focuses on during fact-checking, ensuring a clear and verifiable reasoning process.
- **Providing a Benchmark for Graph-based Fact-Checking Models.** We introduce a synthetic dataset that pairs text with its corresponding extracted knowledge graph, enabling the training and evaluation of KG-enhanced fact-checking models.
- **Empirical Findings.** We demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of GraphCheck, achieving a 7.1% improvement over the base model in fact-checking across extensive general and medical benchmarks.

2 Related Work and Background

Methods in Detecting Hallucination. Recent fact-checking research (Yuan and Vlachos, 2023; Kim et al., 2023) uses Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) (Fan et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2025) and external knowledge bases like DBpedia (Lehmann et al., 2015) and Wikidata (Vrandečić and Krötzsch, 2014) to verify generated claims by retrieving structured or semi-structured data.

Another line of research (Manakul et al., 2023; Mündler et al., 2023) focuses on verifying factual consistency using LLMs with grounding documents. These approaches harness LLMs’ reasoning and language capabilities to fact-check claims against textual evidence. While effective for short texts, they often fail to capture fine-grained inconsistencies in longer documents, limiting their accuracy. Our work builds on this second setting, aiming to improve fact-checking performance on long texts by enhancing LLMs with structured graph-based reasoning.

Fact-Checking on Long Texts. To address the challenge of capturing detailed errors in long texts, recent methods have shifted towards using fine-grained units for fact-checking. Methods like FactScore (Min et al., 2023), MiniCheck (Tang et al., 2024b), and ACUEval (Wan et al., 2024) focus on extracting atomic units from the generated text to enable fine-grained fact verification. However, these fine-grained fact-checking methods often require multiple calls to verify each unit or triple, especially for long texts, which greatly increases computational cost and time. In contrast,




Figure 2: An illustration of the GraphCheck framework. Firstly, an LLM extracts entity-relation triples from both the claim and the document to construct KGs, respectively. A GNN pre-trained with external text graph data is then used to obtain graph embeddings from both KGs. These graph embeddings, combined with the text embeddings, are fed into an LLM for final fact-checking. This approach enables the LLM to perform fine-grained fact-checking by leveraging key triples in the KG (highlighted) alongside the text information.

our approach uses KGs to model complex entity relationships in long texts, enabling fine-grained verification in a single call. This avoids repetitive calls and significantly improves efficiency.

Graph-based Methods for Enhancing Factuality. Previous graph-based fact-checking methods have primarily focused on isolated triple evaluations or document-level encoding, often overlooking the global graph structure and topological information. GraphEval (Liu et al., 2024b) extracts triples from claims and evaluates their factual consistency individually using a pretrained NLI model. However, it also relies on pairwise comparisons and does not incorporate the overall graph structure, limiting its ability to capture complex relationships. FactGraph (Ribeiro et al., 2022) employs graph encoders to process documents and summary semantic graphs extracted via OpenIE. It then combines text and graph embeddings through an MLP for the final prediction. However, as a pre-LLM method, it lacks the powerful contextual reasoning ability of modern models. AMRFact (Qiu et al., 2024) leverages AMR graphs to represent document structures and guide factual summarization generation, focusing on structured summarization rather than direct fact verification. Unlike previ-

ous methods, our approach integrates a trainable GNN with an LLM (Tian et al., 2024; He et al., 2024), combining long-form contextual understanding with structured knowledge from extracted KGs. By incorporating graph reasoning, our model captures complex entity relationships and logical structures, enabling fine-grained fact verification in a single comparison. This enhanced reasoning ability allows the model to generalize effectively to specialized domains. An extended discussion on how LLMs understand knowledge graphs is provided in Appendix F.

3 GraphCheck

In this section, we introduce our *GraphCheck* framework, which is designed for efficient fact-checking. Intuitively, GraphCheck first extracts structural information from KGs to enrich the input text and then leverages an LLM for verification. GraphCheck contains three main steps: (1) Given a source document D and a generated claim C , we extract knowledge triples from them and construct corresponding KGs. (2) A trainable GNN encodes the entire graph, generating comprehensive graph embeddings. (3) These embeddings, along with the document and claim texts, are fed into a verifier

LLM, with frozen parameters, enabling single-call fine-grained fact-checking with the help of structured graph information, as shown in Figure 2.

3.1 Graph Construction

To construct the KGs, we extract triples in the form of $\{source, relation, target\}$ from the text, where each entity and relation captures key semantic information. To achieve this, an LLM is employed to automatically identify and extract these triples. The detailed prompt used for triple extraction is provided in Appendix H. Building on the extracted triplets, we construct a directed graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. Here, $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{v}_i\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ is the set of node (entity) features, where each \mathbf{v}_i denotes the feature vector for node i . $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{e}_{ij}\}_{i,j=1,\dots,n}$ is the set of edge (relation) features, where \mathbf{e}_{ij} denotes the edge feature vector for an edge from node i to node j . The node features and edge features from textual attributes are encoded using Sentence-Transformers.² For a given generated claim C and its source document D we extract the corresponding graphs G_C and G_D .

3.2 GraphCheck Verification

Graph Encoding. We encode the extracted KGs with a GNN. Specifically, for the l -th GNN layer updates node features based on the message passing scheme as:

$$\mathbf{v}_i^{l+1} = \text{UPDATE} \left(\mathbf{v}_i^l, \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \text{MESSAGE} \left(\mathbf{v}_j^l, \mathbf{e}_{ji} \right) \right),$$

where \mathcal{N}_i denotes the set of node i 's neighbors, and UPDATE and MESSAGE functions are implemented by neural networks. The final graph embeddings \mathbf{h}_g are obtained with the GNN output layer, which is implemented with a READOUT function:

$$\mathbf{h}_g = \text{READOUT} \left(\{\mathbf{v}_i^L\}_{i=1,\dots,n} \right).$$

Here, \mathbf{v}_i^L indicates the feature vector of node i at the last layer. Specifically, the READOUT function includes a summation function to capture a global representation of the graph.

Text Encoding. For a given generated claim C and the source document D , we concatenate them following the verifying template shown in Appendix H, and pass the rendered prompt into the verifier LLM to obtain the text embedding \mathbf{h}_t .

²<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-roberta-large-v1>

Dataset	Size	Doc _{len}	Claim _{len}	Neg%
General Domain				
AggreFact-Xsum	558	324	23	48.9%
AggreFact-CNN	558	500	55	10.2%
Summeval	1600	359	63	18.4%
ExpertQA	3702	432	26	19.8%
Medical Domain				
COVID-Fact	4086	72	12	68.3%
PubHealth	1231	77	14	51.3%
SCIFact	809	249	12	58.9%

Table 1: Statistics of Benchmark Datasets. We report the size of each benchmark, the average text length of source documents and generated claims, and the proportion of negative samples.

Graph Projection. To align the graph features with the verifier LLM’s textual embedding space, we employ a projector module P . This module maps the extracted graph features of claim \mathbf{h}_g^C and document \mathbf{h}_g^D into the LLM’s embedding space, resulting in the projected graph embeddings $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_g^C$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_g^D$ for the claim and document, respectively.

Fact-Checking. After obtaining the projected graph embeddings, $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_g^C$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_g^D$, along with the text embedding \mathbf{h}_t , we concatenate them to construct the final input representation, which is then fed into the LLM self-attention layers for fact-checking:

$$y = \text{LLM}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_g^C, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_g^D, \mathbf{h}_t),$$

where $y \in \{\text{"support"}, \text{"unsupport"}\}$. The model consider both the structured and textual information to determine whether the document supports the claim.

By incorporating graph embeddings, our method effectively captures complex multi-hop logic relations in long text while ensuring efficient fact-checking. The knowledge graph, which encodes entity relationships within the entire text, assists the LLM in detecting factual inconsistencies that may be overlooked when relying solely on text.

4 Experimental Setup

4.1 Datasets

Training Dataset. To train a GNN for extracting KG information, we use the {claim, document, label} pairs from MiniCheck dataset (Tang et al., 2024b) with 14K synthetic samples. We use Claude-3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic) to extract KG triples for claims and documents, constructing graphs for each pair. The final training dataset is

Method	General Domain				Medical Domain			Overall Avg. (%)
	AggreFact-Xsum	AggreFact-CNN	Summeval	ExpertQA	COVID-Fact	SciFact	PubHealth	
Large-scale LLMs*								
GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023)	75.4	60.7	69.7	59.6	73.8	83.3	73.2	70.8
GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024)	76.4	66.8	76.3	58.3	62.6	83.2	67.0	70.1
OpenAI o1 (Jaech et al., 2024)	74.8	65.3	70.5	58.8	75.9	90.3	74.8	72.9
Claude 3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic)	75.7	68.8	77.3	58.8	73.8	87.2	73.8	73.6
DeepSeek-V3 671B (Liu et al., 2024a)	74.6	63.2	68.3	58.5	75.9	89.1	72.9	71.7
Small-scale LLMs								
Llama3 8B (Dubey et al., 2024)	53.4	51.3	51.7	51.3	58.1	62.2	70.7	57.0
Qwen2.5 7B (Yang et al., 2024a)	53.2	45.3	58.5	53.6	59.2	53.5	59.1	54.7
Llama3.3 70B (Dubey et al., 2024)	60.1	53.5	57.6	54.3	69.0	85.7	76.9	65.3
Qwen2.5 72B (Yang et al., 2024a)	55.6	49.9	53.4	54.1	69.9	85.6	76.7	63.6
Specialized Fact-checking Methods								
AlignScore (Zha et al., 2023)	68.0	54.1	62.2	59.3	66.5	71.7	64.4	63.7
ACUEval (Wan et al., 2024)	55.5	50.0	53.7	57.5	64.7	79.9	62.9	60.6
MiniCheck (Tang et al., 2024b)	70.8	63.7	74.8	57.4	65.9	78.1	66.3	68.1
GraphEval (Sansford et al., 2024)	67.6	69.5	69.7	56.0	60.7	68.4	63.7	65.1
Ours								
GraphCheck-Llama3.3 70B	72.9	62.4	67.3	60.3	71.5	89.4	73.6	71.1
GraphCheck-Qwen 72B	72.1	66.5	71.0	57.2	69.7	86.4	71.7	70.7

Table 2: Balanced accuracy of fact-checkers across all benchmarks, covering both general and medical domains. Methods are categorized into **Large-scale LLMs*** | **Small-scale LLMs** | **Specialized Fact-checking Methods** | **Ours**. The top-1, top-2, and top-3 performances for each dataset among models smaller than Large-scale LLMs are highlighted, while the best-performing results within Large-scale LLMs are underlined.

structured as $\{C, D, G_C, G_D, \text{label}\}$. The dataset is split into training, validation, and test sets in a 6:2:2 ratio for model training and evaluation.

