

Large Language Models for Generative Information Extraction: A Survey

Derong Xu^{†1,2}, Wei Chen^{†1}, Wenjun Peng¹, Chao Zhang¹, Tong Xu(\boxtimes)¹, Xiangyu Zhao(\boxtimes)², Xian Wu(\boxtimes)³, Yefeng Zheng³, Yang Wang⁴, Enhong Chen(\boxtimes)¹

1 University of Science and Technology of China & State Key Laboratory of Cognitive Intelligence, Hefei 230000, China

2 City University of Hong Kong, Hongkong, China

3 Jarvis Research Center, Tencent YouTu Lab, Beijing 100029, China

4 Anhui Conch Information Technology Engineering Co., Ltd., Hefei 230000, China

© Higher Education Press 2024

Abstract Information extraction (IE) aims to extract structural knowledge from plain natural language texts. Recently, generative Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in text understanding and generation. As a result, numerous works have been proposed to integrate LLMs for IE tasks based on a generative paradigm. To conduct a comprehensive systematic review and exploration of LLM efforts for IE tasks, in this study, we survey the most recent advancements in this field. We first present an extensive overview by categorizing these works in terms of various IE subtasks and techniques, and then we empirically analyze the most advanced methods and discover the emerging trend of IE tasks with LLMs. Based on a thorough review conducted, we identify several insights in technique and promising research directions that deserve further explo-

ration in future studies. We maintain a public repository and consistently update related resources¹.

Keywords Information Extraction, Large Language Models, Review

1 Introduction

Information Extraction (IE) is a crucial domain in natural language processing (NLP) that converts plain text into structured knowledge (e.g., entities, relations, and events), and serves as a foundational requirement for a wide range of downstream tasks,

¹<https://github.com/quqxiu/Awesome-LLM4IE-Papers>

Received month dd, yyyy; accepted month dd, yyyy

E-mail: {derongxu,chenweicw,pengwj,zclfe00}@mail.ustc.edu.cn, {tongxu,cheneh}@ustc.edu.cn,xianzhao@cityu.edu.hk, {kevinxwu,yefengzheng}@tencent.com, wangyang@chinaconch.com

†Equal Contribution.




Fig. 1 LLMs have been extensively explored for generative IE. These studies encompass various IE techniques, specialized frameworks designed for a single subtask, and universal frameworks capable of addressing multiple subtasks simultaneously.

such as knowledge graph construction [245], knowledge reasoning [51] and question answering [180]. Typical IE tasks consist of Named Entity Recognition (NER), Relation Extraction (RE) and Event Extraction (EE) [64, 133, 175, 204]. On the other hand, the emergence of large language models (LLMs) (e.g., GPT-4 [1]) has greatly promoted the development of NLP, due to their extraordinary capabilities in text understanding and generation. Therefore, there has been a recent surge of interest in generative IE methods [166, 175] that adopt LLMs to generate structural information rather than extracting structural information from plain text. These methods have been proven to be more practical in real-world scenarios compared to discriminated methods [24, 128], as they efficiently handle schemas containing millions of entities without significant performance degradation [84].

On the one hand, LLMs have attracted significant attention from researchers in exploring their potentials for various scenarios of IE. In addition to excelling in individual IE tasks, LLMs possess a

remarkable ability to effectively model various IE tasks in a universal format. This is conducted by capturing inter-task dependencies with instructive prompts, and achieves consistent performance [47, 52, 111, 133, 160, 175, 204]. On the other hand, recent works have shown the outstanding generalization of LLMs to not only learn from IE training data through fine-tuning [16, 79, 160, 160, 223], but also extract information in few-shot and even zero-shot scenarios relying solely on in-context examples or instructions [5, 203, 205, 210, 220]. However, for above two groups of research works: 1) the universal frameworks for multiple tasks; 2) cutting-edge learning techniques for scenarios with limited training data, existing surveys [149, 225, 247] do not provide a comprehensive exploration of these areas.

In this survey, we provide a comprehensive exploration of LLMs for generative IE, as illustrated in Figure 1. To achieve this, we categorize existing methods mainly using two taxonomies: (1) a taxonomy of numerous IE subtasks, which aims to

classify different types of information that can be extracted individually or uniformly, and (2) a taxonomy of IE techniques, which categorizes various novel approaches that utilize LLMs for generative IE, particularly on low-resource scenarios. In addition, we present a comprehensive review of studies that specifically focus on the application of IE techniques in various domains. And we discuss studies that aim to evaluate and analyze the performance of LLMs for IE. We also compare several representative methods to gain deeper understanding of their potentials and limitations, and provide insightful analysis on future directions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first survey on generative IE with LLMs.

The remaining part of this survey is organized as follows: We first introduce the definition of generative IE and target of all subtasks in Section 2. Then, in Section 3, we introduce representative models for each task and universal IE, and compare their performance. In Section 4, we summarize different learning techniques of LLMs for IE. Additionally, we introduce works proposed for special domains in Section 5, and present recent studies that evaluate and analyze the abilities of LLMs on IE tasks in Section 6. Finally, we propose potential research directions for future studies in Section 7. In Section 8, we provide a comprehensive summary of the most commonly used LLMs and datasets statistics, as reference for researchers.

2 Preliminaries of Generative IE

In this section, we provide a formal definition of discriminative and generative IE and summarize the IE subtasks, as outlined in Ye et al. [225]. This survey focuses primarily on the tasks of Named Entity Recognition (NER), Relation Extraction (RE), and

Event Extraction (EE) [175, 204], as these are tasks that receive the most attention in IE papers.

(1) For a discriminative model, the objective is to maximize the likelihood of the data. This involves considering an annotated sentence x and a collection of potentially overlapping triples. $t_j = (s, r, o)$:

$$p_{cls}(t|x) = \prod_{(s,r,o) \in t_j} p((s, r, o)|x_j) \quad (1)$$

Another method of discrimination involves generating tags using sequential tagging for each position i . For a sentence x consisting of n words, n different tag sequences are annotated based on the "BIESO" (Begin, Inside, End, Single, Outside) notation schema. During the training of the model, the objective is to maximize the log-likelihood of the target tag sequence by utilizing the hidden vector h_i at each position i :

$$p_{tag}(y|x) = \frac{\exp(h_i, y_i)}{\exp(\exp(h_i, y'_i))} \quad (2)$$

(2) The three types of IE tasks can be formulated in a generative manner. Given an input text (e.g., sentence or document) with a sequence of n tokens $\mathcal{X} = [x_1, \dots, x_n]$, a prompt \mathcal{P} , and the target extraction sequence $\mathcal{Y} = [y_1, \dots, y_m]$, the objective is to maximize the conditional probability in an autoregressive formulation:

$$p_{\theta}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}) = \prod_{i=1}^m p_{\theta}(y_i|\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{P}, y_{<i}), \quad (3)$$

where θ donates the parameters of LLMs, which can be frozen or trainable. In the era of LLMs, several works have proposed appending extra prompts or instructions \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{X} to enhance the comprehensibility of the task for LLMs [204]. Even though the input text \mathcal{X} remains the same, the target sequence varies for each task:




Fig. 2 Taxonomy of research in generative IE using LLMs. Some papers have been omitted due to space limitations.

- **Named Entity Recognition (NER)** includes two tasks: **Entity Identification** and **Entity Typing**. The former task is concerned with identifying spans of entities, and the latter task focuses on assigning types to these identified entities.
- **Relation Extraction (RE)** may have different settings in different works. We categorize it using three terms following the literature [133, 204]: (1) **Relation Classification** refers to classifying the relation type between two given entities; (2) **Relation Triplet** refers to identifying the relation type and the corresponding head and tail entity spans; (3) **Relation Strict** refers to giving the correct relation type, the span, and the type of head and tail entity.
- **Event Extraction (EE)** can be divided into two subtasks [198]: (1) **Event Detection** (also known as Event Trigger Extraction in some works) aims to identify and classify the trigger word and type that most clearly represents the occurrence of an event. (2) **Event Arguments Extraction** aims to identify and classify arguments with specific roles in the events from the sentences.

3 LLMs for Different Information Extraction Tasks

In this section, we first present a introduction to the relevant LLM technologies for IE subtasks, including NER (§3.1), RE (§3.2), and EE (§3.3). We also conduct experimental analysis to evaluate the performance of various methods on representative datasets for three subtasks. Furthermore, we categorize universal IE frameworks into two categories: natural language (NL-LLMs) and code language

(Code-LLMs), to discuss how they model the three distinct tasks using a unified paradigm (§3.4).

3.1 Named Entity Recognition

NER is a crucial component of IE and can be seen as a predecessor or subtask of RE and EE. It is also a fundamental task in other NLP tasks, thus attracting significant attention from researchers to explore new possibilities in the era of LLMs [6, 11, 32, 45, 50, 70, 75, 81, 108, 110, 144, 148, 151, 152, 156, 161, 178, 187, 226]. Considering the gap between the sequence labeling and generation models, GPT-NER [203] transformed NER into a generative task and proposed a self-verification strategy to rectify the mislabeling of NULL inputs as entities.

Xie et al. [218] proposed a training-free self-improving framework that uses LLM to predict on the unlabeled corpus to obtain pseudo demonstrations, thereby enhancing the performance of LLM on zero-shot NER.

Table 1 shows the comparison of NER on five main datasets, which are obtained from their original papers. We can observe that: 1) the models in few-shot and zero-shot settings still have a huge performance gap behind the SFT and DA. 2) Even though there is little difference between backbones, the performance varies greatly between methods under the ICL paradigm. For example, GPT-NER opens up at least a 6% F1 value gap with other methods on each dataset, and up to about 19% higher. 3) Compared to ICL, there are only minor differences in performance between different models after SFT, even though the parameters in their backbones can differ by up to a few hundred times.




Fig. 3 The comparison of prompts of NL-LLMs and Code-LLMs for universal IE. Both NL-based and code-based methods attempt to construct a universal schema, but they differ in terms of prompt format and the way they utilize the generation capabilities of LLMs. This figure is adopted from [204] and [64].

3.2 Relation Extraction

RE also plays an important role in IE, which usually has different setups in different studies as mentioned in Section 2. To address the poor performance of LLMs on RE tasks due to the low incidence of RE in instruction-tuning datasets, as indicated by Gutiérrez et al. [66], QA4RE [233] introduced a framework that enhances LLMs' performance by aligning RE tasks with QA tasks. GPT-RE [196] incorporates task-aware representations and enriching demonstrations with reasoning logic to improve the low relevance between entity and relation and the inability to explain input-label mappings. Due to the large number of predefined relation types and uncontrolled LLMs, Li et al. [109]

proposed to integrate LLM with a natural language inference module to generate relation triples, enhancing document-level relation datasets.

As shown in the Table 2 and 3, we statistically found that universal IE models are generally better solving harder Relation Strict problems due to learning the dependencies between multi-tasks [133, 160], while the task-specific methods solve simpler RE subtasks (e.g. relation classification). In addition, compared with NER, it can be found that the performance differences between models in RE are more obvious, indicating that the potential of LLM in RE task.

Representative Model	Paradigm	Uni.	Backbone	ACE04	ACE05	CoNLL03	Onto. 5	GENIA
DEEPSTRUCT [198]	CDL		GLM-10B	-	28.1	44.4	42.5	47.2
Xie et al. [218]	ZS Pr		GPT-3.5-turbo	-	32.27	74.51	-	52.06
CODEIE [111]	ICL	✓	Code-davinci-002	55.29	54.82	82.32	-	-
Code4UIE [64]	ICL	✓	Text-davinci-003	60.1	60.9	83.6	-	-
PromptNER [5]	ICL		GPT-4	-	-	83.48	-	58.44
Xie et al. [218]	ICL		GPT-3.5-turbo	-	55.54	84.51	-	58.72
GPT-NER [203]	ICL		Text-davinci-003	74.2	73.59	90.91	82.2	64.42
TANL [160]	SFT	✓	T5-base	-	84.9	91.7	89.8	76.4
Cui et al. [31]	SFT		BART	-	-	92.55	-	-
Yan et al. [223]	SFT		BART-large	86.84	84.74	93.24	90.38	79.23
UIE [133]	SFT	✓	T5-large	86.89	85.78	92.99	-	-
DEEPSTRUCT [198]	SFT	✓	GLM-10B	-	86.9	93.0	87.8	80.8
Xia et al. [215]	SFT		BART-large	87.63	86.22	93.48	90.63	79.49
InstructUIE [60]	SFT	✓	Flan-T5-11B	-	86.66	92.94	90.19	74.71
UniNER [249]	SFT		LLaMA-7B	87.5	87.6	-	89.1	80.6
GoLLIE [175]	SFT	✓	Code-LLaMA-34B	-	89.6	93.1	84.6	-
EnTDA [73]	DA		T5-base	88.21	87.56	93.88	91.34	82.25
USM [†] [128]	SFT	✓	RoBERTa-large	87.62	87.14	93.16	-	-
RexUIE [†] [119]	SFT	✓	DeBERTa-v3-large	87.25	87.23	93.67	-	-
Mirror [†] [251]	SFT	✓	DeBERTa-v3-large	87.16	85.34	92.73	-	-

Table 1 Comparison of LLMs for named entity recognition (identification & typing) with the Micro-F1 metric (%). [†] indicates that the model is discriminative. We demonstrate some universal and discriminative models for comparison. IE techniques include Cross-Domain Learning (**CDL**), Zero-Shot Prompting (**ZS Pr**), In-Context Learning (**ICL**), Supervised Fine-Tuning (**SFT**), Data Augmentation (**DA**). **Uni.** denotes whether the model is universal. Onto. 5 denotes the OntoNotes 5.0. Details of datasets (§8) and backbones (§8) are presented in Appendix. The settings for all subsequent tables are consistent with this format.

