

Language Models can be Logical Solvers

Jiazhan Feng^{1*} Ruochen Xu² Junheng Hao² Hiteshi Sharma²
Yelong Shen² Dongyan Zhao¹ Weizhu Chen²

¹Peking University, Beijing ²Microsoft Azure AI, Redmond

{fengjiazhan, zhaody}@pku.edu.cn

{ruox, junhenghao, hitshar, yeshe, wzchen}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Logical reasoning is a fundamental aspect of human intelligence and a key component of tasks like problem-solving and decision-making. Recent advancements have enabled Large Language Models (LLMs) to potentially exhibit reasoning capabilities, but complex logical reasoning remains a challenge. The state-of-the-art, solver-augmented language models, use LLMs to parse natural language logical questions into symbolic representations first and then adopt external logical solvers to take in the symbolic representations and output the answers. Despite their impressive performance, any parsing errors will inevitably result in the failure of the execution of the external logical solver and no answer to the logical questions. In this paper, we introduce LOGIPT, a novel language model that directly emulates the reasoning processes of logical solvers and bypasses the parsing errors by learning to strict adherence to solver syntax and grammar. LOGIPT is fine-tuned on a newly constructed instruction-tuning dataset derived from revealing and refining the invisible reasoning process of deductive solvers. Experimental results on two public deductive reasoning datasets demonstrate that LOGIPT outperforms state-of-the-art solver-augmented LLMs and few-shot prompting methods on competitive LLMs like ChatGPT or GPT-4.

1 Introduction

Logical reasoning is a foundational element of human intelligence, holding a pivotal role in tasks like problem-solving, decision-making, and critical thinking (Huang and Chang, 2023). Recently, substantial advancements have been achieved in the field of NLP through the development of large language models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2022, 2023; Google, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023a,b). It has

been noted that language models (LMs) could potentially display reasoning capabilities when they reach a certain scale threshold (e.g., training compute, model parameters, etc.) (Kaplan et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2022a; Hoffmann et al., 2022). To this end, LLMs can answer logical questions with explicit reasoning steps when prompted with a simple snippet: “*Let’s think step by step.*” (Kojima et al., 2022) or step-wise explanations of reasoning (i.e., “chain of thoughts”) (Wei et al., 2022b).

While LLMs have made significant progress, complex logical reasoning remains challenging (Valmeekam et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2023b). Some prior work (Tafjord et al., 2022; Ling et al., 2023) aimed to enable LMs to perform logical reasoning via specialized module fine-tuning, where reasoning is in natural language (NL). However, the ambiguity and complexity of NL can lead to undesired issues like hallucinations and unfaithful reasoning (Saparov and He, 2023; Gao et al., 2023). To this end, recent work has begun to augment LLMs with access to external Solvers (Chen et al., 2022; Ye et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2023). In this paper, we focus on the logical solvers, which are theorem provers that can be any automated reasoning tool for checking the truth value of logical formulas in symbolic language (SL). Invoking logical solvers can guarantee the accuracy of logical reasoning and relieve the burden of LLMs to execute intricate and precise deductive reasoning.

The data flow of the aforementioned solver-augmented LMs is depicted in Figure 1(a). At the outset, the information of logical questions is stored in NL. It is subsequently fed into a LM for parsing into a symbolic representation suitable for solver-input format. Finally, the SL information is dispatched to a symbolic solver, which yields the truth value of the logical question. However, during this process, any NL-to-SL parsing errors will inevitably result in the failure of the reasoning process and no answer to the question. In our pre-

* Work done during Jiazhan’s internship at Microsoft Azure AI.




Figure 1: Data flow of current solver-augmented LMs for inference (a), and our pipeline for LOGIPT (b,c).

liminary experiments, we observed that the parsing successful rate (i.e., percentage of executable logical formulations) of Vicuna-13B (Chiang et al., 2023) on ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021) is only 17%, significantly below the expected performance. In addressing parsing failures, current methods either directly use LLMs to reason in NL solely or rely on the solver’s erroneous message to regenerate parsing results, but these approaches don’t fundamentally resolve the problem.