Evaluation Benchmarks. Our work mainly focuses on fact-checking tasks that involve long-term text, as shown in Table 1. Therefore, we adopt widely used datasets like AggreFact-CNN (Tang et al., 2023), AggreFact-XSum (Tang et al., 2023), and SummEval (Fabbri et al., 2021), all of which include lengthy documents. To assess our method’s performance in open-domain scenarios, we also incorporate the long-text question-answering dataset ExpertQA (Malaviya et al., 2023). Furthermore, we evaluate our method on medical datasets, including SciFact (Wadden et al., 2020), COVID-Fact (Saakyan et al., 2021), and PubHealth (Kotonya and Toni, 2020), which provide specialized medical domain information. More details are shown in Appendix A.

4.2 Baselines

To comprehensively evaluate our method, we compare it against various fact-checkers, categorized into large-scale LLMs, small-scale LLMs, and specialized fact-checking methods.

Large-scale LLMs³ include GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023), GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024), OpenAI o1

(Jaech et al., 2024), Claude 3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic), and the largest open source model DeepSeek-V3 671B (Liu et al., 2024a). For small-scale LLMs, we include Llama3 8B, Llama3.3 70B (Dubey et al., 2024), Qwen2.5 7B, and Qwen2.5 72B (Yang et al., 2024a). For specialized fact-checking methods, we include AlignScore (Zha et al., 2023) and fine-grained fact-checkers like MiniCheck (Tang et al., 2024b) and ACUEval (Wan et al., 2024). Additionally, we also consider graph-based methods, namely GraphEval (Sansford et al., 2024) and GraphRAG (Edge et al., 2024).

4.3 Evaluation Metric

Considering the data imbalance in some benchmarks, models biased towards a particular class in predictions may not reflect their true performance. To address this, we follow previous approaches (Liu et al., 2023b; Tang et al., 2023) and calculate balanced accuracy (BAcc). For more implementation details, please refer to Appendix G.

5 Results and Analysis

5.1 Main Results

Table 2 presents the BAcc of our proposed method, GraphCheck, compared to LLMs and specialized fact-checkers across general and medical domain benchmarks. The results show that our proposed GraphCheck achieves strong performance, reach-

³We consider Large-scale LLMs as models with more than 300 B parameters.




Figure 3: Average BAcc across general and medical domains. We compare our method with the specialized fact-checking methods in general domain (AggreFact-XSum, AggreFact-CNN, Summeval, ExpertQA) and medical domain (COVID-Fact, PubHealth, SCIFact).

ing an overall BAcc of 71.1% across all benchmarks. Specifically, among large-scale LLMs, Claude 3.5-Sonnet achieves the best overall performance. Our method outperforms GPT-4 and GPT-4o and comes close to the most advanced large-scale models, including OpenAI o1, Claude 3.5-Sonnet, and the latest open-source model DeepSeek-V3 671B, while operating at a smaller scale and significantly lower cost. Interestingly, GPT-4o underperforms on the medical datasets COVID-Fact and PubHealth, which contain shorter texts, even scoring lower than GPT-4. For small-scale LLMs, our method achieves improvements of 5.8% and 7.1% over the similarly sized base models, Llama3.3 70B and Qwen2.5 72B, respectively. For Specialized Fact-checking Methods, GraphCheck outperforms all methods, achieving 10.5%, 3%, and 6% improvements over ACUEval, MiniCheck, and GraphEval, respectively. Notably, compared to methods that require multiple calls, our method achieves superior performance with a single model call. Although GraphRAG is not typically used for fact-checking, its popularity motivated us to adapt it for this purpose. A detailed analysis of these adaptations is provided in the Appendix E.

In particular, our method achieves a BAcc of 60.3% on ExpertQA, surpassing all models. This may be because GraphCheck can extract complex logical relations from graph data. However, our method underperforms on AggreFact-CNN and Summeval, which contain longer claims (average length > 50) and include more factual details. This makes knowledge triplets extraction more challenging, as some important information may be lost dur-




Figure 4: The BAcc of the base model and the proposed GraphCheck architecture across all seven benchmarks for Llama3 8B, Llama3.3 70B, Qwen2.5 7B, Qwen2.5 72B models. The blue-shaded region represents the base model performance, while the red-shaded region highlights the enhanced performance with GraphCheck.

ing the process, affecting subsequent fact-checking. **Performance Analysis in Different Domains.** To evaluate the effectiveness of our method across different domains, we compare it with other specialized fact-checking methods in both general and medical domains, as shown in Figure 3. In the general domain, our method matches the performance of approaches like MiniCheck and GraphEval, which require multiple calls. However, in the medical domain, our method significantly outperforms these methods, achieving an 8.1% improvement over Minicheck. This demonstrates the strong generalization ability of our method, when other methods perform limited in the medical domain, our method still maintains strong performance.

5.2 Ablation Studies

Impact of Additional Graph Information. To evaluate the effectiveness of incorporating graph information, we compare (1) the base LLM models with (2) our proposed GraphCheck, which is based on these models. As shown in Figure 4, our approach has a significant improvement on both lightweight models (Llama3 8B⁴, Qwen2.5 7B⁵) and larger models (Llama3.3 70B, Qwen2.5 72B). Specifically, as shown in Table 1, our method achieves significant improvement on relatively

⁴<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct>

Method	AggreFact -Xsum	AggreFact -CNN	Summeval	ExpertQA	COVID-Fact	SCIFact	PubHealth	Overall Avg. (%)
Llama3.3 70B	60.1	53.5	57.6	54.3	69.0	85.7	76.9	65.3
Llama3.3 70B + KG Text	60.6	53.6	57.8	54.4	71.2	88.8	78.5	66.4
GraphCheck-Llama3.3 70B + KG Text	66.3	60.2	63.8	55.6	71.2	87.9	70.4	67.9
GraphCheck-Llama3.3 70B	72.9	62.4	67.3	60.3	71.5	89.4	73.6	71.1

Table 3: Balanced accuracy of the base model Llama3.3 70B and our proposed GraphCheck, with or without incorporating KG as prompt text, across all benchmarks. The best-performing results are **bold**.

long-text datasets AggreFact-XSum, AggreFact-CNN, and Summeval.

A similar result is observed on the relatively longer SCIFact dataset, where our approach significantly enhances lightweight models. However, for larger models, which can already handle longer texts effectively, the improvement is much more limited. The above results demonstrate the effectiveness of our method, showing that GraphCheck enhances the ability of models to handle long-text fact-checking tasks. Additionally, graph information is essential for effectively capturing complex logical relations within the text.

Evaluating the Use of KGs as Prompt Text. Given that extracted KGs can be directly used as the prompt text for LLMs, as employed in G-Retriever (He et al., 2024), we conduct ablation studies to assess the impact of using the knowledge graph as the prompt text for LLMs, as shown in Table 3. Experimental results show that directly adding KGs text into the prompt yields only marginal improvement over the base model Llama3 70B and even results in performance degradation when integrated into our proposed GraphCheck. This is mainly because LLMs struggle to capture fine-grained factual errors directly from the long textual inputs, and the large extracted knowledge

graph text may further exacerbate this issue. In contrast, our proposed GraphCheck only integrates KGs through a GNN, which enables more effective integration of structured graph information.

Evaluation on Short-Text Fact-Checking. Although GraphCheck is specifically designed for long-term text fact-checking, we also provide evaluations on short texts ($\text{length} < 150$). To do so, we conducted additional experiments on four short-text datasets, as shown in Table 4. The MiniCheck TestSet refers to the test split obtained from the 14K dataset using a 6:2:2 ratio (see Section 4.1). The results demonstrate that our proposed GraphCheck maintains robust performance on short-text fact-checking tasks, outperforming existing specialized methods and base models, indicating its effectiveness across varying text lengths. Although the performance of GraphCheck shows degradation only on the PubHealth dataset compared to the base models, this is primarily because Qwen2.5 72B and Llama-3.3 70B already achieve exceptionally high performance on this dataset, even surpassing OpenAI’s o1 (as shown in Table 2).

Impact of Training Data Sizes. To evaluate the

Method	COVID -Fact	Pub Health	MiniCheck TestSet	Reveal	Overall Avg. (%)
Qwen2.5 72B	69.9	76.7	69.9	85.9	75.6
Llama3.3 70B	69.0	76.9	71.0	86.8	75.9
AlignScore	66.5	64.4	71.9	85.3	72.0
MiniCheck	65.9	66.3	--*	88.8	--*
GraphEval	60.7	63.7	72.1	89.8	71.6
GraphCheck-Qwen2.5 72B	69.7	73.6	78.4	88.0	77.4
GraphCheck-Llama3.3 70B	71.5	71.7	81.2	89.7	78.5

Table 4: Additional evaluations across four short-text datasets: COVID-Fact, PubHealth, the MiniCheck test set, and Reveal (Jacovi et al., 2024). * denotes that the MiniCheck model is trained on the full dataset, including the test set, so the results are omitted for fair comparison.




Figure 5: Balanced accuracy comparison across different training data sizes on all benchmarks. The baseline model performance is marked at 0 on the x -axis.