3.3 Event Extraction

Events can be defined as specific occurrences or incidents that happen in a given context. Recently, many studies [125, 130] aim to understand events and capture their correlations by extracting event triggers and arguments using LLMs, which is essential for various reasoning tasks [8]. For example, Code4Struct [205] leveraged LLMs to translate text into code to tackle structured prediction tasks, using programming language features to introduce external knowledge and constraints through alignment between structure and code. Considering the interrelation between different arguments in

the extended context, PGAD [135] employed a text diffusion model to create a variety of context-aware prompt representations, enhancing both sentence-level and document-level event argument extraction by identifying multiple role-specific argument span queries and coordinating them with the context.

As can be seen from results of recent studies in Table 4, vast majority of current methods are based on SFT paradigm, and only a few methods that use LLMs for either zero-shot or few-shot learning. In addition, generative methods outperform discriminative ones by a wide margin, especially in metric for argument classification task, indicating the

great potential of generative LLMs for EE.

3.4 Universal Information Extraction

Different IE tasks vary a lot, with different optimization objectives and task-specific schemas, requiring separate models to handle the complexity of different IE tasks, settings, and scenarios [133]. As shown in Fig. 2, many works solely focus on a subtask of IE. However, recent advancements in LLMs have led to the proposal of a unified generative framework in several studies [175, 204]. This framework aims to model all IE tasks, capturing the common abilities of IE and learning the dependencies across multiple tasks. The prompt format for Uni-IE can typically be divided into natural language-based LLMs (NL-LLMs) and code-based LLMs (code-LLMs), as illustrated in Fig. 3.

NL-LLMs. NL-based methods unify all IE tasks in a universal natural language schema. For instance, UIE [133] proposed a unified text-to-structure generation framework that encodes extraction structures, and captured common IE abilities through a structured extraction language. InstructUIE [204] enhanced UIE by constructing expert-written instructions for fine-tuning LLMs to consistently model different IE tasks and capture the inter-task dependency. Additionally, ChatIE [210] explored the use of LLMs like ChatGPT [155] in zero-shot prompting, transforming the task into a multi-turn question-answering problem.

Code-LLMs. On the other hand, code-based methods unify IE tasks by generating code with a universal programming schema [205]. Code4UIE [64] proposed a universal retrieval-augmented code generation framework, which leverages Python classes to define schemas and uses in-context learning to generate codes that extract structural knowledge from texts. Besides, CodeKGC [9] leveraged the struc-

tural knowledge inherent in code and employed schema-aware prompts and rationale-enhanced generation to improve performance. To enable LLMs to adhere to guidelines out-of-the-box, GoLLIE [175] enhanced zero-shot ability on unseen IE tasks by aligning with annotation guidelines.

In general, NL-LLMs are trained on a wide range of text and can understand and generate human language, which allows the prompts and instructions to be conciser and easier to design. However, NL-LLMs may produce unnatural outputs due to the distinct syntax and structure of IE tasks [9], which differ from the training data. Code, being a formalized language, possesses the inherent capability to accurately represent knowledge across diverse schemas, which makes it more suitable for structural prediction [64]. But code-based methods often require a substantial amount of text to define a Python class (see Fig. 3), which in turn limits the sample size of the context. Through experimental comparison in Table 1, 2, and 4, we can observe that Uni-IE models after SFT outperform task-specific models in the NER, RE, and EE tasks for most datasets.

4 Techniques of LLMs for Generative IE

In this section, we categorize recent methods based on their techniques, including **Data Augmentation** (§4.1, refers to enhancing information by applying various transformations to the existing data using LLMs), **Prompt Design** (§4.2, refers to the use of task-specific instructions or prompts, to direct the behavior of a model.), **Zero-shot Learning** (§4.3, refers to generating answer without any training examples for the specific IE tasks), **Constrained Decoding Generation** (§4.4, refers to the process

Representative Model	Technique	Uni.	Backbone	NYT	ACE05	ADE	CoNLL04	SciERC
CodeKGC [9]	ZS Pr	✓	Text-davinci-003	-	-	42.8	35.9	15.3
CODEIE [111]	ICL	✓	Code-davinci-002	32.17	14.02	-	53.1	7.74
CodeKGC [9]	ICL	✓	Text-davinci-003	-	-	64.6	49.8	24.0
Code4UIE [64]	ICL	✓	Text-davinci-002	54.4	17.5	58.6	54.4	-
REBEL [16]	SFT		BART-large	91.96	-	82.21	75.35	-
UIE [133]	SFT	✓	T5-large	-	66.06	-	75.0	36.53
InstructUIE [204]	SFT	✓	Flan-T5-11B	90.47	-	82.31	78.48	45.15
GoLLIE [175]	SFT	✓	Code-LLaMA-34B	-	70.1	-	-	-
USM [†] [128]	SFT	✓	RoBERTa-large	-	67.88	-	78.84	37.36
RexUIE [†] [119]	SFT	✓	DeBERTa-v3-large	-	64.87	-	78.39	38.37

Table 2 Comparison of LLMs for relation extraction with the “relation strict” [133] Micro-F1 metric (%). [†] indicates that the model is discriminative.

Representative Model	Technique	Uni.	Backbone	TACRED	Re-TACRED	TACREV	SemEval
QA4RE [233]	ZS Pr		Text-davinci-003	59.4	61.2	59.4	43.3
SUMASK [100]	ZS Pr		GPT-3.5-turbo-0301	79.6	73.8	75.1	-
GPT-RE [196]	ICL		Text-davinci-003	72.15	-	-	91.9
Xu et al. [220]	ICL		Text-davinci-003	31.0	51.8	31.9	-
REBEL [16]	SFT		BART-large	-	90.36	-	-
Xu et al. [220]	DA		Text-davinci-003	37.4	66.2	41.0	-

Table 3 Comparison of LLMs for relation classification with the Micro-F1 metric (%).

of generating text while adhering to specific constraints or rule), **Few-shot Learning** (§4.5, refers to the generalization from a small number of labeled examples by training or in-context learning), **Supervised Fine-tuning** (§4.6, refers to further training LLMs on IE tasks using labeled data), to highlight the commonly used approaches for adapting LLMs to IE.

4.1 Data Augmentation

Data augmentation involves generating meaningful and diverse data to effectively enhance the training examples or information, while avoiding the introduction of unrealistic, misleading, and offset patterns. Recent powerful LLMs also demonstrate remarkable performance in data generation tasks [211], which has attracted the attention of many researchers using LLMs to generate synthetic data

for IE [109, 142, 186, 193, 202, 220, 236]. It can be roughly divided into four strategies according to their techniques, as shown in Fig. 4.

Data Annotation. This strategy directly generates labeled structural data using LLMs. For instance, Zhang et al. [236] proposed LLMaAA to improve accuracy and data efficiency by employing LLMs as annotators within an active learning loop, thereby optimizing both the annotation and training processes. AugURE [202] employed within-sentence pairs augmentation and cross-sentence pairs extraction to enhance the diversity of positive pairs for unsupervised RE, and introduced margin loss for sentence pairs. Li et al. [109] addresses the challenge of document-level relation extraction from a long context, and proposes an automated annotation method for DocRE that combines a LLM with a natural language inference module to generate re-

Representative Model	Technique	Uni.	Backbone	Trg-I	Trg-C	Arg-I	Arg-C
Code4Struct [205]	ZS Pr		Code-davinci-002	-	-	50.6	36.0
Code4UIE [64]	ICL	✓	GPT-3.5-turbo-16k	-	37.4	-	21.3
Code4Struct [205]	ICL		Code-davinci-002	-	-	62.1	58.5
TANL [160]	SFT	✓	T5-base	72.9	68.4	50.1	47.6
Text2Event [132]	SFT		T5-large	-	71.9	-	53.8
BART-Gen [112]	SFT		BART-large	-	-	69.9	66.7
UIE [133]	SFT	✓	T5-large	-	73.36	-	54.79
GTEE-DYNPREF [125]	SFT		BART-large	-	72.6	-	55.8
DEEPSTRUCT [198]	SFT	✓	GLM-10B	73.5	69.8	59.4	56.2
PAIE [139]	SFT		BART-large	-	-	75.7	72.7
PGAD [135]	SFT		BART-base	-	-	74.1	70.5
QGA-EE [130]	SFT		T5-large	-	-	75.0	72.8
InstructUIE [204]	SFT	✓	Flan-T5-11B	-	77.13	-	72.94
GOLLIE [175]	SFT	✓	Code-LLaMA-34B	-	71.9	-	68.6
USM [†] [128]	SFT	✓	RoBERTa-large	-	72.41	-	55.83
RexUIE [†] [119]	SFT	✓	DeBERTa-v3-large	-	75.17	-	59.15
Mirror [†] [251]	SFT	✓	DeBERTa-v3-large	-	74.44	-	55.88

Table 4 Comparison of Micro-F1 Values for Event Extraction on ACE05. Evaluation tasks include: Trigger Identification (Trg-I), Trigger Classification (Trg-C), Argument Identification (Arg-I), and Argument Classification (Arg-C). [†] indicates that the model is discriminative.

lation triples.

Knowledge Retrieval. This strategy effectively retrieves related information from LLMs for IE, which is similar to retrieval augmentation generation (RAG) [56]. PGIM [107] presented a two-stage framework for multimodal NER, which leverages ChatGPT as an implicit knowledge base to heuristically retrieve auxiliary knowledge for more efficient entity prediction. Amalvy et al. [4] proposed to improve NER on long documents by generating a synthetic context retrieval training dataset, and training a neural context retriever. Chen and Feng [21] focuses on the task of Multimodal NER and RE, and showcases their approach to enhancing commonsense reasoning skills by employing a range of CoT prompts that encompass different aspects, including nouns, sentences, and multimodal inputs. Additionally, they employ data augmentation techniques such as style, entity, and image manipula-

tion to further improve the performance.

Inverse Generation. This strategy encourages LLMs to generate natural text or questions by utilizing the structural data provided as input, which aligns with the training paradigm of LLMs. For example, SynthIE [85] showed that LLMs can create high-quality synthetic data for complex tasks by reversing the task direction, and train new models that outperformed previous benchmarks. Rather than relying on ground-truth targets, which limits generalizability and scalability, STAR [137] generated structures from valid triggers and arguments, then generates passages with LLMs by designing fine-grained instructions, error identification, and iterative revision. In order to address the challenge of maintaining text coherence while preserving entities, EnTDA [73] proposed a method that involves manipulating the entity list of the original text. This manipulation includes adding, deleting, replacing,




Fig. 4 Comparison of data augmentation methods.

or swapping entities. And it further introduces a diversity beam search to enhance diversity in the Entity-to-text generation process.

Synthetic Datasets for Fine-tuning. This strategy involves generating some data for instruction-tuning by querying LLMs. Typically, this data is generated by a more powerful model for fine-tuning instructions in dialogues, and then distilled onto a smaller model, enabling it to also acquire stronger zero-shot capabilities [36, 230, 249]. For instance, UniversalNER [249] explored targeted distillation with mission-focused instruction tuning to train student models that excel in open NER, which used ChatGPT as the teacher model and distilled it into smaller UniversalNER model. GNER [36] proposed the integration of negative instances to enhance existing methods by introducing contextual information and improving label boundaries. The authors trained their model using Pile-NER, a dataset that includes approximately 240K entities across 13K distinct entity categories, which are sampled from the Pile Corpus [55] and processed using ChatGPT

to generate the entities. The results demonstrate improved zero-shot performance across unseen entity domains.

Overall, these strategies have their own advantages and disadvantages. While data annotation can directly meet task requirements, the ability of LLMs for structured generation still needs improvement. Knowledge retrieval can provide additional information about entities and relations, but it suffers from the hallucination problem and introduces noise. Inverse generation is aligned with the QA paradigm of LLMs. However, it requires structural data and there exists a gap between the generated pairs and the domain that needs to be addressed. Synthetic Datasets for Fine-tuning: While there have been notable advancements in zero-shot scenarios, the process of generating data from ChatGPT and fine-tuning smaller models presents a significant computational resource challenge.