In this paper, we introduce LOGIPT, a novel LM designed to mimic the reasoning process of logical solvers, enabling it to solve deductive reasoning tasks. We first construct an instruction-tuning dataset containing NL logical questions and their corresponding solver’s symbolic reasoning process. After filtering out cases having invalid syntax, we fine-tune open-source LMs like Vicuna or CodeLlama (Roziere et al., 2023) with this data to create LOGIPT. Then, LOGIPT can generate all implied facts given premises and rules, allowing us to determine the truth value of a logical query by matching it with implied facts or outputting ‘unknown’ if it cannot be determined. The data flow of our pipeline is presented in Figure 1(b,c). We can bypass the syntax or grammatical errors derived from NL-to-SL parsing by directly outputting the answers with a fine-tuned LOGIPT.

Our approach is akin to the process of distillation, whereby we distill knowledge from a symbolic model (i.e., solver) into a neural network (i.e., LM). However, the reasoning process of solvers is invisible to users and we can **only** obtain the answers without intermediate reasoning steps. We design a pipeline to reveal and formalize solvers’ invisible reasoning processes, creating instruction-tuning datasets with visible and interpretable sym-

bolic reasoning steps (see Figure 3).

Our main contributions are three-fold:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to propose empowering LLMs to directly learn the reasoning process of logical solvers, thereby acquiring similar reasoning capability for addressing deductive reasoning tasks.
- Our proposed LOGIPT, can directly act as a deductive solver and output all Facts implied from NL logical questions while bypassing the syntax or grammatical errors derived from NL-to-SL parsing of solver-augmented LMs.
- Evaluation results on two public deductive reasoning datasets show that LOGIPT can outperform state-of-the-art solver-augmented LMs, and few-shot prompting methods on competitive LLMs like ChatGPT or GPT-4.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Deductive Reasoning

Deductive reasoning is an essential type of logical reasoning problem. It typically commences with known facts and rules from logical context, then proceeds through a series of inference steps until the query can be proved or disproved (Poole and Mackworth, 2010). In this paper, we consider the Prolog logic programming language (Clocksin and Mellish, 2003; Körner et al., 2022), which stands as the most prominent symbolic language for describing deductive reasoning problems. We showcased a deductive reasoning question along with its corresponding Prolog syntax representation in Figure 2.

For each question, we denote the NL description as **Context**. The **Context** can further be parsed




Figure 2: A deductive reasoning question derived from ProofWriter and its parsed Facts, Rules, and Query.

into **Facts**, **Rules**, and **Query**¹. Specifically, a **Fact** $F = P(a_1, \dots, a_t)$ is a symbolic statement with a predicate P and t arguments $\{a_1, \dots, a_t\}$ where a_i can be a variable, entity, number or bool. For example, $\text{Green}(\text{'Charlie'}, \text{True})$ means “Charlie is green”; **Rules** are presented in the form of clauses $F_1 \wedge \dots \wedge F_m \rightarrow F_{m+1} \wedge \dots \wedge F_n$, where F_i is a Fact. The Rule means “if each $F_i \in \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ is true, then we can imply that all Facts in $\{F_{m+1}, \dots, F_n\}$ are also true.” For example, $\text{Furry}(\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Quiet}(\$x, \text{True})$ indicates if variable $\$x$ is furry, then $\$x$ is quiet; a **Query** Q is also in the format of a Fact that needs to be proved based on Facts and Rules.

2.2 Solver-augmented LMs

Solver-augmented LMs have demonstrated remarkable performance in deductive reasoning tasks. As shown in Figure 1(a), these model can be generally divided into two stages: *Problem Formulation (from LMs to Symbolic Solvers)* and *Symbolic Reasoning (from Symbolic Solvers to Answers)*.

In *Problem Formulation* stage, an LM is used to parse an NL logical question into symbolic representation (Figure 2). The process can be accomplished by providing LM with detailed instructions about the grammar of Prolog, alongside a few demonstrations as in-context examples (Ouyang et al., 2022). The LM is expected to identify the symbolic Facts, Rules, and Query from the NL logical question following the instructions; In *Symbolic Reasoning* stage, a solver takes in the symbolic representation obtained in the previous stage and conducts symbolic reasoning. The reasoning process of external off-the-shelf solver, e.g., pyke expert system (Frederiksen, 2008), is deterministic and invisible. Then, the truth value of the parsed Query, which is the only output of the solver, can

¹In this paper, the term ‘Query’ refers to a specific sentence of statement or comment, while ‘question’ is used in a broader sense to denote the description of a logical problem.