Document

Administrators of the ACT test took the decision just hours before some 5,500 students were due to sit it. [The ACT is one of two entrance exams](#) available to international and domestic students wanting [to go to a US college](#). This is not the first cheating scandal to hit the tests in East Asia. The other entrance exam - the SAT - was cancelled in South Korea in 2013 because some of the questions were leaked. [The ACT test was due to be held at 56 test centres in both South Korea and Hong Kong on Saturday morning](#). The Associated Press said teachers at some of Seoul's private "cram schools" said they were not notified until about an hour before the students were due to sit the test. ACT Inc, an Iowa-based non-profit organisation that was operating the test, said it took the decision after receiving "credible evidence that test materials intended for administration in these regions have been compromised". The organisation said in a statement that all students would get a refund but would only be able to retake when the tests were held again in September.

Claim

[A US college entrance exam](#) that was due to be held in [South Korea](#) and [Hong Kong](#) on [Saturday](#) has been cancelled after [credible evidence](#) of cheating was found.

Label

Support

Claude 3.5-Sonnet

["ACT administrators", "cancelled", "ACT test"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled for", "5,500 students"],
["ACT test", "is", "US college entrance exam"],
["US college entrance exam", "cancelled", "ACT"],
["US college entrance exam", "consists of", "SAT"],
["SAT", "was cancelled", "South Korea"],
["SAT cancellation", "occurred in", "2013"],
["SAT cancellation", "occurred in", "September"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled for", "56 test centres"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled for", "56 test centres"],
["test centres", "located in", "South Korea"],
["test centres", "located in", "Hong Kong"],
["test centres", "located for", "Saturday morning"],
["Scout cram school teachers", "received notification", "one hour before test"],
["ACT Inc", "is", "non-profit organisation"],
["ACT Inc", "operates", "ACT test"],
["ACT Inc", "operates", "ACT test"],
["ACT Inc", "cancelled test due to", "compromised test materials"],
["ACT Inc", "promoted", "standardized"],
["Students", "will rest in", "September"],
["entrance exams", "experienced cheating scandals", "East Asia"]

GPT-4o

["Administrators of the ACT test", "took the decision to cancel", "the test in South Korea and Hong Kong"],
["Decision", "occurred", "just hours before 5,500 students were due to sit it"],
["Decision", "occurred", "one of two entrance exams for US college"],
["Entrance exams", "are available to", "international and domestic students"],
["The SAT", "was cancelled in", "South Korea", "in 2013"],
["Cancellation in 2013", "occurred because", "questions were leaked"],
["Test centres that were due to hold", "56 test centres"],
["ACT test", "was due to be held on", "Sunday"],
["Teachers", "were notified", "about an hour before the test"],
["ACT Inc", "is", "an Iowa-based non-profit organisation"],
["ACT Inc", "promoted", "standardized"],
["ACT Inc", "cancelled test due to", "cheating"],
["ACT Inc", "cancel", "the decision to cancel", "the test after receiving credible evidence"],
["Teachers", "were compensated for", "administration in these regions"],
["Students", "will get", "a refund"],
["Students", "will be able to retake", "when tests are held again in September"],
["All students", "would receive a refund", "but could only retake in September"]

DeepSeek-V3

["ACT test administrators", "took decision", "hours before students were due to sit"],
["ACT", "is one of two entrance exams", "available to international and domestic students"],
["ACT", "one of the entrance exams available to students going to a US college"],
["ACT", "was cancelled in South Korea", "in 2013"],
["SAT", "was cancelled because", "some of the questions were leaked"],
["ACT test", "was due to be held", "at 56 test centres"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled to be held in", "both South Korea and Hong Kong"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled for", "Saturday morning"],
["Associated Press", "reported", "teachers at some of Seoul's private cram schools were notified late"],
["Teachers", "were notified", "about an hour before the test"],
["ACT Inc", "is", "an Iowa-based non-profit organisation"],
["ACT Inc", "promoted", "standardized"],
["ACT Inc", "cancel", "the decision to cancel", "the test after receiving credible evidence"],
["Teachers", "were compensated for", "administration in these regions"],
["Teachers", "were not notified", "until about an hour before students due to sit the test"],
["ACT Inc", "is", "a non-profit organization operating the test"],
["ACT Inc", "received credible evidence", "that test materials intended for Students", "will get", "a refund"],
["Students", "will be able to retake", "when tests are held again in September"],
["All students", "would receive a refund", "but could only retake in September"]

Llama3 8B

["ACT test", "administered by", "ACT Inc"],
["ACT Inc", "headquartered in", "Iowa"],
["ACT", "operates", "ACT test"],
["ACT test", "held in", "56 test centres in South Korea and Hong Kong"],
["ACT test", "related to", "US college entrance exam"],
["ACT test", "related to", "SAT"],
["SAT", "cancelled in", "South Korea in 2013"],
["SAT", "cancelled because", "some of the questions were leaked"],
["ACT test", "was due to be held", "at 56 test centres"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled to be held in", "both South Korea and Hong Kong"],
["ACT test", "was scheduled for", "Saturday morning"],
["Associated Press", "reported", "teachers at some of Seoul's private cram schools were notified late"],
["Teachers", "were notified", "about an hour before the test"],
["ACT Inc", "is", "an Iowa-based non-profit organisation"],
["ACT Inc", "promoted", "standardized"],
["ACT Inc", "cancel", "the decision to cancel", "the test after receiving credible evidence"],
["Teachers", "were compensated for", "administration in these regions"],
["Teachers", "were not notified", "until about an hour before students due to sit the test"],
["ACT Inc", "is", "a non-profit organization operating the test"],
["ACT Inc", "received credible evidence", "that test materials intended for Students", "will get", "a refund"],
["Students", "will be able to retake", "when tests are held again in September"],
["All students", "would receive a refund", "but could only retake in September"]

Claude 3.5-Sonnet

["US college entrance exam", "was scheduled for", "South Korea"],
["US college entrance exam", "was scheduled for", "Hong Kong"],
["US college entrance exam", "was cancelled due to", "credible evidence of cheating"],
["US college entrance exam", "was held on", "Saturday"],
["US college entrance exam", "experienced cheating scandals", "East Asia"]

GPT 4o

["US college entrance exam", "was due to be held in", "South Korea"],
["US college entrance exam", "was due to be held in", "Hong Kong"],
["US college entrance exam", "has been cancelled", "due to credible evidence of cheating"],
["Credible evidence", "suggested", "cheating"]

DeepSeek-V3

["US college entrance exam", "was due to be held in", "South Korea"],
["US college entrance exam", "was due to be held in", "Hong Kong"],
["US college entrance exam", "cancelled due to", "cheating founded"],
["Cheating founded"]

Llama3 8B

["US college entrance exam", "due to be held in", "South Korea"],
["US college entrance exam", "due to be held in", "Hong Kong"],
["US college entrance exam", "cancelled", "on Saturday"],
["US college entrance exam", "cancelled due to", "credible evidence of cheating"]

Figure 6: Example Analysis of the Impact of Knowledge Graph (KG) Quality on Model Prediction Results. The figure illustrates the influence of KGs extracted by four different models (Claude 3.5-Sonnet, GPT-4o, DeepSeek-V3, Llama 8B) on the performance of GraphCheck fact-checking.

impact of training data size on the fact-checking performance of GraphCheck-Llama3.3 70B, we conducted experiments across all benchmarks, as shown in Figure 5. The results demonstrate a general upward trend in model performance as the amount of training data increases. Specifically, significant improvements can be observed on the long-text datasets AggreFact-XSum, AggreFact-CNN, Summeval, and SCIFact. Among them, XSum exhibits the largest improvement, increasing from 60.1% to 72.9%, while CNN and Summeval also achieve approximately 10% improvements. In contrast, for the short-text datasets, our method shows only a slight improvement on COVID-Fact, while on PubHealth, performance gradually declines. These results further validate the conclusion drawn in Section 5.2.

From the above results, we can observe that as the training data size increases, the overall model performance shows an upward trend. Therefore, we believe that further increasing the data size could continue to enhance the performance of our proposed GraphCheck. Additional experiments on different graph-building methods and GNN architectures are provided in Appendix D.

Impact of Generated Knowledge Graph Quality. Due to the inherent randomness in extracting entity-relationship triples from text using LLMs, we conducted an experiment to assess how the quality of KGs generated from text impacts the model's

final fact-checking results, as illustrated in Figure 6. For shorter generated claims, the triples extracted by the four models show minimal differences, except for occasional missing details by GPT-4o and DeepSeek-V3. These missing have minor effects on fact-checking results, as the models also relied on the original text for verification. In contrast, for longer document texts, there are significant differences in the quality of the triples generated by the models. Specifically, the triples extracted by the Llama 8B model lacked crucial details, such as the time ("Saturday") and the reason for the exam cancellation. The loss of key information could potentially turn the KG into interference during fact-checking, ultimately leading to incorrect results. On the other hand, while the language expressions of the triples extracted by GPT-4, Claude 3.5, and DeepSeek-V3 are different, they all capture the essential details and still ensure that the fact-checker makes the right prediction.

These findings indicate that for short texts, the quality of the extracted KG has minimal impact on fact-checking performance, as models still rely on the original text for verification. However, for long-form documents, the completeness of the KG is critical. If the KG lacks key fact-checking information, it misleads the model rather than assists in verification. This is because longer texts make it more difficult for the model to extract essential details directly, increasing its dependence on the




Figure 7: A case study in the medical domain. Connection weights in the KG are visualized to highlight key relationships primarily used by the model for fact-checking. Key entities and relationships in the text are marked in red and blue, while high-weighted nodes in the KG are highlighted in orange-yellow.

KG. In such cases, an incomplete or inaccurate KG introduces noise and ultimately compromises fact-checking accuracy. Conversely, if the missing information is irrelevant to the verification process, its absence does not affect the result.