4.2 Prompt Design

Prompt engineering is a technique employed to enhance the capabilities of LLMs without altering their network parameters [141, 174]. It entails utilizing task-specific instructions, known as prompts, to guide the behavior of model [20, 122]. The practice of prompt design has proven successful in various applications [199]. Undoubtedly, effective prompt design also plays a crucial role in improving the performance of LLMs on IE tasks. In this section, we categorize prompt design approaches based on different strategies and provide a detailed explanation of the underlying motivations behind these techniques:

Question Answer (QA). LLMs are typically instruction-tuned using a dialogue-based method, which creates a gap when compared to the structured prediction requirements of the IE task. Consequently, recent efforts have been made to employ a QA prompt approach to enhance LLMs and facilitate the generation of desired results more seamlessly [70, 100, 156, 210, 233]. For example, QA4RE [233] found that LLMs tend to perform poorly on RE because the instruction-tuning datasets used to train them have a low incidence of RE tasks, and thus proposes reformulating RE as multiple-choice QA to take advantage of the higher prevalence of QA tasks in instruction-tuning datasets. Li et al. [100] analyzed the limitations of existing RE prompts and proposes a new approach called summarize-and-ask prompting, which transforms zero-shot RE inputs into effective QA format using LLMs recursively. It also shows promise in extracting overlapping relations and effectively handling the challenge of none-of-the-above relations. ChatIE [210] proposed a two-stage framework to transform the zero-shot IE task into a multi-turn QA problem.

The framework initially identified the different types of elements, and then a sequential IE process is executed for each identified element type. Each stage utilized a multi-turn QA process, where prompts are constructed using templates and previously extracted information.

Chain-of-thought (CoT). CoT [208] is a prompting strategy used with LLMs to enhance their performance, by providing a step-wise and coherent reasoning chain as a prompt to guide the model’s response generation. CoT prompting has gained attention in recent years [29], and there is ongoing research exploring its effectiveness on IE tasks [5, 10, 21, 110, 194, 228]. PromptNER [5] combined LLMs with prompt-based heuristics and entity definitions. It prompted an LLM to generate a list of potential entities and their explanations based on provided entity type definitions. Bian et al. [10] proposed a two-step approach to improve Biomedical NER using LLMs. Their approach involved leveraging CoT to enable the LLM to tackle the Biomedical NER task in a step-by-step manner, breaking it down into entity span extraction and entity type determination. Yuan et al. [228] also proposed CoT prompt as a two-stage approach to guide ChatGPT in performing temporal relation reasoning for temporal RE task.

Self-Improvement. While COT technology can partially elicit the reasoning ability of LLM, it is unavoidable that LLM will still generate factual errors. As a result, there have been efforts [69, 218, 238] to employ LLMs for iterative self-verification and self-improvement, aiming to rectify the results. For instance, Xie et al. [218] proposed a training-free self-improving framework, which consists of three main steps. First, LLMs make predictions on unlabeled corpus, generating self-annotated dataset through self-consistency. Second, the authors ex-

plores different strategies to select reliable annotations. Finally, during inference, demonstrations from reliable self-annotated dataset are retrieved for in-context learning. ProgGen [69] involved guiding LLMs to engage in self-reflection within specific domains, resulting in the generation of domain-relevant attributes that contribute to the creation of training data enriched with attributes. Additionally, ProgGen employd a proactive strategy by generating entity terms in advance and constructing NER context data around these entities, thereby circumventing the challenges LLMs face when dealing with intricate structures.

4.3 Zero-shot Learning

The main challenges in zero-shot learning lie in enabling the model to effectively generalize for tasks and domains that it has not been trained on, as well as aligning the pre-trained paradigm of LLMs. Due to the large amount of knowledge embedded within, LLMs show impressive abilities in zero-shot scenarios of unseen tasks [93, 210]. To achieve zero-shot cross-domain generalization of LLMs in IE tasks, several works have been proposed [175, 204, 249]. These works offered a universal framework for modeling various IE tasks and domains, and introduced innovative training prompts, e.g., instruction [204] and guidelines [175], for learning and capturing the inter-task dependencies of known tasks and generalizing them to unseen tasks and domains. In terms of cross-type generalization, BART-Gen [112] proposed a document-level neural model, by formulating EE task as conditional generation, resulting in better performance and excellent portability on unseen event types.

On the other hand, in order to improve the ability of LLMs under zero shot prompts (no need for further fine-tuning), QA4RE [233] and ChatIE [210]

proposed to transform IE into a multi-turn question-answering problem for aligning it with QA task, which is a predominant task in instruction-tuning datasets. Li et al. [100] integrated the chain-of-thought approach and proposed the summarize-and-ask prompting to solve the challenge of ensuring the reliability of outputs from black box LLMs [140].

4.4 Constrained Decoding Generation

LLMs are pretrained models that are initially trained on the task of predicting the next token in a sequence. This pretraining allows researchers to leverage the advantages of these models for various NLP tasks [227, 247]. However, LLMs are primarily designed for generating free-form text and may not perform well on structured prediction tasks where only a limited set of outputs are valid.

To address this challenge, researchers have explored the use of Constrained generation for better decoding [57, 123, 133, 231]. Constrained decoding generation in autoregressive LLMs refers to the process of generating text while adhering to specific constraints or rules [7, 212, 244]. For example, Geng et al. [57] proposed using grammar-constrained decoding (GCD) as a solution to control the generation of LMs, ensuring that the output follows a given structure. The authors introduced input-dependent grammars to enhance flexibility, allowing the grammar to depend on the input and generate different output structures for different inputs. Unlike previous methods, which generate information token by token, Zaratiama et al. [231] introduced a new approach for extracting entities and relations by generating a linearized graph with nodes representing text spans and edges representing relation triplets. The model used a transformer encoder-decoder architecture with a pointing mechanism and a dynamic vocabulary of spans

and relation types, to capture the structural characteristics and boundaries while grounding the output in the original text.

4.5 Few-shot Learning

Few-shot learning has access to only a limited number of labeled examples, leading to challenges like overfitting and difficulty in capturing complex relationships [76]. Fortunately, scaling up the parameters of LLMs gives them amazing generalization capabilities compared to small pre-trained models, allowing them to achieve excellent performance in few-shot settings [5, 110]. Paolini et al. [160] proposed the Translation between Augmented Natural Languages (TANL) framework; Lu et al. [133] proposed a text-to-structure generation framework (called UIE); and Chen et al. [26] proposed collaborative domain-prefix tuning for NER (called cp-NER). These methods have achieved state-of-the-art performance and demonstrated effectiveness in few-shot setting. Despite the success of LLMs, they face challenges in training-free IE because of the difference between sequence labeling and text-generation models [66]. To overcome these limitations, GPT-NER [203] introduced a self-verification strategy, while GPT-RE [196] enhanced task-aware representations and incorporates reasoning logic into enriched demonstrations. These approaches demonstrate how to effectively leverage the capabilities of GPT for in-context learning. CODEIE [111] and CodeKGC [9] showed that converting IE tasks into code generation tasks with code-style prompts and in-context examples leads to superior performance compared to NL-LLMs. This is because code-style prompts provide a more effective representation of structured output, enabling them to effectively handle the complex dependencies in natural language.

4.6 Supervised Fine-tuning

Using all training data to fine-tune LLMs is the most common and promising method [?], which allows the model to capture the underlying structural patterns in the data, and generalize well to unseen samples. For example, DEEPSTRUCT [198] introduced structure pre-training on a collection of task-agnostic corpora to enhance the structural understanding of language models. UniNER [249] explored targeted distillation and mission-focused instruction tuning to train student models for broad applications, such as NER. GIELLM [52] fine-tuned LLMs using mixed datasets, which are collected to utilize the mutual reinforcement effect to enhance performance on multiple tasks.

5 Applications on Specific Domains

It is non-ignorable that LLMs have tremendous potential for extracting information from some specific domains, such as multimodal [17, 21, 107, 108], multilingual [77, 142, 147], medical [2, 10, 12, 66, 74, 75, 96, 110, 136, 142, 144, 146, 186], scientific [14, 27, 32, 42, 50], astronomical [45, 178], historical [58, 187], and legal [95, 153, 154].

For instance, Chen and Feng [21] introduced a conditional prompt distillation method that enhances a model's reasoning ability by combining text-image pairs with chain-of-thought knowledge from LLMs, significantly improving performance in multimodal NER and multimodal RE. Tang et al. [186] explored the potential of LLMs in the field of clinical text mining and proposed a novel training approach, which leverages synthetic data to enhance performance and address privacy issues. Dunn et al. [42] presented a sequence-to-sequence approach by using GPT-3 for joint NER and RE from complex scientific text, demonstrating its effectiveness in ex-

Domain	Method	Task	Paradigm	Backbone
Multimodal	Cai et al. [17]	NER	ICL	GPT-3.5
	PGIM [107]	NER	DA	BLIP2, GPT-3.5
	RiVEG [108]	NER	DA	Vicuna, LLaMA2, GPT-3.5
	Chen and Feng [21]	NER, RE	DA	BLIP2, GPT-3.5, GPT-4
Multilingual	Meoni et al. [142]	NER	DA	Text-davinci-003
	Naguib et al. [147]	NER	ICL	-
	Huang et al. [77]	EE	CDL	mBART, mT5
Medical	Bian et al. [10]	NER	DA	GPT-3.5
	Hu et al. [74]	NER	ZS Pr	GPT-3.5, GPT-4
	Meoni et al. [142]	NER	DA	Text-davinci-003
	Naguib et al. [147]	NER	ICL	-
	VANER [12]	NER	SFT	LLaMA2
	RT [110]	NER	ICL	GPT-4
	Munnangi et al. [146]	NER	ZS Pr, ICL, FS FT	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Claude-2, LLaMA2
	Monajatipoor et al. [144]	NER	SFT, ICL	-
	Hu et al. [75]	NER	ZS Pr, ICL	GPT-3.5, GPT-4
	Gutiérrez et al. [66]	NER, RE	ICL	GPT-3
	GPT3+R [2]	NER, RE	-	Text-davinci-002
	Labrak et al. [96]	NER, RE	-	GPT-3.5, Flan-UL2, Tk-Insturct, Alpaca
	Tang et al. [186]	NER, RE	DA	GPT-3.5
	DICE [136]	EE	SFT	T5-Large
Scientific	Bölcü et al. [14]	NER	ICL	GPT-3.5
	Dunn et al. [42]	NER, RE	SFT	GPT-3
	PolyIE [27]	NER, RE	ICL	GPT-3.5, GPT-4
	Foppiano et al. [50]	NER, RE	ZS Pr, ICL, SFT	GPT-3.5, GPT-4
	Dagdelen et al. [32]	NER, RE	SFT	GPT-3, LLaMA2
Astronomical	Shao [178]	NER	ZS Pr	GPT-3.5, GPT-4, Claude-2, LLaMA2
	Evans et al. [45]	NER	DA	GPT-3.5, GPT-4
Historical	González-Gallardo et al. [58]	NER	ZS Pr	GPT-3.5
	CHisIEC [187]	NER, RE	SFT, ICL	ChatGLM2, Alpaca2, GPT-3.5
Legal	Nunes et al. [153]	NER	ICL	Sabia
	Oliveira et al. [154]	NER	DA	GPT-3
	Kwak et al. [95]	RE, EE	ICL	GPT-4

Table 5 The statistics of researches in Specific Domain.

tracting complex scientific knowledge in material chemistry. Shao [178] explored the use of LLMs to extract astronomical knowledge entities from astrophysical journal articles. Conventional approaches encounter difficulties such as manual labor and limited generalizability. To address these issues, the authors proposed a prompting strategy that incorporates five prompt elements and eight combination prompt, aiming to specifically target celestial object identifiers and telescope names as the ex-

perimental objects of interest. González-Gallardo et al. [58] examined the performance of ChatGPT in the NER task specifically on historical texts. The research not only compared ChatGPT with other state-of-the-art language model-based systems but also delved into the challenges encountered in this zero-shot setting. The findings shed light on the limitations of entity identification in historical texts, encompassing concerns related to annotation guidelines, entity complexity, code-switching, and the

specificity of prompts.

6 Evaluation & Analysis

Despite the great success of LLMs in various natural language processing tasks, their performance in the field of information extraction still have room for improvement [67]. To alleviate this problem, recent research has explored the capabilities of LLMs with respect to the major subtasks of IE, i.e., NER [147, 217], RE [194, 228], and EE [53]. Considering the superior reasoning capabilities of LLMs, Xie et al. [217] proposed four reasoning strategies for NER, which are designed to simulate ChatGPT’s potential on zero-shot NER. Wadhwa et al. [194] explored the use of LLMs for RE and found that few-shot prompting with GPT-3 achieves near SOTA performance, while Flan-T5 can be improved with chain-of-thought style explanations generated via GPT-3. For EE task, Gao et al. [53] showed that ChatGPT still struggles with it due to the need for complex instructions and a lack of robustness.