Model	ProofWriter	PrOntoQA
Vicuna-13B	17.00	40.80
CodeLlama-13B-Base	0.33	0.40
CodeLlama-13B-Instruct	71.33	77.80

Table 1: Parsing successful rate (%) of our selected open-source LLMs on two deductive reasoning datasets.

be treated as the answer to the given question.

2.3 Analysis on the Parsing Successful Rate

Through the aforementioned two phases, once the solver-augmented LMs correctly formulate the problem, the answers obtained through symbolic reasoning will be faithful, attributed to the deterministic nature of the solver. However, this heavily relies on the in-context learning capabilities of LMs. Therefore, we first calculate the parsing successful rate of three selected open-source LLMs on two deductive reasoning datasets in Table 1. Firstly, we observe that CodeLlama-13B-Base (CodeLlama-13b-hf) is unable to effectively conduct NL-to-SL parsing due to the limited in-context learning capabilities in natural languages. Then we can find that replacing the Base model with the Instruct version (CodeLlama-13b-Instruct-hf) can alleviate this issue, which may be attributed to the fact that the Instruct version is further fine-tuned with an additional approx. 5B tokens to better follow human instructions. Overall, open-source LLMs still exhibit parsing performance significantly lower than expected in some cases.

3 LoGiPT

In this paper, we aim to mitigate the parsing issue and present a novel LM, LOGIPT instructed to imitate the logical reasoning process of Solvers for deductive reasoning tasks. To achieve this, we first reveal the solver reasoning process when solving logical problems (§3.1). Then, we construct a solver-derived instruction-tuning dataset, comprising NL logical questions and corresponding SL reasoning steps (§3.2). Finally, we fine-tune open-source LLMs using this dataset to develop LOGIPT (§3.3).

3.1 Revealing the Solver Reasoning Process

Before operating on the solvers, we first adopt gpt-4 as the problem formulator for NL-to-SL parsing with instructions about the grammar and




Figure 3: A comprehensive 4-turn training example of our instruction-tuning data. We highlight the initial occurrences of each functionality described in §3.1 using the corresponding colors. We omit some predicates and Facts in Turn-2 due to limited space. *Hint: this figure is color-sensitive.*

few-shot demonstrations², and obtain the SL representations of all training logical questions of the given logical datasets. Then, consistent with solver-augmented methods, we adopt pyke expert system as the symbolic solver in this work that can make inferences using the Prolog symbolic language. Given a logical question, pyke first sets up a knowledge base and injects all known Facts and Rules (Figure 2) from solver’s inputs. Then, it iteratively applies Rules on already known or implied Facts, aiming at obtaining more implied Facts until the Query is proved or disproved.

The reasoning process executed by pyke solver is invisible to users and solver-augmented LMs use the solver as a *black-box*. We hypothesize the ‘chain-of-thought’ reasoning process of the solver is valuable and LLMs are able to learn from it. To this end, we first modify the source code of the pyke³ to achieve the following functionalities:

1. For each application of a Rule, explicitly state the Rule being ‘Used’, or ‘Reused’ if the Rule has been applied before.
2. When finishing the application of a Rule, explicitly state the ‘Finish’ action.
3. When assigning a value (e.g., an entity) to a variable (e.g., \$x) within a Fact in a Rule, explicitly specify the variable being assigned using ‘Bind’ and its corresponding value.
4. Similarly, when the variable assignment is complete, provide an explicit indication via ‘Unbind’.
5. When obtaining a new implied Fact, explicitly state the ‘New Fact obtained’. If this Fact is an ‘Already known or implied Fact’, this should also be noted explicitly.
6. Upon the completion of reasoning, explicitly display ‘All newly implied Facts’ in the knowledge base.

With the aforementioned instructions, we can obtain the revealed solver’s reasoning process for the construction of training data. We also high-

²Detailed instructions for NL-to-SL Parsing are shown in Appendix A and B.

³<https://pyke.sourceforge.net/>

lighted the initial occurrences of each functionality using the corresponding colors in Figure 3 (Turn-2), where a case will be described in detail in the next section.

3.2 Constructing the Instruction-tuning Data

However, as previously mentioned, we cannot guarantee that LMs can definitely complete the NL-to-SL parsing on arbitrary questions. To this end, we first filter out all unsuccessfully parsed training cases that cannot be executed by pyke. Then we reorganize and refine the filtered training data to enhance the interpretability of the solver-derived reasoning steps. For each case, we divide the reasoning process into four conversational turns (Turn-1&3 for human and Turn-2&4 for LM), which will be described elaborately in the following paragraphs. We also provide a comprehensive training example of our instruction-tuning data⁴ in Figure 3, and the full version is also included in Appendix C.