5.3 Rethink Graph Importance on Long-Form Fact-checking

We conduct a case study in the medical domain to demonstrate how our method uses KGs to help LLMs in the fact-checking process. We also showcase how our approach provides clear and interpretable explanations for the final checking results, as shown in Figure 7. For each edge in the graph, we visualize its connection weight to show the attention distribution learned by the GNN model. The results indicate that the model selectively focuses on specific edges by assigning higher attention weights, emphasizing key relationships in the graph. Notably, these high-weight triplets correspond to key relations that align with the fact-checking requirements. For instance, the triplets (*Dr. Erica Pan, is, California state epidemiologist*) and (*Dr. Erica Pan, recommended pause of, Moderna COVID-19 vaccine*) in the document KG capture key information needed to verify the claim.

Explainability. This visualization not only high-

lights the key information the model relies on, but also improves the explainability of its fact-checking process. By revealing which relationships receive higher attention, it becomes easier to understand how the model makes its final decision and incorporates graph reasoning into its predictions. This explainability is particularly important in the medical domain, where fact-checking requires a clear and reliable reasoning path.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose GraphCheck, a fact-checking method that integrates knowledge graphs to enhance LLM-based fact-checking, particularly for long-form text. GraphCheck addresses the limitations of LLMs in capturing complex entity relationships, which often result in overlooked factual errors. By leveraging graph neural networks (GNNs) to integrate representations from the generated claim and the source document KGs, our method enables fine-grained fact-checking in a single model call, significantly improving efficiency. Furthermore, the incorporation of graph information enhances the interpretability of the fact-checking process. Experiments on general and medical domain datasets demonstrate that GraphCheck achieves competitive performance.

Limitations

Quality of Knowledge Graphs. Although integrating KGs into the fact-checking process is effective, our method remains limited by the quality of KGs. Currently, there is no reliable method for evaluating the quality of extracted KGs, and the process largely depends on manual judgment. As the dataset grows, it becomes difficult to assess the quality of the extracted KGs. As analyzed in our paper, KG quality directly impacts our method’s performance (errors in the KG may introduce noise or fail to provide sufficient support for fact-checking).

Limited Training Data. The lack of high-quality training data is a common limitation in long-text fact-checking. For this reason, and to ensure a fair comparison, we adopted the 14K dataset provided by MiniCheck, which consists of relatively short texts. As shown in the paper, the performance of our method improves with increased training data, suggesting that there remains significant potential for further improvement if larger or higher-quality long-text datasets are considered.

Acknowledgments

Dr. Irene Li is supported by JST ACT-X (Grant JPMJAX24CU) and JSPS KAKENHI (Grant 24K20832). Dr. Qingyu Chen is supported by 1R01LM014604, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health. This work used supercomputers provided by the Research Institute for Information Technology, Kyushu University, through the HPCI System Research Project (Project ID: hp250092). This work is also supported by NVIDIA Academic Grant Program and Google Cloud (Gemma 3 Academic Program).

References

- Hiba Ahsan, Denis Jered McInerney, Jisoo Kim, Christopher Potter, Geoffrey Young, Silvio Amir, and Byron C. Wallace. 2023. **Retrieving evidence from ehrs with llms: Possibilities and challenges.** *Proceedings of machine learning research*, 248:489–505.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet. <https://www.anthro pic.com/news/clause-3-5-sonnet>. Retrieved February 12, 2025.
- Jinheon Baek, Alham Fikri Aji, and Amir Saffari. 2023. Knowledge-augmented language model prompting for zero-shot knowledge graph question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04136*.
- Cléa Chataigner, Afaf Taïk, and Golnoosh Farnadi. 2024. Multilingual hallucination gaps in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18270*.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, and Jonathan Larson. 2024. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130*.
- Alexander R. Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. **Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation.** *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409.
- Wenqi Fan, Yujuan Ding, Liang bo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. 2024. **A survey on rag meeting llms: Towards retrieval-augmented large language models.** In *Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04166*.
- Fan Gao, Hang Jiang, Rui Yang, Qingcheng Zeng, Jinghui Lu, Moritz Blum, Dairui Liu, Tianwei She, Yuang Jiang, and Irene Li. 2023. **Evaluating large language models on wikipedia-style survey generation.** In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Jiayan Guo, Lun Du, Hengyu Liu, Mengyu Zhou, Xinyi He, and Shi Han. 2023. Gpt4graph: Can large language models understand graph structured data? an empirical evaluation and benchmarking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15066*.
- Xiaoxin He, Yijun Tian, Yifei Sun, Nitesh V Chawla, Thomas Laurent, Yann LeCun, Xavier Bresson, and Bryan Hooi. 2024. G-retriever: Retrieval-augmented generation for textual graph understanding and question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07630*.
- Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*.
- Xuanwen Huang, Kaiqiao Han, Yang Yang, Dezheng Bao, Quanjin Tao, Ziwei Chai, and Qi Zhu. 2024. Can gnn be good adapter for llms? In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2024*, pages 893–904.
- Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. 2024. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*.
- Alon Jacovi, Yonatan Bitton, Bernd Bohnet, Jonathan Herzig, Or Honovich, Michael Tseng, Michael Collins, Roee Aharoni, and Mor Geva. 2024. A chain-of-thought is as strong as its weakest link: A benchmark for verifiers of reasoning chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00559*.
- Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*.
- Bowen Jin, Gang Liu, Chi Han, Meng Jiang, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. 2024. Large language models on graphs: A comprehensive survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*.
- Jiho Kim, Sungjin Park, Yeonsu Kwon, Yohan Jo, James Thorne, and Edward Choi. 2023. Factkg: Fact verification via reasoning on knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06590*.
- Kyungha Kim, Sangyun Lee, Kung-Hsiang Huang, Hou Pong Chan, Manling Li, and Heng Ji. 2024. **Can llms produce faithful explanations for fact-checking? towards faithful explainable fact-checking via multi-agent debate.** *ArXiv*, abs/2402.07401.

- Neema Kotonya and Francesca Toni. 2020. Explainable automated fact-checking for public health claims. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.09926*.
- Jean Lee, Nicholas Stevens, Soyeon Caren Han, and Minseok Song. 2024. [A survey of large language models in finance \(finllms\)](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2402.02315.
- Jens Lehmann, Robert Isele, Max Jakob, Anja Jentzsch, Dimitris Kontokostas, Pablo N Mendes, Sebastian Hellmann, Mohamed Morsey, Patrick Van Kleef, Sören Auer, et al. 2015. Dbpedia—a large-scale, multilingual knowledge base extracted from wikipedia. *Semantic web*, 6(2):167–195.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. 2024a. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*.
- Dairui Liu, Boming Yang, Honghui Du, Derek Greene, Aonghus Lawlor, Ruihai Dong, and Irene Li. 2023a. Recprompt: A prompt tuning framework for news recommendation using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10463*.
- Xiaozhe Liu, Feijie Wu, Tianyang Xu, Zhuo Chen, Yichi Zhang, Xiaoqian Wang, and Jing Gao. 2024b. Evaluating the factuality of large language models using large-scale knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00942*.
- Yinhong Liu, Zhijiang Guo, Tianya Liang, Ehsan Shareghi, Ivan Vulić, and Nigel Collier. 2024c. Aligning with logic: Measuring, evaluating and improving logical consistency in large language models. *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2410.02205.
- Yixin Liu, Alexander Fabbri, Yilun Zhao, Pengfei Liu, Shafiq Joty, Chien-Sheng Wu, Caiming Xiong, and Dragomir Radev. 2023b. Towards interpretable and efficient automatic reference-based summarization evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 16360–16368, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chaitanya Malaviya, Subin Lee, Sihao Chen, Elizabeth Sieber, Mark Yatskar, and Dan Roth. 2023. Expertqa: Expert-curated questions and attributed answers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07852*.
- Potsawee Manakul, Adian Liusie, and Mark JF Gales. 2023. Selfcheckgpt: Zero-resource black-box hallucination detection for generative large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08896*.
- Costas Mavromatis and George Karypis. 2024. Gnnrag: Graph neural retrieval for large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20139*.
- Nick McKenna, Tianyi Li, Liang Cheng, Mohammad Hosseini, Mark Johnson, and Mark Steedman. 2023. Sources of hallucination by large language models on inference tasks. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2758–2774, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxi Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14251*.
- Niels Mündler, Jingxuan He, Slobodan Jenko, and Martin Vechev. 2023. Self-contradictory hallucinations of large language models: Evaluation, detection and mitigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15852*.
- Ramesh Nallapati, Bowen Zhou, Caglar Gulcehre, Bing Xiang, et al. 2016. Abstractive text summarization using sequence-to-sequence rnns and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06023*.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. Don’t give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08745*.
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#).
- Haoyi Qiu, Kung-Hsiang Huang, Jingnong Qu, and Nanyun Peng. 2024. [AMRFact: Enhancing Summarization Factuality Evaluation with AMR-Driven Negative Samples Generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 594–608, Mexico City, Mexico. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sanjana Ramprasad, Elisa Ferracane, and Zachary C Lipton. 2024. Analyzing llm behavior in dialogue summarization: Unveiling circumstantial hallucination trends. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03487*.
- Leonardo FR Ribeiro, Mengwen Liu, Iryna Gurevych, Markus Dreyer, and Mohit Bansal. 2022. Factgraph: Evaluating factuality in summarization with semantic graph representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06508*.
- Arkadiy Saakyan, Tuhin Chakrabarty, and Smaranda Muresan. 2021. Covid-fact: Fact extraction and verification of real-world claims on covid-19 pandemic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03794*.
- Hannah Sansford, Nicholas Richardson, Hermina Petric Maretic, and Juba Nait Saada. 2024. Grapheval: A knowledge-graph based llm hallucination evaluation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10793*.
- Priyanka Sen, Sandeep Mavadia, and Amir Saffari. 2023. Knowledge graph-augmented language models for complex question answering. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Natural Language Reasoning and Structured Explanations (NLRSE)*, pages 1–8, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jiashuo Sun, Chengjin Xu, Lumingyuan Tang, Saizhuo Wang, Chen Lin, Yeyun Gong, Lionel M Ni, Heung-Yeung Shum, and Jian Guo. 2023. Think-on-graph: Deep and responsible reasoning of large language model on knowledge graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07697*.
- Jiabin Tang, Yuhao Yang, Wei Wei, Lei Shi, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2024a. Graphpt: Graph instruction tuning for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 491–500.
- Liyan Tang, Tanya Goyal, Alex Fabbri, Philippe Laban, Jiacheng Xu, Semih Yavuz, Wojciech Kryscinski, Justin Rousseau, and Greg Durrett. 2023. Understanding factual errors in summarization: Errors, summarizers, datasets, error detectors. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 11626–11644, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liyan Tang, Philippe Laban, and Greg Durrett. 2024b. Minicheck: Efficient fact-checking of llms on ground documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10774*.
- Yijun Tian, Huan Song, Zichen Wang, Haozhu Wang, Ziqing Hu, Fang Wang, Nitesh V Chawla, and Panpan Xu. 2024. Graph neural prompting with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19080–19088.
- Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*.
- Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. 2014. Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85.
- David Wadden, Shanchuan Lin, Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, Madeleine van Zuylen, Arman Cohan, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2020. Fact or fiction: Verifying scientific claims. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14974*.
- David Wan, Koustuv Sinha, Srini Iyer, Asli Celikyilmaz, Mohit Bansal, and Ramakanth Pasunuru. 2024. Acueval: Fine-grained hallucination evaluation and correction for abstractive summarization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 10036–10056.
- Weihao Xuan, Rui Yang, Heli Qi, Qingcheng Zeng, Yunze Xiao, Yun Xing, Junjue Wang, Huitao Li, Xin Li, Kunyu Yu, et al. 2025. Mmlu-prox: A multilingual benchmark for advanced large language model evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10497*.
- An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. 2024a. Qwen2. 5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*.
- Rui Yang, Haoran Liu, Edison Marrese-Taylor, Qingcheng Zeng, Yuhe Ke, Wanxin Li, Lechao Cheng, Qingyu Chen, James Caverlee, Yutaka Matsuo, and Irene Li. 2024b. KG-rank: Enhancing large language models for medical QA with knowledge graphs and ranking techniques. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing*, pages 155–166, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rui Yang, Yilin Ning, Emilia Keppo, Mingxuan Liu, Chuan Hong, Danielle S Bitterman, Jasmine Chiat Ling Ong, Daniel Shu Wei Ting, and Nan Liu. 2025. Retrieval-augmented generation for generative artificial intelligence in health care. *npj Health Systems*, 2(1):2.
- Rui Yang, Ting Fang Tan, Wei Lu, Arun James Thirunavukarasu, Daniel Shu Wei Ting, and Nan Liu. 2023. Large language models in health care: Development, applications, and challenges. *Health Care Science*, 2(4):255–263.
- Rui Yang, Qingcheng Zeng, Keen You, Yujie Qiao, Lucas Huang, Chia-Chun Hsieh, Benjamin Rosand, Jeremy Goldwasser, Amisha Dave, Tiarnan Keenan, et al. 2024c. Ascle—a python natural language processing toolkit for medical text generation: development and evaluation study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 26:e60601.
- Zhangdie Yuan and Andreas Vlachos. 2023. Zero-shot fact-checking with semantic triples and knowledge graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11785*.
- Seongjun Yun, Minbyul Jeong, Raehyun Kim, Jaewoo Kang, and Hyunwoo J Kim. 2019. Graph transformer networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Yuheng Zha, Yichi Yang, Ruichen Li, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. Alignscore: Evaluating factual consistency with a unified alignment function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16739*.
- Muru Zhang, Ofir Press, William Merrill, Alisa Liu, and Noah A Smith. 2023. How language model hallucinations can snowball. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13534*.