Along this line, some researchers performed a more comprehensive analysis of LLMs by evaluating multiple IE subtasks simultaneously. Li et al. [98] evaluated ChatGPT’s overall ability on IE, including performance, explainability, calibration, and faithfulness. They found that ChatGPT mostly performs worse than BERT-based models in the standard IE setting, but excellently in the OpenIE setting. Furthermore, Han et al. [67] introduced a soft-matching strategy for a more precise evaluation and identified “unannotated spans” as the predominant error type, highlighting potential issues with data annotation quality.

7 Future Directions

The development of LLMs for generative IE is still in its early stages, and there are numerous opportu-

nities for improvement.

Universal IE. Previous generative IE methods and benchmarks are often tailored for specific domains or tasks, limiting their generalizability [229]. Although some unified methods [133] using LLMs have been proposed recently, they still suffer from certain limitations (e.g., long context input, and misalignment of structured output). Therefore, further development of universal IE frameworks that can adapt flexibly to different domains and tasks is a promising research direction (such as integrating the insights of task-specific models to assist in constructing universal models).

Low-Resource IE. The generative IE system with LLMs still encounters challenges in resource-limited scenarios [98]. There is a need for further exploration of in-context learning of LLMs, particularly in terms of improving the selection of examples. Future research should prioritize the development of robust cross-domain learning techniques [204], such as domain adaptation or multi-task learning, to leverage knowledge from resource-rich domains. Additionally, efficient data annotation strategies with LLMs should also be explored.

Prompt Design for IE. Designing effective instructions is considered to have a significant impact on the performance of LLMs [167, 227]. One aspect of prompt design is to build input and output pairs that can better align with pre-training stage of LLMs (e.g., code generation) [64]. Another aspect is optimizing the prompt for better model understanding and reasoning (e.g., Chain-of-Thought) [100], by encouraging LLMs to make logical inferences or explainable generation. Additionally, researchers can explore interactive prompt design (such as multi-turn QA) [233], where LLMs can iteratively refine or provide feedback on the generated extractions automatically.

Task	Dataset	Domain	#Class	#Train	#Val	#Test
NER	ACE04 [38]	News	7	6,202	745	812
	ACE05 [195]	News	7	7,299	971	1,060
	BC5CDR [106]	Biomedical	2	4,560	4,581	4,797
	Broad Twitter Corpus [33]	Social Media	3	6,338	1,001	2,000
	CADEC [86]	Biomedical	1	5,340	1,097	1,160
	CoNLL03 [176]	News	4	14,041	3,250	3,453
	CoNLLpp [207]	News	4	14,041	3,250	3,453
	CrossNER-AI [127]	Artificial Intelligence	14	100	350	431
	CrossNER-Literature [127]	Literary	12	100	400	416
	CrossNER-Music [127]	Musical	13	100	380	465
	CrossNER-Politics [127]	Political	9	199	540	650
	CrossNER-Science [127]	Scientific	17	200	450	543
	FabNER [94]	Scientific	12	9,435	2,182	2,064
	Few-NERD [35]	General	66	131,767	18,824	37,468
	FindVehicle [59]	Traffic	21	21,565	20,777	20,777
	GENIA [89]	Biomedical	5	15,023	1,669	1,854
	HarveyNER [23]	Social Media	4	3,967	1,301	1,303
	MIT-Movie [120]	Social Media	12	9,774	2,442	2,442
	MIT-Restaurant [120]	Social Media	8	7,659	1,520	1,520
	MultiNERD [190]	Wikipedia	16	134,144	10,000	10,000
	NCBI [39]	Biomedical	4	5,432	923	940
	OntoNotes 5.0 [164]	General	18	59,924	8,528	8,262
	ShARe13 [163]	Biomedical	1	8,508	12,050	9,009
	ShARe14 [145]	Biomedical	1	17,404	1,360	15,850
	SNAP* [129]	Social Media	4	4,290	1,432	1,459
	TTC [171]	Social Meida	3	10,000	500	1,500
	Tweebank-NER [83]	Social Media	4	1,639	710	1,201
	Twitter2015* [235]	Social Media	4	4,000	1,000	3,357
	Twitter2017* [129]	Social Media	4	3,373	723	723
	TwitterNER7 [192]	Social Media	7	7,111	886	576
	WikiDiverse* [206]	News	13	6,312	755	757
	WNUT2017 [34]	Social Media	6	3,394	1,009	1,287
RE	ACE05 [195]	News	7	10,051	2,420	2,050
	ADE [65]	Biomedical	1	3,417	427	428
	CoNLL04 [172]	News	5	922	231	288
	DocRED [224]	Wikipedia	96	3,008	300	700
	MNRE* [243]	Social Media	23	12,247	1,624	1,614
	NYT [170]	News	24	56,196	5,000	5,000
	Re-TACRED [181]	News	40	58,465	19,584	13,418
	SciERC [134]	Scientific	7	1,366	187	397
	SemEval2010 [68]	General	19	6,507	1,493	2,717
	TACRED [240]	News	42	68,124	22,631	15,509
	TACREV [3]	News	42	68,124	22,631	15,509
EE	ACE05 [195]	News	33/22	17,172	923	832
	CASIE [177]	Cybersecurity	5/26	11,189	1,778	3,208
	GENIA11 [90]	Biomedical	9/11	8,730	1,091	1,092
	GENIA13 [91]	Biomedical	13/7	4,000	500	500
	PHEE [184]	Biomedical	2/16	2,898	961	968
	RAMS [43]	News	139/65	7,329	924	871
	WikiEvents [113]	Wikipedia	50/59	5,262	378	492

Table 6 Statistics of common datasets for information extraction. * denotes the dataset is multimodal. # refers to the number of categories or sentences. The data in the table is partially referenced from InstructUIE [60].

Series	Model	Size	Base Model	Open Source	Instruction Tuning	RLHF
BART	BART [97]	140M (base), 400M (large)	-	✓	-	-
T5	T5 [169]	60M, 220M (base), 770M (large), 3B, 11B	-	✓	-	-
	mT5 [221]	300M, 580M (base), 1.2B (large), 3.7B, 13B	-	✓	-	-
	Flan-T5 [30]	80M, 250M (base), 780M (large), 3B, 11B	T5	✓	✓	-
GLM	GLM [40]	110M (base), 335M (large), 410M, 515M, 2B, 10B	-	✓	-	-
		6B	GLM	✓	✓	✓
LLaMA	LLaMA [191]	7B, 13B, 33B, 65B	-	✓	-	-
	Alpaca [189]	7B, 13B	LLaMA	✓	✓	-
	Vicuna [28]	7B, 13B	LLaMA	✓	✓	-
	LLaMA2 [80]	7B, 13B, 70B	-	✓	-	-
	LLaMA2-chat [80]	7B, 13B, 70B	LLaMA2	✓	✓	✓
	Code-LLaMA [173]	7B, 13B, 34B	LLaMA2	✓	-	-
GPT	GPT-2 [168]	117M, 345M, 762M, 1.5B	-	✓	-	-
	GPT-3 [15]	175B	-	-	-	-
	GPT-J [197]	6B	GPT-3	✓	-	-
	Code-davinci-002 [157]	-	GPT-3	-	✓	-
	Text-davinci-002 [157]	-	GPT-3	-	✓	-
	Text-davinci-003 [157]	-	GPT-3	-	✓	✓
	GPT-3.5-turbo series [155]	-	-	-	✓	✓
	GPT-4 series [1]	-	-	-	✓	✓

Table 7 The common backbones for generative information extraction. We mark the commonly used base and large versions for better reference.

Open IE. Open IE settings present greater challenges for IE models, as they do not provide a candidate label set and rely solely on the models’ ability to comprehend the task. LLMs, with their knowledge and understanding abilities, have significant advantages in some Open IE tasks [249]. However, there are still instances of poor performance in more challenging tasks [166], which require further exploration by researchers.

8 Benchmarks & Backbones

Benchmarks As shown in Table 6, we compiled a comprehensive collection of benchmarks covering various domains and tasks, to provide researchers with a valuable resource that they can query and reference as needed. Moreover, we also summarized the download links for each dataset in our open source repository.

Backbones We briefly describe some backbones that are commonly used in the field of generative information extraction, which is shown in Table 7.

9 Conclusion

In this survey, We first introduced the subtasks of IE and discussed some universal frameworks aiming to unify all IE tasks with LLMs. Additional theoretical and experimental analysis provided insightful exploration for these methods. Then we delved into different IE techniques that apply LLMs for IE and demonstrate their potential for extracting information in specific domains. Finally, we analyzed the current challenges and presented potential future directions. We hope this survey can provide a valuable resource for researchers to explore more efficient utilization of LLMs for IE.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Monica Agrawal, Stefan Hegselmann, Hunter Lang, Yoon Kim, and David Sontag. Large language models are few-shot clinical information extractors. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1998–2022, 2022.
- [3] Christoph Alt, Aleksandra Gabryszak, and Leonhard Hennig. TACRED revisited: A thorough evaluation of the TACRED relation extraction task. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1558–1569, 2020.
- [4] Arthur Amalvy, Vincent Labatut, and Richard Dufour. Learning to rank context for named entity recognition using a synthetic dataset. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10372–10382, 2023.
- [5] Dhananjay Ashok and Zachary C Lipton. Promptner: Prompting for named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15444*, 2023.
- [6] Jesse Atuhurra, Seiveright Cargill Dujohn, Hidetaka Kamigaito, Hiroyuki Shindo, and Taro Watanabe. Distilling named entity recognition models for endangered species from large language models. *CoRR*, 2024.
- [7] Luca Beurer-Kellner, Mark Niklas Müller, Marc Fischer, and Martin Vechev. Prompt sketching for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.04954*, 2023.
- [8] Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Chaitanya Malaviya, Keisuke Sakaguchi, Ari Holtzman, Hannah Rashkin, Doug Downey, Wen tau Yih, and Yejin Choi. Abductive commonsense reasoning. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Byg1v1HKDB>.
- [9] Zhen Bi, Jing Chen, Yinuo Jiang, Feiyu Xiong, Wei Guo, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. CodeKGC: Code language model for generative knowledge graph construction. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*, 23(3):1–16, 2024.

- [10] Junyi Bian, Jiaxuan Zheng, Yuyi Zhang, and Shanfeng Zhu. Inspire the large language model by external knowledge on biomedical named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12278*, 2023.
- [11] Junyi Biana, Weiqi Zhai, Xiaodi Huang, Jiaxuan Zheng, and Shanfeng Zhu. Vaner: Leveraging large language model for versatile and adaptive biomedical named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17835*, 2024.
- [12] Junyi Biana, Weiqi Zhai, Xiaodi Huang, Jiaxuan Zheng, and Shanfeng Zhu. Vaner: Leveraging large language model for versatile and adaptive biomedical named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17835*, 2024.
- [13] Sergei Bogdanov, Alexandre Constantin, Timothée Bernard, Benoit Crabbé, and Etienne Bernard. Nuner: Entity recognition encoder pre-training via llm-annotated data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15343*, 2024.
- [14] Necva Bölcü, Maciej Rybinski, and Stephen Wan. impact of sample selection on in-context learning for entity extraction from scientific writing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5090–5107, 2023.
- [15] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. 33: 1877–1901, 2020.
- [16] Pere-Lluís Huguet Cabot and Roberto Navigli. REBEL: Relation extraction by end-to-end language generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2370–2381, 2021.
- [17] Chenran Cai, Qianlong Wang, Bin Liang, Bing Qin, Min Yang, Kam-Fai Wong, and Rui Feng Xu. In-context learning for few-shot multimodal named entity recognition. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2969–2979, 2023.
- [18] Erica Cai and Brendan O'Connor. A Monte Carlo language model pipeline for zero-shot sociopolitical event extraction. 2023.
- [19] Zefan Cai, Po-Nien Kung, Ashima Suvarna, Mingyu Derek Ma, Hritik Bansal, Baobao Chang, P Jeffrey Brantingham, Wei Wang, and Nanyun Peng. Improving event definition following for zero-shot event detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02586*, 2024.
- [20] Banghao Chen, Zhaofeng Zhang, Nicolas Langrené, and Shengxin Zhu. Unleashing the potential of prompt engineering in large language models: a comprehensive review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14735*, 2023.
- [21] Feng Chen and Yujian Feng. Chain-of-thought prompt distillation for multimodal named entity and multimodal relation extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14122*, 2023.
- [22] Jiawei Chen, Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Jie Lou, Wei Jia, Dai Dai, Hua Wu, Boxi Cao, Xianpei Han, and Le Sun. Learning in-context learning for named entity recogni-