Turn-1: Instructions & NL logical Context.

For each NL logical question within the training set, we begin by stripping away the specific Query statement while retaining the question Context and subsequently integrating it with elaborately crafted instructions. Taking the case in Figure 3 as an example, we temporarily exclude the Query ‘Dave is not green’ from the ‘Context’ field. Here, we only consider Query-agnostic question description to ensure that LMs initially focus on the logical background itself. This is because sometimes the ground-truth answer is ‘Unknown’ (e.g., cases in ProofWriter). The truth value of the Query cannot be inferred from the Context, and therefore we need to deduce all implied Facts first.

Turn-2: Query-agnostic Solver-derived Reasoning.

As we have acquired the solver’s symbolic reasoning data in the revealing phase, our goal in Turn-2 is to further refine and enhance the reasoning process to achieve a more readable form of the solver’s reasoning process. Specifically, for each logical question, we first define all necessary predicates and append the corresponding natural language explanations. Then we list the known Facts and Rules extracted from the Context with interleaved NL instructions.

After that, we represent the application of each Rule by utilizing separate blocks, line by line. We

⁴In the original case, the Query is ‘Charlie is not green.’. We replace it with ‘Dave is not green.’ for better illustration.

strive to preserve as many solver actions as possible, such as ‘Binding’ and ‘Unbinding’, as well as the acquisition of new implied Facts, and so forth. Noting that this information has already been obtained during the revealing phase, we focus on the refinement of the solver-derived reasoning process. Finally, we enumerate all newly implied Facts to enable the model to perform an interim review.

Turn-3: Query & Answering Instructions. In Turn-3, we present instructions for answering a given Query. Following prior works (Ceri et al., 1989; Tafjord et al., 2021), a Query can be considered true within a certain logical context if it is explicitly mentioned or if it can be implied through several Rule applications. To handle negation, we consider two distinct assumptions: 1) the open-world assumption (OWA) that treats any fact that cannot be provable as special truth value ‘unknown’; 2) the closed-world assumption (CWA) where any fact not provable is assumed ‘false’. Following both assumptions, we adjust the answering instructions, particularly the ‘Options’ part.

Turn-4: Query-based Reasoning & Formatted Answer.

In the final Turn-4, we compare the parsed Query with all the known Facts and implied Facts, expecting the model to perform basic language inference and generate answer options in the desired format.

3.3 Fine-tuning Open-source LLMs

After obtaining the refined deductive reasoning instruction-tuning dataset, we can perform fine-tuning on open-source LLMs with the expectation that the trained model (i.e., LOGIPT) can possess reasoning abilities similar to those of solvers. Consequently, for any given Query, we can bypass the syntax or grammatical errors derived from NL-to-SL parsing by directly generating the answer with a fine-tuned LOGIPT.

4 Experiments

We construct our solver-derived instruction-tuning data on two public deductive reasoning datasets and evaluate LOGIPT on corresponding test sets.

4.1 Datasets

ProofWriter (Tafjord et al., 2021) is a commonly employed dataset for deductive logical reasoning. Following Pan et al. (2023), we adopt the open-world assumption (OWA) subset where the answer

Model	Prompting Methods	ProofWriter	PrOntoQA
Random Answering	-	33.33	50.00
<i>closed-source LMs</i>			
ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo)	Few-shot Standard	35.50	47.40
ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo)	Few-shot CoT	49.17	67.80
GPT-3.5 (text-davinci-003)	Few-shot Standard	36.16	51.80
GPT-3.5 (text-davinci-003)	Few-shot CoT	48.33	83.00
GPT-4 (gpt-4)	Few-shot Standard	52.67	77.40
GPT-4 (gpt-4)	Few-shot CoT	68.11	<u>98.79</u>
<i>open-source LMs</i>			
Vicuna-13B (vicuna-13b-v1.5-16k)	Few-shot Standard	35.50	53.80
Vicuna-13B (vicuna-13b-v1.5-16k)	Few-shot CoT	41.50	37.40
CodeLlama-13B-Base (CodeLlama-13b-hf)	Few-shot Standard	0.00	0.00
CodeLlama-13B-Base (CodeLlama-13b-hf)	Few-shot CoT	36.00	50.00
CodeLlama-13B-Instruct (CodeLlama-13b-Instruct-hf)	Few-shot Standard	36.83	52.20
CodeLlama-13B-Instruct (CodeLlama-13b-Instruct-hf)	Few-shot CoT	32.67	66.40
<i>solver-argued LMs</i>			
LogicLM (gpt-3.5-turbo)	Few-shot CoT	58.33	61.00
LogicLM (text-davinci-003)	Few-shot CoT	71.45	85.00
LogicLM (gpt-4)	Few-shot CoT	79.66	83.20
<i>ours</i>			
LOGIPT (vicuna-13b-v1.5-16k)	Four-turn CoT	81.17	96.40
LOGIPT (CodeLlama-13b-hf)	Four-turn CoT	89.50	95.60
LOGIPT (CodeLlama-13b-Instruct-hf)	Four-turn CoT	81.67	96.20