A Benchmark Details

A.1 General Domain Benchmarks

AggreFact-XSum, AggreFact-CNN. They are subsets of the AGGREFACT benchmark (Tang et al., 2023), designed for evaluating factual consistency in summarization. These subsets correspond to two widely used summarization datasets: XSum (Nallapati et al., 2016) and CNN/DailyMail (CNN/DM) (Narayan et al., 2018), which feature different summarization styles. Both datasets contain relatively long documents, making them well-suited for assessing our method’s effectiveness in handling long-text fact-checking.

Summeval. (Fabbri et al., 2021) consists of human evaluations of 16 summarization model outputs based on 100 articles from the CNN/DailyMail dataset. Each summary is rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 across four categories: consistency, coherence, fluency, and relevance. In our use of this dataset, we extract each individual claim from the summaries as separate data points. The consistency score is mapped such that a score of 5 is labeled as Support, while scores ranging from 0 to 4 are labeled as Unsupport.

ExpertQA. (Malaviya et al., 2023) includes responses from six different systems to expert-curated queries, with sentence-level verification against cited or retrieved documents. In our dataset, a sentence is labeled as Support only if the evidence fully supports it. In contrast, partial and incomplete support is classified as Unsupport.

A.2 Medical Domain Benchmarks

COVID-Fact. (Saakyan et al., 2021) is a dataset containing 4,086 claims related to the COVID-19 pandemic. The dataset focuses on automatically detecting true claims and their corresponding source articles, followed by generating counter-claims using automated methods instead of human annotators.

PubHealth. (Kotonya and Toni, 2020) consists of 11,832 claims related to a variety of health topics, including biomedical subjects such as infectious diseases and stem cell research, government healthcare policies like abortion, mental health, and women’s health, as well as other public health-related issues. Each claim in the dataset is paired with journalist-crafted, gold-standard explanations that provide judgments to support the corresponding fact-check labels. The dataset is designed for two main tasks: veracity prediction and explanation generation, with claims categorized into four labels: true, false, mixture, and unproven. In our experiments, we use the test set as a benchmark, classifying claims labeled as true as Support, while those labeled as false, mixture, and unproven are classified as Unsupport.

SCIFact. (Wadden et al., 2020) consists of 1,400 expert-written scientific claims, each paired with evidence-containing abstracts annotated with labels and rationales. To construct the dataset, annotators re-formulate naturally occurring claims found in scientific literature—specifically citation sentences—into atomic scientific claims, ensuring clarity and precision. Since its training set is labeled, we use it as a benchmark in our experiments. Furthermore, claims with contradictory evidence or no supporting evidence are classified as Unsupport, while all others are classified as Support.

A.3 Preprocessing for Benchmark

To extract graph information from the benchmark text data, we utilize LLM to separately extract entity-relation triples from both the claims and the documents. The extraction process follows the prompt shown in H. After preprocessing, the dataset is structured as {claim, doc, claim_kg, doc_kg, label}, where claim_kg and doc_kg represent the extracted KGs for the claim and document, respectively. Samples of the processed data are illustrated in Figure 8.

B Synthetic Dataset for Training

To pre-train an external GNN, we synthesized a structured dataset of 14,000 samples based on the MiniCheck training set. Using a method similar to A.3, we employed the Qwen2.5 7B model to extract KG triples from both the claim and document in each sample, following the prompt in H. Each sample is structured as {claim, doc, claim_kg, doc_kg, label}. Examples are shown in Figure 9.

Model	Avg. Calls per Sample	Inference time per Sample (secs)	Cost (\$)
GPT-4	1	7.1	18.6
OpenAI o1	1	17.4	27.7
Claude 3.5-Sonnet	1	8.2	7.2
Minicheck	5	0.01	< 1.0
ACUEval	5	5.9	8.8
GraphEval	9	0.51	< 1.0
GraphCheck(Ours)	1	0.68	<1.0

Table 5: Comparison of the cost of our method with other specialized fact-checking methods and LLMs.

C Analysis of Computational Cost and Time Efficiency

We compare the computational cost of specialized fact-checking methods and LLMs on the ExpertQA benchmark, selected for its large dataset size and longer text length. For locally deployed methods, we calculate the cost at a rate of \$0.8 per GPU hour, as shown in Table 5. The results show that the cost of our method is significantly lower than that of similar LLMs, such as GPT-4, OpenAI O1, and Claude 3.5-Sonnet. Compared to specialized fact-checking methods, our approach shows a substantial efficiency improvement over ACUEval, which also uses the Llama3.3 70B as the base model. Additionally, the cost of our method is comparable to that of Minicheck and GraphEval, which are based on smaller NLI models. Notably, due to the small size of NLI models, their inference speed is fast, allowing Minicheck and GraphEval to maintain low computational costs. However, this also limits their performance and generalization ability. In contrast, our approach remains computationally efficient while achieving superior performance on complex verification tasks. Specifically, our method outperforms Minicheck and GraphEval on the ExpertQA benchmark, demonstrating stronger generalization in handling long-form text scenarios.

Graph_Building Method	XSum	CNN	Summeval	ExpertQA
Edge as Input (used)	72.9	60.3	66.2	60.3
Edge as Node	72.5	59.6	66.8	58.6

Table 6: Balanced accuracy comparison of different graph building methods on XSum, CNN, Summeval and ExpertQA benchmarks.

Model	XSum	CNN	Summeval	ExpertQA
Llama3.3 70B	60.1	53.5	57.6	54.3
Llama3.3 70B + GAT	72.9	59.6	65.4	60.3
Llama3.3 70B + GT	64.8	62.4	67.3	59.1

Table 7: Balanced accuracy comparison of different GNN architectures on XSum, CNN, Summeval and ExpertQA benchmarks.

D Additional Experiments

Analyzing the Impact of Different Graph-Building Methods. We explored two different graph-building methods to evaluate the impact of graph building methods on our approach. The first method directly encodes the relation as edge information in the triplet, represented as [entity1, relation, entity2]. The second method treats the relation as a node, represented as [entity1 → relation] and [relation → entity2]. As shown in Table 6, the results show that directly encoding edge information leads to slightly better performance compared to treating the relation as a node, although the difference is minimal.