- tion. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 13661–13675, 2023.
- [23] Pei Chen, Haotian Xu, Cheng Zhang, and Ruihong Huang. Crossroads, buildings and neighborhoods: A dataset for fine-grained location recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3329–3339, 2022.
- [24] Wei Chen, Lili Zhao, Pengfei Luo, Tong Xu, Yi Zheng, and Enhong Chen. HE-Proto: A hierarchical enhancing protonet based on multi-task learning for few-shot named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 296–305, 2023.
- [25] Xiang Chen, Lei Li, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Changliang Xu, Fei Huang, Luo Si, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. Light-NER: A lightweight tuning paradigm for low-resource NER via pluggable prompting. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 2374–2387, 2022.
- [26] Xiang Chen, Lei Li, Shuofei Qiao, Ningyu Zhang, Chuanqi Tan, Yong Jiang, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. One model for all domains: Collaborative domain-prefix tuning for cross-domain NER. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5030–5038, 2023.
- [27] Jerry Junyang Cheung, Yuchen Zhuang, Yinghao Li, Pranav Shetty, Wantian Zhao, Sanjeev Grampurohit, Rampi Ramprasad, and Chao Zhang. PolyIE: A dataset of information extraction from polymer material scientific literature. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07715*, 2023.
- [28] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing GPT-4 with 90%* ChatGPT quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org>, 2023.
- [29] Zheng Chu, Jingchang Chen, Qianglong Chen, Weijiang Yu, Tao He, Haotian Wang, Weihua Peng, Ming Liu, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey of chain of thought reasoning: Advances, frontiers and future. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15402*, 2023.
- [30] Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, et al. Scaling instruction-finetuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11416*, 2022.
- [31] Leyang Cui, Yu Wu, Jian Liu, Sen Yang, and Yue Zhang. Template-based named entity recognition using BART. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1835–1845, 2021.
- [32] John Dagdelen, Alexander Dunn, Sanghoon Lee, Nicholas Walker, Andrew S Rosen, Gerbrand Ceder, Kristin A Persson, and

- Anubhav Jain. Structured information extraction from scientific text with large language models. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):1418, 2024.
- [33] Leon Derczynski, Kalina Bontcheva, and Ian Roberts. Broad Twitter corpus: A diverse named entity recognition resource. In *26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1169–1179, 2016.
- [34] Leon Derczynski, Eric Nichols, Marieke van Erp, and Nut Limsopatham. Results of the WNUT2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 140–147, 2017.
- [35] Ning Ding, Guangwei Xu, Yulin Chen, Xiaobin Wang, Xu Han, Pengjun Xie, Haitao Zheng, and Zhiyuan Liu. Few-NERD: A few-shot named entity recognition dataset. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 3198–3213, 2021.
- [36] Yuyang Ding, Juntao Li, Pinzheng Wang, Zecheng Tang, Bowen Yan, and Min Zhang. Rethinking negative instances for generative named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16602*, 2024.
- [37] Zepeng Ding, Wenhao Huang, Jiaqing Liang, Yanghua Xiao, and Deqing Yang. Improving recall of large language models: A model collaboration approach for relational triple extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 8890–8901, 2024.
- [38] George R. Doddington, Alexis Mitchell, Mark A. Przybocki, Lance A. Ramshaw, Stephanie M. Strassel, and Ralph M. Weischedel. The automatic content extraction (ACE) program - tasks, data, and evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 837–840. European Language Resources Association, 2004.
- [39] Rezarta Islamaj Doğan, Robert Leaman, and Zhiyong Lu. NCBI disease corpus: a resource for disease name recognition and concept normalization. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 47:1–10, 2014.
- [40] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Glm: General language model pre-training with autoregressive blank infilling. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 320–335, 2022.
- [41] Junwen Duan, Xincheng Liao, Ying An, and Jianxin Wang. Keyee: Enhancing low-resource generative event extraction with auxiliary keyword sub-prompt. *Big Data Mining and Analytics*, 7(2):547–560, 2024.
- [42] Alexander Dunn, John Dagdelen, Nicholas Walker, Sanghoon Lee, Andrew S Rosen, Gerbrand Ceder, Kristin Persson, and Anubhav Jain. Structured information extraction from complex scientific text with fine-

- tuned large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05238*, 2022.
- [43] Seth Ebner, Patrick Xia, Ryan Culkin, Kyle Rawlins, and Benjamin Van Durme. Multi-sentence argument linking. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8057–8077, 2020.
- [44] Sefika Efeoglu and Adrian Paschke. Retrieval-augmented generation-based relation extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13397*, 2024.
- [45] Julia Evans, Sameer Sadruddin, and Jennifer D’Souza. Astro-ner–astronomy named entity recognition: Is gpt a good domain expert annotator? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02602*, 2024.
- [46] Zhiyuan Fan and Shizhu He. Efficient data learning for open information extraction with pre-trained language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 13056–13063, 2023.
- [47] Hao Fei, Shengqiong Wu, Jingye Li, Bobo Li, Fei Li, Libo Qin, Meishan Zhang, Min Zhang, and Tat-Seng Chua. LasUIE: Unifying information extraction with latent adaptive structure-aware generative language model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15460–15475, 2022.
- [48] Hao Fei, Meishan Zhang, Min Zhang, and Tat-Seng Chua. XNLP: An interactive demonstration system for universal struc-
- tured nlp. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01846*, 2023.
- [49] Yanlin Feng, Adithya Pratapa, and David R. Mortensen. Calibrated seq2seq models for efficient and generalizable ultra-fine entity typing. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 15550–15560, 2023.
- [50] Luca Foppiano, Guillaume Lambard, Toshiyuki Amagasa, and Masashi Ishii. Mining experimental data from materials science literature with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.11052*, 2024.
- [51] Cong Fu, Tong Chen, Meng Qu, Woojeong Jin, and Xiang Ren. Collaborative policy learning for open knowledge graph reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 2672–2681, 2019.
- [52] Chengguang Gan, Qinghao Zhang, and Tat-sunori Mori. Giellm: Japanese general information extraction large language model utilizing mutual reinforcement effect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06838*, 2023.
- [53] Jun Gao, Huan Zhao, Changlong Yu, and Rui Feng Xu. Exploring the feasibility of ChatGPT for event extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03836*, 2023.
- [54] Jun Gao, Huan Zhao, Wei Wang, Changlong Yu, and Rui Feng Xu. Eventrl: Enhancing event extraction with outcome supervision

- for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11430*, 2024.
- [55] Leo Gao, Stella Biderman, Sid Black, Lawrence Golding, Travis Hoppe, Charles Foster, Jason Phang, Horace He, Anish Thite, Noa Nabeshima, et al. The pile: An 800gb dataset of diverse text for language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00027*, 2020.
- [56] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2023.
- [57] Saibo Geng, Martin Josifosky, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. Flexible grammar-based constrained decoding for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13971*, 2023.
- [58] Carlos-Emiliano González-Gallardo, Emanuela Boros, Nancy Girdhar, Ahmed Hamdi, José G. Moreno, and Antoine Doucet. Yes but.. can chatgpt identify entities in historical documents? In *ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, pages 184–189, 2023.
- [59] Runwei Guan, Ka Lok Man, Feifan Chen, Shanliang Yao, Rongsheng Hu, Xiaohui Zhu, Jeremy Smith, Eng Gee Lim, and Yutao Yue. FindVehicle and VehicleFinder: A NER dataset for natural language-based vehicle retrieval and a keyword-based cross-modal vehicle retrieval system. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, 2023.
- [60] Honghao Gui, Jintian Zhang, Hongbin Ye, and Ningyu Zhang. InstructIE: A Chinese instruction-based information extraction dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11527*, 2023.
- [61] Honghao Gui, Hongbin Ye, Lin Yuan, Ningyu Zhang, Mengshu Sun, Lei Liang, and Huajun Chen. Iepile: Unearthing large-scale schema-based information extraction corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14710*, 2024.
- [62] Qian Guo, Yi Guo, and Jin Zhao. Diluie: constructing diverse demonstrations of in-context learning with large language model for unified information extraction. *Neural Computing and Applications*, pages 1–22, 2024.
- [63] Qipeng Guo, Yuqing Yang, Hang Yan, Xipeng Qiu, and Zheng Zhang. DORE: document ordered relation extraction based on generative framework. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 3463–3474, 2022.
- [64] Yucan Guo, Zixuan Li, Xiaolong Jin, Yantao Liu, Yutao Zeng, Wenxuan Liu, Xiang Li, Pan Yang, Long Bai, Jiafeng Guo, et al. Retrieval-augmented code generation for universal information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02962*, 2023.
- [65] Harsha Gurulingappa, Abdul Mateen Rajput, Angus Roberts, Juliane Fluck, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, and Luca Toldo. Development of a benchmark corpus to support the automatic extraction of drug-related adverse effects from medical case reports. *J. Biomed. Informatics*, 45(5):885–892, 2012.

- [66] Bernal Jiménez Gutiérrez, Nikolas McNeal, Clayton Washington, You Chen, Lang Li, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. Thinking about GPT-3 in-context learning for biomedical IE? think again. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 4497–4512, 2022.
- [67] Ridong Han, Tao Peng, Chaohao Yang, Benyou Wang, Lu Liu, and Xiang Wan. Is information extraction solved by ChatGPT? an analysis of performance, evaluation criteria, robustness and errors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14450*, 2023.
- [68] Iris Hendrickx, Su Nam Kim, Zornitsa Kozareva, Preslav Nakov, Diarmuid Ó Séaghdha, Sebastian Padó, Marco Pennacchiotti, Lorenza Romano, and Stan Szpakowicz. SemEval-2010 task 8: Multi-way classification of semantic relations between pairs of nominals. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*, pages 33–38, 2010.
- [69] Yuzhao Heng, Chunyuan Deng, Yitong Li, Yue Yu, Yinghao Li, Rongzhi Zhang, and Chao Zhang. Proggen: Generating named entity recognition datasets step-by-step with self-reflexive large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11103*, 2024.
- [70] Wenlong Hou, Weidong Zhao, Xianhui Liu, and Wenyang Guo. Knowledge-enriched prompt for low-resource named entity recognition. *ACM Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*, 23(5):1–15, 2024.
- [71] I-Hung Hsu, Kuan-Hao Huang, Elizabeth Boschee, Scott Miller, Prem Natarajan, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. DEGREE: A data-efficient generation-based event extraction model. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1890–1908, 2021.
- [72] I-Hung Hsu, Zhiyu Xie, Kuan-Hao Huang, Prem Natarajan, and Nanyun Peng. AMPERE: amr-aware prefix for generation-based event argument extraction model. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10976–10993, 2023.
- [73] Xuming Hu, Yong Jiang, Aiwei Liu, Zhongqiang Huang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Lijie Wen, and S Yu Philip. Entity-to-text based data augmentation for various named entity recognition tasks. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 9072–9087, 2023.
- [74] Yan Hu, Iqra Ameer, Xu Zuo, Xueqing Peng, Yujia Zhou, Zehan Li, Yiming Li, Jianfu Li, Xiaoqian Jiang, and Hua Xu. Zero-shot clinical entity recognition using ChatGPT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16416*, 2023.
- [75] Yan Hu, Qingyu Chen, Jingcheng Du, Xueqing Peng, Vipina Kuttichi Keloth, Xu Zuo, Yujia Zhou, Zehan Li, Xiaoqian Jiang, Zhiyong Lu, et al. Improving large language models for clinical named entity recognition via prompt engineering. *Journal of the*

- American Medical Informatics Association, page ocad259, 2024.
- [76] Jiaxin Huang, Chunyuan Li, Krishan Subudhi, Damien Jose, Shobana Balakrishnan, Weizhu Chen, Baolin Peng, Jianfeng Gao, and Jiawei Han. Few-shot named entity recognition: An empirical baseline study. pages 10408–10423, 2021.
- [77] Kuan-Hao Huang, I Hsu, Premkumar Natarajan, Kai-Wei Chang, Nanyun Peng, et al. Multilingual generative language models for zero-shot cross-lingual event argument extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4633–4646, 2022.
- [78] Kuan-Hao Huang, I-Hung Hsu, Tanmay Parekh, Zhiyu Xie, Zixuan Zhang, Premkumar Natarajan, Kai-Wei Chang, Nanyun Peng, and Heng Ji. Textee: Benchmark, reevaluation, reflections, and future challenges in event extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09562*, 2023.
- [79] Kung-Hsiang Huang, Sam Tang, and Nanyun Peng. Document-level entity-based extraction as template generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5257–5269, 2021.
- [80] Touvron Hugo, Martin Louis, Stone Kevin, and others. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [81] Guochao Jiang, Zepeng Ding, Yuchen Shi, and Deqing Yang. P-icl: Point in-context learning for named entity recognition with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04960*, 2024.
- [82] Guochao Jiang, Ziqin Luo, Yuchen Shi, Dixuan Wang, Jiaqing Liang, and Deqing Yang. Toner: Type-oriented named entity recognition with generative language model. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 16251–16262, 2024.
- [83] Hang Jiang, Yining Hua, Doug Beeferman, and Deb Roy. Annotating the Tweebank corpus on named entity recognition and building NLP models for social media analysis. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 7199–7208, 2022.
- [84] Martin Josifoski, Nicola De Cao, Maxime Peyrard, Fabio Petroni, and Robert West. GenIE: Generative information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4626–4643, 2022.
- [85] Martin Josifoski, Marija Sakota, Maxime Peyrard, and Robert West. Exploiting asymmetry for synthetic training data generation: Synthie and the case of information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1555–1574, 2023.
- [86] Sarvnaz Karimi, Alejandro Metke-Jimenez, Madonna Kemp, and Chen Wang. Cadec: A