Table 2: Main results on two evaluation datasets. The best results of LOGIPT are in **bold** and the best results within each dataset are underlined.

of each example is one of $\{True, False, Unknown\}$. The original dataset is partitioned into 5 subsets where each part requiring $0, \leq 1, \leq 2, \leq 3$, and ≤ 5 hops of reasoning, respectively. For evaluation, we adopted the version provided by Pan et al. (2023), which comprises 600 samples from the most challenging 5-hop subsets with balanced label distribution. For training, we merged all training subsets and obtained 41,433 training examples after the construction stage.

PrOntoQA (Saparov and He, 2023) is a synthetic logical reasoning dataset created recently to test the general deductive reasoning capacity of LLMs. We adopt the hardest *fictional characters* version of the dataset following Pan et al. (2023) where the entities of Facts are fictional concept names (e.g., ‘wumpus’ instead of ‘cat’), to avoid any confounding effects from knowledge acquired during the pretraining phase. Similar to ProofWriter, PrOntoQA is organized into several subsets based on the number of required reasoning steps. We use the hardest 5-hop subset for evaluation. Contrary to ProofWriter, PrOntoQA is in a closed-world assumption (CWA) subset where the answer of each example is one of $\{True, False\}$. For training, we merely merge all subsets with *fictional characters*

and obtained 15,940 training cases after filtering out syntax-invalid ones.

4.2 Baselines

We consider comparing LOGIPT with following groups of baselines:

Closed-source LMs: We include the ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo) (OpenAI, 2022), GPT-3.5 (text-davinci-003) (Ouyang et al., 2022) and GPT-4 (gpt-4) (OpenAI, 2023) as closed-source LMs for evaluation following Pan et al. (2023).

Open-source LMs: We also evaluate open-source LMs for research community. Specifically, we choose Vicuna-13B (vicuna-13b-v1.5-16k) (Chiang et al., 2023), a chatbot trained by fine-tuning LLaMA-2 (Touvron et al., 2023b) on user-shared conversations collected from ShareGPT⁵, and CodeLlama-13B (Roziere et al., 2023), foundation models for code tasks. We select the base version (CodeLlama-13b-hf), and instruction fine-tuned version (CodeLlama-13b-Instruct-hf).

Solver-argued LMs: Finally, we compare our model against the solver-argued LMs. We focus on the representative LogicLM (Pan

⁵<https://sharegpt.com/>

et al., 2023) with underlying LLMs ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo), GPT-3.5 (text-davinci-003) and GPT-4 (gpt-4), which serve as the state-of-the-art deductive reasoning methods.

Apart from the LMs, we also analyze two types of prompting methods: i) *Standard prompting* that uses in-context learning with few-shot demonstrations to directly answer the given question; ii) *Chain-of-Thought (CoT)* that utilizes step-by-step problem-solving process to generate explanations where few-shot demonstrations are also provided, and then outputs the final answer. For a fair comparison, we use the same in-context examples, shown in Appendix A and B, for NL-to-SL parsing when evaluating all models on the same dataset, consistent with Pan et al. (2023). To enhance the clarification, we also provide a specific baseline ‘*Random Answering*’ that randomly outputs answer options.

4.3 Implementation Details

During the fine-tuning phase, we use a batch size of 32 per GPU and a learning rate of $1e-5$ for all open-source LMs. We train our model on 8 Nvidia A100-80G GPUs with DeepSpeed ZeRO-3 (Rasley et al., 2020) for 12 hours on 2 epochs. For reproducibility, we use greedy decoding and set the temperature to 0 and the maximum context length to 8192. As for baselines, we strictly follow the setting of Pan et al. (2023). Given that all instances are presented in the form of multiple-choice questions, we assess the model’s performance by the accuracy of selecting the correct answer option.