Impact of Different GNN Architecture. In our study, we explore the effect of different GNN architectures—Graph Attention Network (GAT) (Veličković et al., 2017) and Graph Transformer (GT) (Yun et al., 2019). As shown in Table 7, the experimental results demonstrate that for the XSum dataset, GAT

significantly improves performance from the baseline of 60.1 to 72.9% (+12.8%), while GT achieves a smaller improvement of 4.7% (64.8%). This suggests that XSum relies more on local relationships, where GAT’s attention mechanism effectively captures interactions between adjacent nodes. In contrast, GT’s global self-attention may introduce noise or lead to over-smoothing, limiting its effectiveness. However, for Summeval and CNN, GT outperforms GAT (Summeval: 67.3% vs. 65.4%, CNN: 62.4% vs. 59.6%), suggesting that tasks requiring long-range dependencies and global context benefit more from GT’s ability to integrate information across the graph structure. For the ExpertQA dataset, both GAT and GT exhibit similar performance.

Method	AggreFact-Xsum	AggreFact-CNN	Summeval	ExpertQA	COVID-Fact	SCI-Fact	PubHealth	Overall Avg. (%)
GraphRAG (GPT-4o) (Edge et al., 2024)	70.0	60.4	68.2	60.7	72.7	88.2	74.2	70.6
GraphCheck-Llama3.3 70B (Ours)	72.9	62.4	67.3	60.3	71.5	89.4	73.6	71.1
GraphCheck-Qwen 72B (Ours)	72.1	66.5	71.0	57.2	69.7	86.4	71.7	70.7

Table 8: Balanced accuracy of GraphRAG and GraphCheck across all evaluation benchmarks.

E GraphRAG Evaluation

Implementation Details of GraphRAG. To streamline our implementation process, we leveraged the approach from the open-source nano-GraphRAG project⁶ for our testing phase. In our experiments, we followed the official approach by using GPT-4o and GPT-4o-mini models. GPT-4o was used for planning and generating responses, while GPT-4o-mini was used for summarization tasks. The workflow is divided into two phases: **Insert** and **Query**.

In the **Insert** phase, we insert the extracted document and claim KGs to build the knowledge base.

In the **Query** phase, GraphRAG retrieves the relevant triples from the knowledge base and invokes GPT-4o for inference to determine whether the claim is supported or not.

We compare GraphRAG and GraphCheck in Table 8. The results show that GraphRAG, based on GPT-4o, still underperforms our proposed GraphCheck, which is based on Llama3.3 70B and Qwen 72B. Fundamentally, GraphRAG is not the primary focus of our study. Although both involve graph structures, the core methods are different: GraphRAG relies on retrieval-based reasoning, while GraphCheck integrates structured knowledge directly into LLM for fact-checking. Additionally, GraphRAG is very costly, with expenses significantly exceeding those of direct inference with GPT-4o (reaching \$47.9 in Table 3’s scenario), while offering only marginal performance improvements. Since GraphRAG is a general-purpose framework rather than one specifically designed for fact-checking, we believe it may not be the suitable approach for this task.

F Extended Discussion on How LLMs Understand Knowledge Graphs

Apart from fact-checking, using Knowledge Graphs (KGs) to enhance the text understanding ability of LLMs is also a popular research domain. A key challenge in this area is to enable LLMs to effectively understand graph-structured information. Existing methods (Guo et al., 2023; Sen et al., 2023; Baek et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2024a) directly convert graph-structured information into natural language as part of the prompt, enabling LLMs to process graph knowledge without requiring additional graph encoders. However, these approaches struggle to effectively handle complex KGs, often requiring multiple calls (Sun et al., 2023) to help LLMs fully comprehend the structured information.

GNN-Based Methods. To address this limitation, existing methods (Huang et al., 2024; Mavromatis and Karypis, 2024) use Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) to encode complex KGs, allowing LLMs to focus on the most relevant entities and relationships. Specifically, G-Retriever (He et al., 2024) uses a GNN to encode the retrieved KG as a graph embedding and converts the graph information into natural language as part of the prompt, feeding both into the LLM for better understanding. GNP (Tian et al.,

⁶<https://github.com/gusye1234/nano-graphrag>

Hyperparameter	Value
batch_size	8
num_epochs	20
learning_rate	1e-5
weight_decay	0.05
warmup_epochs	2
early_stop_patience	3
llm_num_virtual_tokens	4
max_txt_len	1024
max_new_tokens	5, 8
gnn_model	gat, gt
gnn_num_layers	2, 3, 4
gnn_in_dim	1024
gnn_hidden_dim	1024
gnn_num_heads	4
gnn_dropout	0.3, 0.4, 0.5

Table 9: Hyperparameters.

2024) encodes KGs into node embedding vectors and extracts the most relevant node embeddings, which are fed into the LLM along with text embeddings.

In this work, to enable efficient fact-checking on long-form texts, we use a pre-trained GNN to separately encode the entity relationships in the extracted claim KG and document KG. The resulting graph embeddings, combined with text prompt embeddings, enhance the LLM’s ability to understand complex logical structures in long texts. On the other hand, directly comparing the extracted document and claim KGs assists the LLM in performing fine-grained fact-checking within a single inference.

G Implementation Details

For training, we use Llama3.3 70B ⁷ and Qwen2.5 72B ⁸ as the base models, which remain frozen throughout the training process. The trainable external graph encoder is a GNN. We train the models for 20 epochs with early stopping, setting the maximum generation length to 5 and the learning rate to 1×10^{-5} . The best model is selected based on performance on the validation set. The experiments are conducted on 4 NVIDIA A100 80GB GPUs for both training and testing.

Detail of Hyperparameter. We list all the parameters used for both Llama3.3 70B and Qwen2.5 72B models, as shown in table 9. This includes configuration details such as batch size, learning rate, and optimizer settings.

H Prompts

Triplets Extraction. Figure 10 presents the prompt and an example used for extracting entity-relation triples from a text using an LLM. The example is sourced from the COVID-Fact dataset.

Fact-Checking. Figure 11 presents the fact-checking prompt and an example output. Compared to our method (first row), zero-shot LLMs (second row) require additional descriptive instructions to ensure the stability of the generated output format.

I Future Work

Currently, most fact-checking research primarily focuses on English, and there remains a significant gap in multilingual settings (Chataigner et al., 2024; Xuan et al., 2025). To address this limitation, we plan to extend GraphCheck to support multilingual fact-checking in future work.