- corpus of adverse drug event annotations. *J. Biomed. Informatics*, 55:73–81, 2015.
- [87] Uri Katz, Matan Vetzler, Amir D. N. Cohen, and Yoav Goldberg. NERetrieve: Dataset for next generation named entity recognition and retrieval. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3340–3354, 2023.
- [88] Vipina K Keloth, Yan Hu, Qianqian Xie, Xueqing Peng, Yan Wang, Andrew Zheng, Melih Selek, Kalpana Raja, Chih Hsuan Wei, Qiao Jin, et al. Advancing entity recognition in biomedicine via instruction tuning of large language models. *Bioinformatics*, page btae163, 2024.
- [89] Jin-Dong Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Yuka Tateisi, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. GENIA corpus - a semantically annotated corpus for bio-textmining. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Intelligent Systems for Molecular Biology*, pages 180–182, 2003.
- [90] Jin-Dong Kim, Yue Wang, Toshihisa Takagi, and Akinori Yonezawa. Overview of Genia event task in BioNLP shared task 2011. In *Proceedings of BioNLP Shared Task 2011 Workshop*, pages 7–15, 2011.
- [91] Jin-Dong Kim, Yue Wang, and Yasunori Yamamoto. The Genia event extraction shared task, 2013 edition - overview. In *Proceedings of the BioNLP Shared Task 2013 Workshop*, pages 8–15, 2013.
- [92] Seoyeon Kim, Kwangwook Seo, Hyungjoo Chae, Jinyoung Yeo, and Dongha Lee. Verifiner: Verification-augmented ner via knowledge-grounded reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18374*, 2024.
- [93] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 22199–22213, 2022.
- [94] Aman Kumar and Binil Starly. ”Fab-NER”: information extraction from manufacturing process science domain literature using named entity recognition. *J. Intell. Manuf.*, 33(8):2393–2407, 2022.
- [95] Alice Saebom Kwak, Cheonkam Jeong, Gaetano Forte, Derek E. Bambauer, Clayton T. Morrison, and Mihai Surdeanu. Information extraction from legal wills: How well does GPT-4 do? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 4336–4353, 2023.
- [96] Yanis Labrak, Mickaël Rouvier, and Richard Dufour. A zero-shot and few-shot study of instruction-finetuned large language models applied to clinical and biomedical tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.12114*, 2023.
- [97] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2020*, pages 7871–7880, 2020.

- [98] Bo Li, Gexiang Fang, Yang Yang, Quansen Wang, Wei Ye, Wen Zhao, and Shikun Zhang. Evaluating ChatGPT’s information extraction capabilities: An assessment of performance, explainability, calibration, and faithfulness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11633*, 2023.
- [99] Bo Li, Dingyao Yu, Wei Ye, Jinglei Zhang, and Shikun Zhang. Sequence generation with label augmentation for relation extraction. In *Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 13043–13050, 2023.
- [100] Guozheng Li, Peng Wang, and Wenjun Ke. Revisiting large language models as zero-shot relation extractors. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 6877–6892, 2023.
- [101] Guozheng Li, Wenjun Ke, Peng Wang, Zijie Xu, Ke Ji, Jiajun Liu, Ziyu Shang, and Qiqing Luo. Unlocking instructive in-context learning with tabular prompting for relational triple extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13741*, 2024.
- [102] Guozheng Li, Peng Wang, Wenjun Ke, Yikai Guo, Ke Ji, Ziyu Shang, Jiajun Liu, and Zijie Xu. Recall, retrieve and reason: Towards better in-context relation extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17809*, 2024.
- [103] Guozheng Li, Peng Wang, Jiajun Liu, Yikai Guo, Ke Ji, Ziyu Shang, and Zijie Xu. Meta in-context learning makes large language models better zero and few-shot relation extractors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17807*, 2024.
- [104] Guozheng Li, Zijie Xu, Ziyu Shang, Jiajun Liu, Ke Ji, and Yikai Guo. Empirical analysis of dialogue relation extraction with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17802*, 2024.
- [105] Jiangnan Li, Yice Zhang, Bin Liang, Kam-Fai Wong, and Ruifeng Xu. Set learning for generative information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13043–13052, 2023.
- [106] Jiao Li, Yueping Sun, Robin J Johnson, Daniela Sciaky, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Robert Leaman, Allan Peter Davis, Carolyn J Mattingly, Thomas C Wiegers, and Zhiyong Lu. Biocreative V CDR task corpus: a resource for chemical disease relation extraction. *Database J. Biol. Databases Curation*, 2016, 2016.
- [107] Jinyuan Li, Han Li, Zhuo Pan, Di Sun, Jiahao Wang, Wenkun Zhang, and Gang Pan. Prompting ChatGPT in MNER: enhanced multimodal named entity recognition with auxiliary refined knowledge. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2787–2802, 2023.
- [108] Jinyuan Li, Han Li, Di Sun, Jiahao Wang, Wenkun Zhang, Zan Wang, and Gang Pan. Llms as bridges: Reformulating grounded multimodal named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09989*, 2024.
- [109] Junpeng Li, Zixia Jia, and Zilong Zheng. Semi-automatic data enhancement for document-level relation extraction with distant supervision from large language models. pages 5495–5505, 2023.

- [110] Mingchen Li, Huixue Zhou, Han Yang, and Rui Zhang. Rt: a retrieving and chain-of-thought framework for few-shot medical named entity recognition. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, page ocae095, 2024.
- [111] Peng Li, Tianxiang Sun, Qiong Tang, Hang Yan, Yuanbin Wu, Xuanjing Huang, and Xipeng Qiu. CodeIE: Large code generation models are better few-shot information extractors. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15339–15353. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [112] Sha Li, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. Document-level event argument extraction by conditional generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 894–908, 2021.
- [113] Sha Li, Heng Ji, and Jiawei Han. Document-level event argument extraction by conditional generation. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021*, pages 894–908, 2021.
- [114] Yiming Li, Xueqing Peng, Jianfu Li, Xu Zuo, Suyuan Peng, Donghong Pei, Cui Tao, Hua Xu, and Na Hong. Relation extraction using large language models: A case study on acupuncture point locations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05415*, 2024.
- [115] Yinghao Li, Rampi Ramprasad, and Chao Zhang. A simple but effective approach to improve structured language model output for information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13364*, 2024.
- [116] Zixuan Li, Yutao Zeng, Yuxin Zuo, Weicheng Ren, Wenxuan Liu, Miao Su, Yu-can Guo, Yantao Liu, Xiang Li, Zhilei Hu, et al. Knowcoder: Coding structured knowledge into llms for universal information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07969*, 2024.
- [117] Xue Lilong, Zhang Dan, Dong Yuxiao, and Tang Jie. Autore: Document-level relation extraction with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14888*, 2024.
- [118] Zizheng Lin, Hongming Zhang, and Yangqiu Song. Global constraints with prompting for zero-shot event argument classification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 2482–2493, 2023.
- [119] Chengyuan Liu, Fubang Zhao, Yangyang Kang, Jingyuan Zhang, Xiang Zhou, Changlong Sun, Kun Kuang, and Fei Wu. RexUIE: A recursive method with explicit schema instructor for universal information extraction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15342–15359, 2023.
- [120] Jingjing Liu, Panupong Pasupat, Scott Cyphers, and James R. Glass. Asgard: A portable architecture for multilingual dialogue systems. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, pages 8386–8390. IEEE, 2013.

- [121] Junkai Liu, Jiayi Wang, Hui Huang, Rui Zhang, Muyun Yang, and Tiejun Zhao. Improving llm-based health information extraction with in-context learning. In *China Health Information Processing Conference*, pages 49–59. Springer, 2023.
- [122] Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9):1–35, 2023.
- [123] Tianyu Liu, Yuchen Eleanor Jiang, Nicholas Monath, Ryan Cotterell, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Autoregressive structured prediction with language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 993–1005, 2022.
- [124] Wanlong Liu, Li Zhou, Dingyi Zeng, Yichen Xiao, Shaohuan Cheng, Chen Zhang, Grandee Lee, Malu Zhang, and Wenyu Chen. Beyond single-event extraction: Towards efficient document-level multi-event argument extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01884*, 2024.
- [125] Xiao Liu, He-Yan Huang, Ge Shi, and Bo Wang. Dynamic prefix-tuning for generative template-based event extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5216–5228, 2022.
- [126] Yanming Liu, Xinyue Peng, Tianyu Du, Jianwei Yin, Weihao Liu, and Xuhong Zhang. Era-cot: Improving chain-of-thought through entity relationship analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06932*, 2024.
- [127] Zihan Liu, Yan Xu, Tiezheng Yu, Wenliang Dai, Ziwei Ji, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Cross-NER: Evaluating cross-domain named entity recognition. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 13452–13460, 2021.
- [128] Jie Lou, Yaojie Lu, Dai Dai, Wei Jia, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Hua Wu. Universal information extraction as unified semantic matching. In *Thirty-Seventh AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 13318–13326, 2023.
- [129] Di Lu, Leonardo Neves, Vitor Carvalho, Ning Zhang, and Heng Ji. Visual attention model for name tagging in multimodal social media. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1990–1999, 2018.
- [130] Di Lu, Shihao Ran, Joel Tetreault, and Alejandro Jaimes. Event extraction as question generation and answering. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 1666–1688, 2023.
- [131] Jinghui Lu, Ziwei Yang, Yanjie Wang, Xuejing Liu, and Can Huang. Padellm-ner: Parallel decoding in large language models for named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04838*, 2024.
- [132] Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Jin Xu, Xianpei Han, Jialong Tang, Annan Li, Le Sun,

- Meng Liao, and Shaoyi Chen. Text2Event: Controllable sequence-to-structure generation for end-to-end event extraction. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2795–2806, 2021.
- [133] Yaojie Lu, Qing Liu, Dai Dai, Xinyan Xiao, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Hua Wu. Unified structure generation for universal information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5755–5772, 2022.
- [134] Yi Luan, Luheng He, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Multi-task identification of entities, relations, and coreference for scientific knowledge graph construction. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3219–3232, 2018.
- [135] Lei Luo and Yajing Xu. Context-aware prompt for generation-based event argument extraction with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 1717–1725, 2023.
- [136] Mingyu Derek Ma, Alexander Taylor, Wei Wang, and Nanyun Peng. DICE: data-efficient clinical event extraction with generative models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15898–15917. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [137] Mingyu Derek Ma, Xiaoxuan Wang, Po-Nien Kung, P Jeffrey Brantingham, Nanyun Peng, and Wei Wang. STAR: Boosting low-resource event extraction by structure-to-text data generation with large language models. 38(17):18751–18759, 2024.
- [138] Xilai Ma, Jing Li, and Min Zhang. Chain of thought with explicit evidence reasoning for few-shot relation extraction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2334–2352, 2023.
- [139] Yubo Ma, Zehao Wang, Yixin Cao, Mukai Li, Meiqi Chen, Kun Wang, and Jing Shao. Prompt for extraction? PAIE: Prompting argument interaction for event argument extraction. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6759–6774, 2022.
- [140] Yubo Ma, Yixin Cao, Yong Hong, and Aixin Sun. Large language model is not a good few-shot information extractor, but a good reranker for hard samples! In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 10572–10601, 2023.
- [141] Ggaliwango Marvin, Nakayiza Hellen, Daudi Jjingo, and Joyce Nakatumba-Nabende. Prompt engineering in large language models. In *International Conference on Data Intelligence and Cognitive Informatics*, pages 387–402. Springer, 2023.
- [142] Simon Meoni, Eric De la Clergerie, and Theo Ryffel. Large language models as instructors: A study on multilingual clinical