4.4 Main Results

We report the results of LOGIPT and baselines on Table 2 and have following main findings:

1) When prompting with few-shot examples, open-source LMs exhibit notably poor deductive reasoning capabilities, with their outputs closed to random answering. Even the Standard prompting models of ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-turbo) and GPT-3.5 (text-davinci-003) exhibit a similar performance to random answering. This once again demonstrates that it is considerably difficult for many LLMs to solve logical reasoning tasks.

2) LOGIPT is significantly superior to the state-of-the-art solver-augmented LMs by a large margin on both deductive reasoning benchmarks. In ProofWriter, our best-performing model, LOGIPT (CodeLlama-13b-hf), outperforms the currently state-of-the-art LogicLM (gpt-4) by an absolute improvement of 9.84%. Mean-

while, in PrOntoQA, our best-performing model LOGIPT (vicuna-13b-v1.5-16k) exhibits an even higher absolute improvement of 13.20% than LogicLM (gpt-4). This indicates that our approach is better than the pipeline of problem formulation first and then reasoning with solvers, and fine-tuning with solver-derived reasoning data can facilitate the deductive reasoning capacity of LMs.

3) LOGIPT significantly outperforms all selected open/closed-source LMs on both datasets, except for the CoT experiment on the PrOntoQA data where LOGIPT achieves comparable results with GPT-4 CoT. This is surprising considering that our underlying open-source LMs are merely 13B parameters in size. As for the baseline experiments of GPT-4, our performance on ProofWriter also significantly surpasses that of GPT-4’s Standard and CoT prompting versions, as well as the Standard version of PrOntoQA. These results further demonstrate that open-source LMs, when coupled with solver-simulated reasoning capacity, can achieve performance on par with or even superior to closed-source GPT models.

4) The accuracy of CodeLlama-13B-Base (CodeLlama-13b-hf) with Standard prompting was 0.00, and the performance of the CoT version was close to random answering. By examining the outputs, we found that this is due to the CodeLlama-13B-Base’s inability to follow the provided few-shot demonstrations, resulting in outputting no answering options. The introduction of the Instruct version of CodeLlama-13B mitigates this issue to some extent. However, after training with LOGIPT, the CodeLlama models far less encounter this issue (i.e., following the right answering format in both test sets) and even achieve better performance than the Vicuna version of LOGIPT. This demonstrates the potential of code foundation models in logical reasoning tasks, consistent with the finding on prior work (Yue et al., 2023).

5 Further Analysis

5.1 Impact of Solver-derived Reasoning Formats

We further investigate the impact of different solver-derived reasoning formats on the model’s performance. Specifically, we consider the following format variations: 1) *w/o ‘unbind’ statements* that we remove all ‘Unbind’ statements from **Turn-2** to investigate the utility of the explicit retention of this action from the solver; 2) *w/o ‘fail & back-*

Model	Accuracy
LOGIPT (vicuna-13b-v1.5-16k)	81.17
+ (w/o ‘unbind’ statements)	80.67
+ (w/o ‘fail & backtrack’ statements)	<u>84.00</u>
+ (w/ NL representation)	66.33
LOGIPT (CodeLlama-13b-hf)	89.50
+ (w/o ‘unbind’ statements)	<u>93.33</u>
+ (w/o ‘fail & backtrack’ statements)	87.17
+ (w/ NL representation)	52.33
LOGIPT (CodeLlama-13b-Instruct-hf)	81.67
+ (w/o ‘unbind’ statements)	79.00
+ (w/o ‘fail & backtrack’ statements)	<u>84.83</u>
+ (w/ NL representation)	66.33

Table 3: The accuracy of the variations on solver-derived reasoning format, and replacing SL representations with NL on ProofWriter. The best results on each underlying LMs are underlined.