⁷<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct>

⁸<https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct>

Claim	Doc	Claim_kg	Doc_kg	Label
donald sterling , nba team last year . sterling 's wife used for \$ 2.6 million in gifts . sterling says he is the former female companion who has lost the amount sterling has ordered v. stiviano to pay back \$ 2.6 m in gifts after his wife used . sterling also includes a \$ 391 easter bunny costume , \$ 299 and a \$ 299 .	[CNN) Donald Sterling's racist remarks cost him an NBA team last year. But now it's his former female companion who has lost big. A Los Angeles judge has ordered V. Stiviano to pay back more than \$2.6 million in gifts after Stiviano's wife used her wife's legal team. Roschelle "Shelly" Sterling, 60, accused Donald Sterling of targeting extremely wealthy older men. She claimed Donald Sterling used the couple's money to buy Stiviano a Ferrari, two Bentleys and a Range Rover, and that he helped her get a \$1.8 million duplex. Who is V. Stiviano? Stiviano countered that there was nothing wrong with Donald Sterling giving her gifts and that she never took advantage of the former Los Angeles Clippers owner, who made much of his fortune in real estate. Shelly Sterling was thrilled with the court decision Tuesday, her lawyer told CNN affiliate KABC. "This is a victory for the Sterling family in recovering the \$2,630,000 that Donald lavished on a conniving mistress," attorney Pierce O'Donnell said in a statement. "It also sets a precedent that the injured spouse can recover damages from the recipient of these ill-begotten gifts." Stiviano's gifts from Donald Sterling didn't just include über-expensive items like luxury cars. According to the Los Angeles Times, the list also includes a \$391 Easter bunny costume, a \$299 two-speed blender and a \$12 lace thong. Donald Sterling's downfall came after an audio recording surfaced of the octogenarian arguing with Stiviano. In the tape, Sterling chastises Stiviano for posting pictures on social media of her posing with African-Americans, including basketball legend Magic Johnson. "In your lousy f***ing Instagrams, you don't have to have yourself -- walking with black people," Sterling said in the audio first posted by TMZ. He also tells Stiviano not to bring Johnson to Clippers games and not to post photos with the Hall of Famer so Sterling's friends can see. "Admire him, bring him here, feed him, f*** him, but don't put (Magic) on an Instagram for the world to have to see so they have to call me," Sterling said. NBA Commissioner Adam Silver banned Sterling from the league, fined him \$2.5 million and pushed through a charge to terminate all of his ownership rights in the franchise. Fact check: Donald Sterling's claims vs. reality CNN's Dottie Evans contributed to this report.	[('Donald Sterling', 'owned', 'NBA team'), ('Sterling's wife', 'used for', '\$2.6 million in gifts'), ('V. Stiviano', 'ordered to pay', '\$2.6 million'), ('V. Stiviano', 'used for', 'easter bunny costume'), ('easter bunny costume', 'valued at', '\$391'), ('Sterling's wife', 'used', 'V. Stiviano'), ('V. Stiviano', 'was', 'former female companion'), ('V. Stiviano', 'must return', 'gifts')]	[('Donald Sterling', 'lost', 'NBA team'), ('Donald Sterling', 'made racist remarks', 'in audio recording'), ('V. Stiviano', 'ordered to pay back', '\$2.6 million in gifts'), ('Shelly' Sterling', 'used', 'V. Stiviano'), ('Roschelle Shelly' Sterling', 'accused', 'V. Stiviano of targeting wealthy older men'), ('Donald Sterling', 'bought for', 'V. Stiviano'), ('Donald Sterling', 'purchased', 'Ferrari'), ('Donald Sterling', 'purchased', 'Range Rover'), ('Donald Sterling', 'helped acquire', '\$1.8 million duplex'), ('V. Stiviano', 'claimed', 'gifts were legitimate'), ('Donald Sterling', 'was', 'former Los Angeles Clippers owner'), ('Donald Sterling', 'made fortune in', 'real estate'), ('Pierce O'Donnell', 'is', 'Shelly Sterling's lawyer'), ('Donald Sterling', 'gave', '\$391 Easter bunny costume'), ('Donald Sterling', 'gave', '\$299 two-speed blender'), ('Donald Sterling', 'gave', '\$12 lace thong'), ('Donald Sterling', 'argued with', 'V. Stiviano in audio recording'), ('Donald Sterling', 'criticized', 'Stiviano's social media posts with African-Americans'), ('Donald Sterling', 'mentioned', 'Magic Johnson in recording'), ('Adam Silver', 'is', 'NBA Commissioner'), ('Adam Silver', 'banned', 'Donald Sterling from NBA'), ('Adam Silver', 'fined', 'Donald Sterling \$2.5 million'), ('Adam Silver', 'terminated', 'Sterling's ownership rights'), ('Donald Sterling', 'told Stiviano not to bring', 'Magic Johnson to games'), ('Donald Sterling', 'told Stiviano not to post photos with', 'Magic Johnson'), ('Magic Johnson', 'is', 'basketball legend'), ('Magic Johnson', 'is', 'Hall of Famer')]	0
According to the web search results, the recommended first line of treatment for HER2+ metastatic breast cancer is **chemotherapy plus HER2-directed therapy***, which are drugs that target the HER2 protein on cancer cells.	By Wade Smith, MD, as told to Kara Mayer Robinson A diagnosis of HER2-positive breast cancer can be frightening at first, especially when you hear the words "aggressive cancer." But there's reason to be optimistic about today's advances in treatment. There isn't a one-size-fits-all approach, but with the help of your doctors, you can choose what's best for you.	[('HER2+ metastatic breast cancer', 'has recommended treatment of', 'chemotherapy plus HER2-directed therapy'), ('HER2-directed therapy', 'targets', 'HER2 protein'), ('HER2 protein', 'located on', 'cancer cells'), ('chemotherapy plus HER2-directed therapy', 'is', 'first line of treatment')]	[('HER2-positive breast cancer', 'is described as', 'aggressive cancer'), ('HER2-positive breast cancer', 'has', 'advances in treatment'), ('HER2-positive breast cancer', 'requires', 'unique treatment approach'), ('HER2-positive breast cancer', 'is different from', 'other breast cancer types'), ('Treatment', 'is influenced by', 'tumor size'), ('Treatment', 'is influenced by', 'cancer metastasis status'), ('Treatment', 'is influenced by', 'risk of recurrence'), ('Common treatment', 'consists of', 'chemotherapy plus HER2-directed therapy'), ('Treatment sequence', 'follows', 'surgery'), ('Common treatment', 'is best for', 'patients with large tumors'), ('Common treatment', 'is best for', 'cancer in regional lymph nodes'), ('Monoclonal antibodies', 'includes', 'trastuzumab (Herceptin), (Trastuzumab', 'is', 'first-in-its-class precision therapy drug'), ('Trastuzumab', 'is approved by', 'FDA'), ('Trastuzumab', 'is approved for', 'HER2+ breast cancer'), ('Alternative treatment sequence', 'starts with', 'surgery'), ('Alternative treatment sequence', 'is followed by', 'chemotherapy and HER2-directed therapy'), ('Alternative treatment sequence', 'is suitable for', 'small tumors without lymph node involvement'), ('Endocrine therapy', 'involves', 'daily pill'), ('Endocrine therapy', 'duration', 'at least 5 years'), ('Endocrine therapy', 'starts after', 'completion of chemotherapy and surgery')]	0
Bariatric surgery leads to positive outcomes in mental health.	Your Treatment Is Unique HER2-positive breast cancer is different from other breast cancer types, so your treatment won't necessarily be the same as someone else who has a different form of breast cancer. It may also be different than another HER2-positive patient's therapy. Each cancer is unique, so doctors try to develop the treatment course that's best for you. Things to consider include the size of your tumor, whether the cancer has metastasized (spread), or your overall risk of recurrence.	[('Bariatric surgery', 'leads to', 'positive outcomes'), ('positive outcomes', 'occurs in', 'mental health'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'improves', 'mental health')]	[('Bariatric surgery', 'associated with', 'sustained weight loss'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'associated with', 'improved physical health status'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'leads to', 'postoperative decreases in depression'), ('Depression', 'has prevalence of', '19%'), ('Binge eating disorder', 'has prevalence of', '17%'), ('PubMed', 'used as', 'data source'), ('MEDLINE on OVID', 'used as', 'data source'), ('PsycINFO', 'used as', 'data source'), ('Mental health conditions', 'common in', 'bariatric surgery patients'), ('Depression', 'type of', 'mental health condition'), ('Binge eating disorder', 'is type of', 'mental health condition'), ('GRADE criteria', 'used for', 'quality of evidence rating'), ('Mental health conditions', 'has unclear association with', 'postoperative weight loss'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'reduces', 'depression prevalence'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'reduces', 'depressive symptoms')]	1
IMPORTANCE Bariatric surgery is associated with sustained weight loss and improved physical health status for severely obese individuals. Mental health problems are known to affect patients seeking bariatric surgery; however, the prevalence of these conditions and whether they are associated with postoperative outcomes remains unknown.	OBJECTIVE To determine the prevalence of mental health conditions among bariatric surgery candidates and recipients, to evaluate the association between preoperative mental health conditions and health outcomes following bariatric surgery, and to evaluate the association between surgery and the clinical course of mental health conditions.	[('Bariatric surgery', 'leads to', 'positive outcomes'), ('positive outcomes', 'occurs in', 'mental health'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'improves', 'mental health')]	[('Bariatric surgery', 'associated with', 'sustained weight loss'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'associated with', 'improved physical health status'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'leads to', 'postoperative decreases in depression'), ('Depression', 'has prevalence of', '19%'), ('Binge eating disorder', 'has prevalence of', '17%'), ('PubMed', 'used as', 'data source'), ('MEDLINE on OVID', 'used as', 'data source'), ('PsycINFO', 'used as', 'data source'), ('Mental health conditions', 'common in', 'bariatric surgery patients'), ('Depression', 'type of', 'mental health condition'), ('Binge eating disorder', 'is type of', 'mental health condition'), ('GRADE criteria', 'used for', 'quality of evidence rating'), ('Mental health conditions', 'has unclear association with', 'postoperative weight loss'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'reduces', 'depression prevalence'), ('Bariatric surgery', 'reduces', 'depressive symptoms')]	
DATA SOURCES We searched PubMed, MEDLINE on OVID, and PsycINFO for studies published between January 1988 and November 2015. Study quality was assessed using an adapted tool for risk of bias; quality of evidence was rated based on GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation) criteria.	FINDINGS We identified 68 publications meeting inclusion criteria: 59 reporting the prevalence of preoperative mental health conditions (65,363 patients) and 27 reporting associations between preoperative mental health conditions and postoperative outcomes (50,182 patients). Among patients seeking and undergoing bariatric surgery, the most common mental health conditions, based on random-effects estimates of prevalence, were depression (19% [95% CI, 14%–25%]) and binge eating disorder (17% [95% CI, 13%–21%]). There was conflicting evidence regarding the association between preoperative mental health conditions and postoperative weight loss. Neither depression nor binge eating disorder was consistently associated with differences in weight outcomes. Bariatric surgery was, however, consistently associated with postoperative decreases in the number of days of depression (7 studies; 8%–74% decrease) and the severity of depressive symptoms (6 studies; 40%–100% decrease).			
CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE Mental health conditions are common among bariatric surgery patients—in particular, depression and binge eating disorder. There is inconsistent evidence regarding the association between preoperative mental health conditions and postoperative weight loss. Moderate-quality evidence supports an association between bariatric surgery and lower rates of depression postoperatively.				

Figure 8: Samples of benchmark data. Each sample consists of a claim, its corresponding document, and the extracted KGs (claim_kg and doc_kg), along with the assigned label (Support or Unsupport).