- entity extraction. In *The 22nd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing and BioNLP Shared Tasks*, pages 178–190, 2023.
- [143] Ying Mo, Jian Yang, Jiahao Liu, Shun Zhang, Jingang Wang, and Zhoujun Li. C-icl: Contrastive in-context learning for information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11254*, 2024.
- [144] Masoud Monajatipoor, Jiaxin Yang, Joel Stremmel, Melika Emami, Fazlolah Moshagh, Mozhdeh Rouhsedaghat, and Kai-Wei Chang. Llms in biomedicine: A study on clinical named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.07376*, 2024.
- [145] Danielle L. Mowery, Sumithra Velupillai, Brett R. South, Lee M. Christensen, David Martínez, Liadh Kelly, Lorraine Goeuriot, Noémie Elhadad, Sameer Pradhan, Guergana K. Savova, and Wendy W. Chapman. Task 2: ShARE/CLEF eHealth evaluation lab 2014. In *Working Notes for CLEF 2014 Conference*, volume 1180, pages 31–42, 2014.
- [146] Monica Munnangi, Sergey Feldman, Byron C Wallace, Silvio Amir, Tom Hope, and Aakanksha Naik. On-the-fly definition augmentation of llms for biomedical ner. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00152*, 2024.
- [147] Marco Naguib, Xavier Tannier, and Aurélie Névéol. Few shot clinical entity recognition in three languages: Masked language models outperform llm prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12801*, 2024.
- [148] Yuji Naraki, Ryosuke Yamaki, Yoshikazu Ikeda, Takafumi Horie, and Hiroki Naganuma. Augmenting ner datasets with llms: Towards automated and refined annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01334*, 2024.
- [149] Zara Nasar, Syed Waqar Jaffry, and Muhammad Kamran Malik. Named entity recognition and relation extraction: State-of-the-art. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(1):1–39, 2021.
- [150] Chien Van Nguyen, Hieu Man, and Thien Huu Nguyen. Contextualized soft prompts for extraction of event arguments. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 4352–4361, 2023.
- [151] Xuanfan Ni, Piji Li, and Huayang Li. Unified text structuralization with instruction-tuned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.14956*, 2023.
- [152] Binling Nie, Yiming Shao, and Yigang Wang. Know-adapter: Towards knowledge-aware parameter-efficient transfer learning for few-shot named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 9777–9786, 2024.
- [153] Rafael Oleques Nunes, Andre Suslik Spritzer, Carla Maria Dal Sasso Freitas, and Dennis Giovani Balreira. Out of sesame street: A study of portuguese legal named entity recognition through in-context learning.

- [154] Vitor Oliveira, Gabriel Nogueira, Thiago Faleiros, and Ricardo Marcacini. Combining prompt-based language models and weak supervision for labeling named entity recognition on legal documents. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, pages 1–21, 2024.
- [155] OpenAI. Introduce ChatGPT. *OpenAI blog*, 2023.
- [156] Wolfgang Otto, Sharmila Upadhyaya, and Stefan Dietze. Enhancing software related information extraction with generative language models through single-choice question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05587*, 2024.
- [157] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.
- [158] Yilmazcan Ozyurt, Stefan Feuerriegel, and Ce Zhang. In-context few-shot relation extraction via pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11085*, 2023.
- [159] Chaoxu Pang, Yixuan Cao, Qiang Ding, and Ping Luo. Guideline learning for in-context information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15372–15389, 2023.
- [160] Giovanni Paolini, Ben Athiwaratkun, Jason Krone, Jie Ma, Alessandro Achille, Rishita Anubhai, Cícero Nogueira dos Santos, Bing Xiang, and Stefano Soatto. Structured prediction as translation between augmented natural languages. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [161] Letian Peng, Zilong Wang, Feng Yao, Zihan Wang, and Jingbo Shang. Metaie: Distilling a meta model from llm for all kinds of information extraction tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00457*, 2024.
- [162] Nicholas Popović and Michael Färber. Embedded named entity recognition using probing classifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11747*, 2024.
- [163] Sameer Pradhan, Noémie Elhadad, Brett R. South, David Martínez, Lee M. Christensen, Amy Vogel, Hanna Suominen, Wendy W. Chapman, and Guergana K. Savova. Task 1: ShARe/CLEF eHealth evaluation lab 2013. In *Working Notes for CLEF 2013 Conference*, 2013.
- [164] Sameer Pradhan, Alessandro Moschitti, Nianwen Xue, Hwee Tou Ng, Anders Björkelund, Olga Uryupina, Yuchen Zhang, and Zhi Zhong. Towards robust linguistic analysis using ontonotes. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, CoNLL 2013*, pages 143–152, 2013.
- [165] Ji Qi, Kaixuan Ji, Xiaozhi Wang, Jifan Yu, Kaisheng Zeng, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, and Bin Xu. Mastering the task of open information extraction with large language models and consistent reasoning environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10590*, 2023.

- [166] Ji Qi, Chuchun Zhang, Xiaozhi Wang, Kaisheng Zeng, Jifan Yu, Jinxin Liu, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, and Xu Bin. Preserving knowledge invariance: Rethinking robustness evaluation of open information extraction. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023*, pages 5876–5890, 2023.
- [167] Shuofei Qiao, Yixin Ou, Ningyu Zhang, Xiang Chen, Yunzhi Yao, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, and Huajun Chen. Reasoning with language model prompting: A survey. pages 5368–5393, 2023.
- [168] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.
- [169] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67, 2020.
- [170] Sebastian Riedel, Limin Yao, and Andrew McCallum. Modeling relations and their mentions without labeled text. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, volume 6323, pages 148–163, 2010.
- [171] Shruti Rijhwani and Daniel Preotiuc-Pietro. Temporally-informed analysis of named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7605–7617, 2020.
- [172] Dan Roth and Wen-tau Yih. A linear programming formulation for global inference in natural language tasks. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 1–8, 2004.
- [173] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémie Rapin, et al. Code LLama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023.
- [174] Pranab Sahoo, Ayush Kumar Singh, Sriparna Saha, Vinija Jain, Samrat Mondal, and Aman Chadha. A systematic survey of prompt engineering in large language models: Techniques and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07927*, 2024.
- [175] Oscar Sainz, Iker García-Ferrero, Rodrigo Agerri, Oier Lopez de Lacalle, German Rigau, and Eneko Agirre. GoLLIE: Annotation guidelines improve zero-shot information-extraction. 2024.
- [176] Erik Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. Introduction to the CoNLL-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning*, pages 142–147, 2003.
- [177] Taneeya Satyapanich, Francis Ferraro, and Tim Finin. CASIE: extracting cybersecurity event information from text. In *The Thirty-*

- Fourth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 8749–8757, 2020.
- [178] wujun Shao. Astronomical knowledge entity extraction in astrophysics journal articles via large language models. *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 2024.
- [179] Zhengpeng Shi and Haoran Luo. Cre-lm: A domain-specific chinese relation extraction framework with fine-tuned large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18085*, 2024.
- [180] Rohini Srihari, Wei Li, and X Li. Information extraction supported question answering. In *TREC*, 1999.
- [181] George Stoica, Emmanouil Antonios Platanios, and Barnabás Póczos. Re-tacred: Addressing shortcomings of the TACRED dataset. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 13843–13850, 2021.
- [182] Jindian Su and Hong Yu. Unified named entity recognition as multi-label sequence generation. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, pages 1–8, 2023.
- [183] Qi Sun, Kun Huang, Xiaocui Yang, Rong Tong, Kun Zhang, and Soujanya Poria. Consistency guided knowledge retrieval and denoising in llms for zero-shot document-level relation triplet extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13598*, 2024.
- [184] Zhaoyue Sun, Jiazheng Li, Gabriele Pergola, Byron C. Wallace, Bino John, Nigel Greene, Joseph Kim, and Yulan He. PHEE: A dataset for pharmacovigilance event extraction from text. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5571–5587, 2022.
- [185] Zhaoyue Sun, Gabriele Pergola, Byron C Wallace, and Yulan He. Leveraging chatgpt in pharmacovigilance event extraction: An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15663*, 2024.
- [186] Ruixiang Tang, Xiaotian Han, Xiaoqian Jiang, and Xia Hu. Does synthetic data generation of LLMs help clinical text mining? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04360*, 2023.
- [187] Xuemei Tang, Qi Su, Jun Wang, and Zekun Deng. Chisiec: An information extraction corpus for ancient chinese history. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 3192–3202, 2024.
- [188] Xuemei Tang, Jun Wang, and Qi Su. Small language model is a good guide for large language model in chinese entity relation extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14373*, 2024.
- [189] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tat-sunori B Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model, 2023.
- [190] Simone Tedeschi and Roberto Navigli. MultiNERD: A multilingual, multi-genre and fine-grained dataset for named entity

- recognition (and disambiguation). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 801–812, 2022.
- [191] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, and et al. Azhar, Faisa. LLaMA: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [192] Asahi Ushio, Francesco Barbieri, Vítor Silva, Leonardo Neves, and José Camacho-Collados. Named entity recognition in twitter: A dataset and analysis on short-term temporal shifts. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 12th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2022 - Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 309–319, 2022.
- [193] Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Viet Lai, Franck Dernoncourt, and Thien Huu Nguyen. Unleash GPT-2 power for event detection. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6271–6282, 2021.
- [194] Somin Wadhwa, Silvio Amir, and Byron C. Wallace. Revisiting relation extraction in the era of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15566–15589, 2023.
- [195] Christopher Walker, Stephanie Strassel, Julie Medero, and Kazuaki Maeda. Ace 2005 multilingual training corpus. <https://catalog.ldc.upenn.edu/LDC2006T06>, 2006.
- [196] Zhen Wan, Fei Cheng, Zhuoyuan Mao, Qianying Liu, Haiyue Song, Jiwei Li, and Sadao Kurohashi. GPT-RE: in-context learning for relation extraction using large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3534–3547, 2023.
- [197] Ben Wang. Mesh-Transformer-JAX: Model-parallel implementation of Transformer language model with JAX. <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>, May 2021.
- [198] Chenguang Wang, Xiao Liu, Zui Chen, Haoyun Hong, Jie Tang, and Dawn Song. DeepStruct: Pretraining of language models for structure prediction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 803–823, 2022.
- [199] Jiaqi Wang, Enze Shi, Sigang Yu, Zihao Wu, Chong Ma, Haixing Dai, Qiushi Yang, Yanqing Kang, Jinru Wu, Huawei Hu, et al. Prompt engineering for healthcare: Methodologies and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14670*, 2023.
- [200] Jiaqi Wang, Yuying Chang, Zhong Li, Ning An, Qi Ma, Lei Hei, Haibo Luo, Yifei Lu, and Feiliang Ren. Techgpt-2.0: A large

- language model project to solve the task of knowledge graph construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04507*, 2024.
- [201] Liwen Wang, Rumei Li, Yang Yan, Yuanmeng Yan, Sirui Wang, Wei Wu, and Weiran Xu. InstructionNER: A multi-task instruction-based generative framework for few-shot NER. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03903*, 2022.
- [202] Qing Wang, Kang Zhou, Qiao Qiao, Yuepei Li, and Qi Li. Improving unsupervised relation extraction by augmenting diverse sentence pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12136–12147, 2023.
- [203] Shuhe Wang, Xiaofei Sun, Xiaoya Li, Rongbin Ouyang, Fei Wu, Tianwei Zhang, Jiwei Li, and Guoyin Wang. Gpt-NER: Named entity recognition via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10428*, 2023.
- [204] Xiao Wang, Weikang Zhou, Can Zu, Han Xia, Tianze Chen, Yuansen Zhang, Rui Zheng, Junjie Ye, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, et al. InstructUIE: Multi-task instruction tuning for unified information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08085*, 2023.
- [205] Xingyao Wang, Sha Li, and Heng Ji. Code4Struct: Code generation for few-shot event structure prediction. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3640–3663, 2023.
- [206] Xuwu Wang, Junfeng Tian, Min Gui, Zhixu Li, Rui Wang, Ming Yan, Lihan Chen, and Yanghua Xiao. WikiDiverse: A multimodal entity linking dataset with diversified contextual topics and entity types. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4785–4797, 2022.
- [207] Zihan Wang, Jingbo Shang, Liyuan Liu, Lihao Lu, Jiacheng Liu, and Jiawei Han. CrossWeigh: Training named entity tagger from imperfect annotations. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 5153–5162, 2019.
- [208] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [209] Xiang Wei, Yufeng Chen, Ning Cheng, Xingyu Cui, Jinan Xu, and Wenjuan Han. Collabkg: A learnable human-machine-cooperative information extraction toolkit for (event) knowledge graph construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00769*, 2023.
- [210] Xiang Wei, Xingyu Cui, Ning Cheng, Xiaobin Wang, Xin Zhang, Shen Huang, Pengjun Xie, Jinan Xu, Yufeng Chen, Meishan Zhang, et al. Zero-shot information extraction via chatting with ChatGPT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10205*, 2023.

- [211] Chenxi Whitehouse, Monojit Choudhury, and Alham Fikri Aji. LLM-powered data augmentation for enhanced crosslingual performance. 2023.
- [212] Brandon T Willard and Rémi Louf. Efficient guided generation for large language models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2307, 2023.
- [213] Chenxiao Wu, Wenjun Ke, Peng Wang, Zhizhao Luo, Guozheng Li, and Wanyi Chen. Consistner: Towards instructive NER demonstrations for llms with the consistency of ontology and context. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 19234–19242, 2024.
- [214] Nan Xia, Hang Yu, Yin Wang, Junyu Xuan, and Xiangfeng Luo. DAFS: a domain aware few shot generative model for event detection. *Machine Learning*, 112(3):1011–1031, 2023.
- [215] Yu Xia, Yongwei Zhao, Wenhao Wu, and Sujian Li. Debiasing generative named entity recognition by calibrating sequence likelihood. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 1137–1148, 2023.
- [216] Xinglin Xiao, Yijie Wang, Nan Xu, Yuqi Wang, Hanxuan Yang, Minzheng Wang, Yin Luo, Lei Wang, Wenji Mao, and Daniel Zeng. Yayi-uie: A chat-enhanced instruction tuning framework for universal information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15548*, 2023.
- [217] Tingyu Xie, Qi Li, Jian Zhang, Yan Zhang, Zuozhu Liu, and Hongwei Wang. Empirical study of zero-shot NER with ChatGPT. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7935–7956, 2023.
- [218] Tingyu Xie, Qi Li, Yan Zhang, Zuozhu Liu, and Hongwei Wang. Self-improving for zero-shot named entity recognition with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08921*, 2023.
- [219] Jun Xu, Mengshu Sun, Zhiqiang Zhang, and Jun Zhou. Chatuie: Exploring chat-based unified information extraction using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05132*, 2024.
- [220] Xin Xu, Yuqi Zhu, Xiaohan Wang, and Ningyu Zhang. How to unleash the power of large language models for few-shot relation extraction? In *Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Simple and Efficient Natural Language Processing*, pages 190–200. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023.
- [221] Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Sidhdhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel. mT5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 483–498, 2021.
- [222] Faren Yan, Peng Yu, and Xin Chen. Ltner: Large language model tagging for named entity recognition with contextualized entity marking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05624*, 2024.

- [223] Hang Yan, Tao Gui, Junqi Dai, Qipeng Guo, Zheng Zhang, and Xipeng Qiu. A unified generative framework for various NER sub-tasks. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5808–5822, 2021.
- [224] Yuan Yao, Deming Ye, Peng Li, Xu Han, Yankai Lin, Zhenghao Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Lixin Huang, Jie Zhou, and Maosong Sun. DocRED: A large-scale document-level relation extraction dataset. In *Proceedings of the 57th Conference of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 764–777, 2019.
- [225] Hongbin Ye, Ningyu Zhang, Hui Chen, and Huajun Chen. Generative knowledge graph construction: A review. pages 1–17, 2022.
- [226] Junjie Ye, Nuo Xu, Yikun Wang, Jie Zhou, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, and Xuanjing Huang. Llm-da: Data augmentation via large language models for few-shot named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14568*, 2024.
- [227] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13549*, 2023.
- [228] Chenhan Yuan, Qianqian Xie, and Sophia Ananiadou. Zero-shot temporal relation extraction with ChatGPT. In *The 22nd Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing and BioNLP Shared Tasks*, pages 92–102, 2023.
- [229] Siyu Yuan, Deqing Yang, Jiaqing Liang, Zhixu Li, Jinxi Liu, Jingyue Huang, and Yanghua Xiao. Generative entity typing with curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3061–3073, 2022.
- [230] Urchade Zaratiana, Nadi Tomeh, Pierre Holat, and Thierry Charnois. Gliner: Generalist model for named entity recognition using bidirectional transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08526*, 2023.
- [231] Urchade Zaratiana, Nadi Tomeh, Pierre Holat, and Thierry Charnois. An autoregressive text-to-graph framework for joint entity and relation extraction. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 19477–19487, 2024.
- [232] Jiasheng Zhang, Xikai Liu, Xinyi Lai, Yan Gao, Shusen Wang, Yao Hu, and Yiqing Lin. 2iner: Instructive and in-context learning on few-shot named entity recognition. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3940–3951, 2023.
- [233] Kai Zhang, Bernal Jimenez Gutierrez, and Yu Su. Aligning instruction tasks unlocks large language models as zero-shot relation extractors. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 794–812, 2023.
- [234] Meishan Zhang, Bin Wang, Hao Fei, and Min Zhang. In-context learning for few-

- shot nested named entity recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01182*, 2024.
- [235] Qi Zhang, Jinlan Fu, Xiaoyu Liu, and Xuanjing Huang. Adaptive co-attention network for named entity recognition in tweets. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5674–5681, 2018.
- [236] Ruoyu Zhang, Yanzeng Li, Yongliang Ma, Ming Zhou, and Lei Zou. LLMaAA: Making large language models as active annotators. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 13088–13103, 2023.
- [237] Shuai Zhang, Yongliang Shen, Zeqi Tan, Yiquan Wu, and Weiming Lu. De-bias for generative extraction in unified NER task. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 808–818, 2022.
- [238] Xinliang Frederick Zhang, Carter Blum, Temma Choji, Shalin Shah, and Alakananda Vempala. Ultra: Unleash llms’ potential for event argument extraction through hierarchical modeling and pair-wise refinement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13218*, 2024.
- [239] Xinpeng Zhang, Ming Tan, Jingfan Zhang, and Wei Zhu. NAG-NER: a unified non-autoregressive generation framework for various NER tasks. In *Proceedings of the The 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Industry Track*, pages 676–686, 2023.
- [240] Yuhao Zhang, Victor Zhong, Danqi Chen, Gabor Angeli, and Christopher D. Manning. Position-aware attention and supervised data improve slot filling. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 35–45, 2017.
- [241] Zhen Zhang, Yuhua Zhao, Hang Gao, and Mengting Hu. Linkner: Linking local named entity recognition models to large language models using uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10573*, 2024.
- [242] Gang Zhao, Xiaocheng Gong, Xinjie Yang, Guanting Dong, Shudong Lu, and Si Li. DemoSG: Demonstration-enhanced schema-guided generation for low-resource event extraction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1805–1816, 2023.
- [243] Changmeng Zheng, Zhiwei Wu, Junhao Feng, Ze Fu, and Yi Cai. MNRE: A challenge multimodal dataset for neural relation extraction with visual evidence in social media posts. In *IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- [244] Lianmin Zheng, Liangsheng Yin, Zhiqiang Xie, Jeff Huang, Chuyue Sun, Cody Hao Yu, Shiyi Cao, Christos Kozyrakis, Ion Stoica, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Efficiently programming large language models using sclang. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.07104*, 2023.
- [245] Lingfeng Zhong, Jia Wu, Qian Li, Hao Peng, and Xindong Wu. A comprehensive

- survey on automatic knowledge graph construction. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(4):1–62, 2023.
- [246] Hanzhang Zhou, Junlang Qian, Zijian Feng, Hui Lu, Zixiao Zhu, and Kezhi Mao. Heuristics-driven link-of-analogy prompting: Enhancing large language models for document-level event argument extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06555*, 2023.
- [247] Shaowen Zhou, Bowen Yu, Aixin Sun, Cheng Long, Jingyang Li, Haiyang Yu, Jian Sun, and Yongbin Li. A survey on neural open information extraction: Current status and future directions. 2022.
- [248] Sizhe Zhou, Yu Meng, Bowen Jin, and Jiawei Han. Grasping the essentials: Tailoring large language models for zero-shot relation extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11142*, 2024.
- [249] Wenzuan Zhou, Sheng Zhang, Yu Gu, Muhan Chen, and Hoifung Poon. UniversalNER: Targeted distillation from large language models for open named entity recognition. 2024.
- [250] Yucheng Zhou, Tao Shen, Xiubo Geng, Guodong Long, and Daxin Jiang. Claret: Pre-training a correlation-aware context-to-event transformer for event-centric generation and classification. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2559–2575, 2022.
- [251] Tong Zhu, Junfei Ren, Zijian Yu, Mengsong Wu, Guoliang Zhang, Xiaoye Qu, Wenliang Chen, Zhefeng Wang, Baoxing Huai, and Min Zhang. Mirror: A universal framework for various information extraction tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8861–8876, 2023.



Derong Xu is currently a joint PhD student at University of Science and Technology of China and City University of Hong Kong. His research interests focus on Multimodal Knowledge graph and large language models.



Wei Chen is currently a master’s student at the University of Science and Technology of China. His research interests include data mining, information extraction, large language models.



Wenjun Peng is currently working toward the Master’s degree in the School of Computer Science and Technology at University of Science and Technology of China (USTC). He obtained his B.E. degree from Sichuan University in 2021. His main research interests include data mining, multimodal learning and person re-ID.




Chao Zhang received the B.E. degree in software engineering from Shandong University, Jinan, China, in 2022. He is currently pursuing the M.S. degree with the School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China.

His research interests include data mining, multimodal learning, and large language models.



Tong Xu is currently working as a Professor at University of Science and Technology of China (USTC), Hefei, China. He has authored more than 100 top-tier journal and conference papers in related fields, including TKDE, TMC, TMM, TOMM, KDD, SIGIR, WWW, ACM MM, etc. He was the recipient of the Best Paper Award of KSEM 2020, and the Area Chair Award for NLP Application Track of ACL 2023.



Xiangyu Zhao is an assistant professor of the school of data science at City University of Hong Kong (CityU). His current research interests include data mining and machine learning. He has published more than 100 papers in top conferences and journals. His research has been awarded ICDM'22 and ICDM'21 Best-ranked Papers, Global Top 100 Chinese New Stars in AI, Huawei Innovation Research Program, CCF-Tencent Open Fund (twice), CCF-Ant Research Fund, Ant Group Research Fund, Tencent Focused Research Fund, and nomination for Joint AAAI/ACM SIGAI Doctoral Dissertation Award. He serves as top data science conference (senior) program committee members and session chairs, and journal guest editors and reviewers. Please find more information at <https://zhaoxyai.github.io/>.

Chao Zhang received the B.E. degree in software engineering from Shandong University, Jinan, China, in 2022. He is currently pursuing the M.S. degree with the School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China.

Tong Xu is currently working as a Professor at University of Science and Technology of China (USTC), Hefei, China. He has authored more than 100 top-tier journal and conference papers in related fields, including TKDE,



Xian Wu is now a Principal Researcher in Tencent. Before joining Tencent, he worked as a Senior Scientist Manager and a Staff Researcher in Microsoft and IBM

Research. Xian Wu received his PhD degree from Shanghai Jiao Tong University. His research interests includes Medical AI, Natural Language Processing and Multi-Modal modeling. Xian Wu has published papers in Nature Computational Science, NPJ digital medicine, T-PAMI, CVPR, NeurIPS, ACL, WWW, KDD, AAAI, IJCAI etc. He also served as PC member of BMJ, T-PAMI, TKDE, TKDD, TOIS, TIST, CVPR, ICCV, AAAI etc.



Yefeng Zheng received B.E. and M.E. degrees from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China in 1998 and 2001, respectively, and a Ph.D. degree from University of Maryland, College Park, USA in 2005. After graduation, he worked at Siemens Corporate Research in Princeton, New Jersey, USA on medical image analysis before joining Tencent in Shenzhen, China in 2018. He is now Distinguished Scientist and Director of Tencent Jarvis Research Center, leading the company's initiative on medical artificial intelligence. He has published 300+ papers and invented 80+ US patents. His work has been cited more than 18,000 times with h-index of 69. He is a fellow of Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), a fellow of American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE), and an Associate Editor of IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging.



Yang Wang is currently working as an Engineer at Anhui Conch Information Technology Engineering Co., Ltd., Wuhu, China. He has more than 10 years of IT project implementation experience in building materials industry, applied for 11 invention patents, published 2 technological papers, and participated in 3 large-scale national science and technology projects.



Enhong Chen (CCF Fellow, IEEE Fellow) is a professor and vice dean of the School of Computer Science, USTC. His general area of research includes data mining and machine learning, social network analysis, and recommender systems. He has published more than 300 papers in refereed conferences and journals, including Nature Communications, IEEE/ACM Transactions, KDD, NIPS, IJCAI and AAAI, etc. He was on program committees of numerous conferences including KDD, ICDM, and SDM. He received the Best Application Paper Award on KDD-2008, the Best Research Paper Award on ICDM-2011, and the Best of SDM-2015. His research is supported by the National Science Foundation for Distinguished Young Scholars of China.