Claim	Doc	Claim_kg	Doc_kg	Label
Hunter Biden seeks subpoenas against Trump for alleged case pressure by citing various sources.	Hunter Biden's attorney Abbe Lowell argued the information was essential to his defense that the case is "possibly, a vindictive or selective prosecution arising from an unrelenting pressure campaign beginning in the last administration," that violated his rights. The subpoena request is before U.S. District Judge Maryellen Noreika, a Trump nominee whose questions about a proposed plea deal over the summer ended with the agreement imploding in July. Hunter Biden had been expected to plead guilty to misdemeanor tax charges in an agreement that would have spared him prosecution on a gun count if he stayed out of trouble for two years. It had been pilloried as a "sweetheart deal" by Trump and congressional Republicans investigating nearly every aspect of Hunter Biden's business dealings and investigating Department's handling of the case. Hunter Biden has taken a more aggressive legal approach in recent months, striking back with lawsuits against Republican Trump allies who have traded and passed around private data from a laptop that purportedly belonged to him. No new tax charges have yet been filed, but the special counsel overseeing the case has indicated they are possible in Washington or in California, where Hunter Biden lives.	[("Hunter Biden", "seeks", "subpoenas"), ("Hunter Biden", "against", "Trump"), ("Hunter Biden", "citing", "various sources"), ("Hunter Biden", "alleged case pressure by", "Trump")]	[("Hunter Biden", "has attorney", "Abbe Lowell"), ("Abbe Lowell", "argued", "importance of information for defense"), ("Abbe Lowell", "stated", "case is possibly vindictive or selective prosecution"), ("Abbe Lowell", "mentioned", "unrelenting pressure campaign starting in previous administration"), ("Abbe Lowell", "asserted", "pressure campaign violated rights"), ("Subpoena request", "before", "U.S. District Judge Maryellen Noreika"), ("Maryellen Noreika", "questioned about plea deal proposal"), ("Maryellen Noreika", "questioned about plea deal proposal", "summer"), ("Hunter Biden", "expected to plead guilty to", "misdemeanor tax charges"), ("Plea deal", "would have spared prosecution on gun count", "if stayed out of trouble for two years"), ("Plea deal", "criticized as", "sweetheart deal"), ("Sweetheart deal", "criticized by", "Trump and congressional Republicans"), ("Hunter Biden", "filed lawsuits against", "Republican Trump allies"), ("Private data laptop", "purportedly belonged to", "Hunter Biden")]	0
Johnson's spending bill tensions reveal deep divides within Republican ranks and with Democrats.	Johnson's office did not respond to a request for comment. McCarthy was ousted by eight hardliners on Oct. 3, after averting an Oct. 1 shutdown with a stopgap bill that ran afoul of the far right but won overwhelming support from Democrats. Johnson, who commanded respect within the far right in an outspoken Christian conservative, faced hardliners this week with his own short-term spending bill to maintain existing government funding levels and programs into early 2024. The bill passed the House with support from 209 Democrats and only 127 Republicans - a troubling sign for the new speaker. He had also angered hardliners by suspending House rules to circumvent their hopes of blocking debate on the measure.	[("Johnson's spending bill", "reveals", "deep divides"), ("deep divides", "within", "Republican ranks"), ("deep divides", "with", "Democrats")]	[("Johnson", "did not respond to", "request for comment"), ("McCarthy", "was ousted by", "eight hardliners"), ("eight hardliners", "ousted", "McCarthy"), ("McCarthy", "ousted on", "Oct. 3"), ("McCarthy", "averted an Oct. 1 shutdown", "with a stopgap bill"), ("stopgap bill", "ran afoul of", "the far right"), ("stopgap bill", "won overwhelming support from", "Democrats"), ("Johnson", "commanded respect within the far right", "as an outspoken Christian conservative"), ("Johnson", "faced hardliners this week with", "his short-term spending bill"), ("short-term spending bill", "passed the House with support from", "209 Democrats"), ("short-term spending bill", "only 127 Republicans supported"), ("short-term spending bill", "troubling sign for", "new speaker"), ("Johnson", "angered hardliners by", "suspending House rules"), ("House rules", "circumvented", "hardliners' hopes of blocking debate on the measure")]	0
He composed the music to the national anthem of Greenland.	A renowned composer's creation has found a lasting place among the patriotic symbols of Greenland, a country nestled between the frosty expanses of the Arctic and the vast domains of the Atlantic oceans. This melody, adopted with reverence, has since become the backbone of Greenland's official national anthem, a tune steeped in the nation's rich and storied fabric. Cultural representatives in Greenland recently came together to mark the significant anniversary of their national anthem, which, when translated into English, bears the profound title "Our Country, Who's Become So Old." In a ceremonial gathering steeped in tradition and pride, officials took a moment to underscore the importance of continuity by highlighting that the anthem's indigenous name, a deep-seated emblem of Greenlandic identity, has been preserved in its original form since the very day of its inception.	[("Greenland", "has", "national anthem"), ("He", "composed the music to", "Greenland's national anthem")]	[("Greenland", "has", "national anthem", "Melody"), ("Melody", "adopted with reverence"), ("Melody", "became", "backbone of Greenland's official national anthem"), ("Greenland's national anthem", "translated into English"), ("Our Country, Who's Become So Old"), ("Cultural representatives", "marked the significant anniversary of", "Greenland's national anthem"), ("Greenland's national anthem", "has indigenous name"), ("Indigenous name", "preserved in its original form", "since the very day of its inception"), ("Indigenous name", "deep-seated emblem of", "Greenlandic identity")]	1
Born on June 1, 1929, in East London, Neville Price was a South African long jumper who competed in the 1952 Summer Olympics.	In the summer of 1929, a warm celebration greeted the Price family as they welcomed a baby boy into their home within the vibrant, industrial folds of East London, on the city's bustling eastern frontier. Birth records chronicling the era's new arrivals pinpoint that, on the outset of June, Neville stood alone as the district's only registered male infant. The threads of history weave forward to reveal, according to extant athletic archives, a sportsman by the name of Neville Price partaking in the fervor of international competition in the summer of 1952. Concurrently, the Olympic Games captivated the global sports audience, standing unchallenged as the season's premier athletic showdown. Further corroboration arrives via the roster of the Melbourne Games, where estimates place Neville Price among its entrants, specifically within the demanding track and field arena. Neville's prowess on the field, especially in the disciplines of long jumps and bounds, had garnered commendation, spotlighting a South African athlete whose flair for track and field events, particularly jumping, was noted as exceptional. Just last year, the athletics community convened in celebration of Neville Price's legacy, marking the anniversary of a national record he set in the long jump category, an accolade that cements his athletic contributions in the annals of sports history.	[("Greenland", "has", "national anthem"), ("He", "composed the music to", "Greenland's national anthem")]	[("Neville Price", "welcomed into", "Price family"), ("Price family", "resided in", "East London"), ("East London", "located on", "city's bustling eastern frontier"), ("Neville Price", "born on", "June 1st"), ("Neville Price", "participated in", "international competition in the summer of 1952"), ("Neville Price", "competed in", "track and field arena"), ("Neville Price", "excelled in", "disciplines involving leaps and bounds"), ("Neville Price", "was recognized for", "flair for track and field events, particularly jumping"), ("Neville Price", "set a national record in", "long jump category"), ("Neville Price", "celebrated for his legacy in", "athletics community"), ("Neville Price", "contributed to", "sports history through his achievements")]	1

Figure 9: Samples of training data.

Extract a knowledge graph (KG) from the following text. Follow these steps:

1. **Entities**: Identify all entities in the text. Ensure each entity is precise and specific.
2. **Relations**: Extract relationships between entities as triples: ["entity1", "relation", "entity2"].
3. **Coreference Resolution**: Unify references to the same entity (e.g., "Apple Inc." and "Apple" should be the same entity).

Important Requirements:

- The KG must not be empty. Ensure at least one triple is extracted.
- All entities mentioned in the text must be included in the KG, either as part of a triple or as a standalone entity if no relation is found.
- If no explicit relation is found between entities, create a generic relation like "related to" or "associated with" to ensure all entities are connected.
- Each triple must have three non-empty elements: ["entity1", "relation", "entity2"]. None of these elements can be empty or null.

Please only return the KG as a Python list of triples. For example:

```
<python>
[
["Apple Inc.", "founded by", "Steve Jobs"],
["Apple Inc.", "headquartered in", "Cupertino, California"],
["Apple Inc.", "produces", "iPhone"],
["Steve Jobs", "associated with", "Cupertino, California"]
]
</python>
```

Text: {TEXT}

TEXT

New AI model detects asymptomatic Covid-19 infections through device-recorded coughs. Vocal sentiments Prior to the pandemics onset, research groups already had been training algorithms on cellphone recordings of coughs to accurately diagnose conditions such as pneumonia and asthma. The model identified 98.5 percent of coughs from people confirmed with Covid-19, and of those, it accurately detected all of the asymptomatic coughs. When they fed the model new cough recordings, it accurately identified 98.5 percent of coughs from people who were confirmed to have Covid-19, including 100 percent of coughs from asymptomatics who reported they did not have symptoms but had tested positive for the virus.

Extracted Triples

```
<python>
[
    ('AI model', 'detects', 'asymptomatic Covid-19 infections'),
    ('AI model', 'uses', 'device-recorded coughs'),
    ('research groups', 'trained', 'algorithms'),
    ('algorithms', 'diagnose', 'pneumonia'),
    ('algorithms', 'diagnose', 'asthma'),
    ('algorithms', 'analyze', 'cellphone recordings of coughs'),
    ('AI model', 'identified', 'Covid-19 coughs'),
    ('AI model', 'detection accuracy', '98.5 percent'),
    ('AI model', 'detection accuracy for asymptomatics', '100 percent'),
    ('asymptomatic patients', 'tested positive for', 'Covid-19'),
    ('asymptomatic patients', 'reported', 'no symptoms')
]
</python>
```

Figure 10: Prompt for Triplets Extraction.

Question: Does the Document support the Claim? Please Answer in one word in the form of '\support\' or '\unsupport\'.

Document:
{DOCUMENT_TEXT}

Claim:
{CLAIM_TEXT}

Question: Does the Document support the Claim? Please Answer in one word in the form of '\support\' or '\unsupport\'.

Document:
{DOCUMENT_TEXT}

Claim:
{CLAIM_TEXT}

Conclusion:
- Return "1" if the given document fully support the claim.
- Return "0" the given document don't support the claim.
- Giving the Final result in the format: "Final Result: 1" for supported or "Final Result: 0" for unsupported.

DOCUMENT TEXT

New AI model detects asymptomatic Covid-19 infections through device-recorded coughs Vocal sentiments Prior to the pandemics onset, research groups already had been training algorithms on cellphone recordings of coughs to accurately diagnose conditions such as pneumonia and asthma. The model identified 98.5 percent of coughs from people confirmed with Covid-19, and of those, it accurately detected all of the asymptomatic coughs. When they fed the model new cough recordings, it accurately identified 98.5 percent of coughs from people who were confirmed to have Covid-19, including 100 percent of coughs from asymptomatics who reported they did not have symptoms but had tested positive for the virus.

CLAIM TEXT

Artificial intelligence model detects asymptomatic covid-19 infections through cellphone-recorded coughs.

OUTPUT

[Final Result: 1]

Figure 11: Prompt for Fact-checking.