Train set	Test Set	VCN	CLB	CLI
PrOntoQA	PrOntoQA	96.40	95.60	96.20
Both	PrOntoQA	91.00	87.00	89.00
Both (Reformat)	PrOntoQA	90.00	87.00	77.80
ProofWriter	ProofWriter	81.17	89.50	81.67
Both	ProofWriter	79.33	87.17	79.67
Both (Reformat)	ProofWriter	79.00	90.83	84.50

Table 4: The accuracy of LOGIPT trained with merged data and tested on single data with different underlying LMs. ‘VCN’, ‘CLB’, and ‘CLI’ respectively represent Vicuna-13B, CodeLlama-13B-Base, and CodeLlama-13B-Instruct. ‘Both’ means ‘ProofWriter + PrOntoQA’.

track’ statements that we removing all ‘Fail & backtrack’ statements from **Turn-2**. During the solver’s reasoning process, it is expected to encounter situations in which, after binding a value, the solver realizes that not all premises are satisfied (e.g., ‘Fiona is blue’ but ‘Fiona is not quiet’ for application of Rule3 in Figure 3). Consequently, a ‘Fail & backtrack’ operation occurs (highlighted in color in Figure 3). We explore the effectiveness of explicitly stating these operations.

We present the accuracy of the variations on solver-derived reasoning format on ProofWriter in Table 3 where several observations can be made: 1) regardless of using the default format, removing ‘Unbind’ statements, or removing ‘Fail & backtrack’ statements, it can not be determined which format guarantees the optimal results. To retain the maximum amount of action information that the solver can provide, we still adopt the de-

fault settings in LOGIPT; 2) whether ‘Unbind’ statements are removed or ‘Fail & backtrack’ statements are removed, there is always an experiment under each open-source LMs that can surpass the default LOGIPT results. This further enhances the best performance of LOGIPT shown in Table 2.

5.2 Impact of SL Reasoning Representations

We are also curious about the impact of SL reasoning representations. Therefore, we include additional experiments in Table 3, denoted as *w/ NL representation* that we re-translate the symbolic representation (e.g., `Green(‘Charlie’, True)`) back to its original NL version (e.g., `Charlie is green.`) and replace the original symbolic representation in **Turn-2**. From the table, we can find that replacing SL representations with NL results in a significant decrease in model performance, further emphasizing that symbolic representations are superior to NL representations in deductive reasoning tasks.

5.3 Effectiveness of Merging Data from Different Reasoning Assumptions

Since ProofWriter is an open-world assumption and PrOntoQA is labeled within a closed-world assumption, we also perform a further investigation on whether both reasoning assumptions can benefit each other. Specifically, we first merge both constructed training data and then test LOGIPT on each test set. The experimental results are shown in Table 4. We can conclude that if we directly mix the two types of data for training, the results on their respective test sets will be slightly lower than those obtained from training solely on their respective datasets. Therefore, we conducted an in-depth analysis of the underlying reasons and observed that in PrOntoQA, the majority of Rules are in the format of ‘Every/Each A is (not) B’ or ‘A are (not) B’. While in ProofWriter, the predominant structure of Rules consists of: ‘If someone is A, then they are B’ or ‘If something is A, then it is B’. Therefore, we conducted an additional set of experiments in which the Rule format of two training sets was randomly reformatted into the four aforementioned types using regular expression (denoted as ‘Both (Reformat)’). Then, we test the model on the original test sets. We can observe that by employing this approach, the code models yield improved performance on ProofWriter. Thus, the style/genre of logical context must also be taken into consideration to maximize the efficacy of transfer learning

in logical reasoning.

6 Related Work

Logical Reasoning with LMs. Recent efforts in adapting Large Language Models (LLMs) for logical reasoning tasks generally adopt direct fine-tuning specialized modules (Clark et al., 2020; Tafjord et al., 2021, 2022; Yang et al., 2022) or in-context learning (Zhou et al., 2022; Lyu et al., 2023; Ling et al., 2023), where reasoning in NL is used by both groups of methods. Fine-tuning approaches involve training the full model or specialized modules, enhancing LLMs with module-level logical reasoning skills like proof, enumeration, and abduction (Tafjord et al., 2021). The in-context learning approaches create specific prompts to encourage LLMs’ step-by-step reasoning skills. Common methods encompass chain-of-thought prompting (Wei et al., 2022b; Chen et al., 2023), which produces explanations before delivering a final answer, and least-to-most prompting (Zhou et al., 2022), which deconstructs a problem into simpler components that can be resolved individually. Some recent work has focused on combining neural networks with symbolic reasoning (Tian et al., 2022; Pryor et al., 2022; Pan et al., 2023), especially the solver-augmented LMs that parse NL logical questions into symbolic representations, then utilizing external logical solvers for answering. Despite their impressive performance, parsing errors can lead to solver execution failure and logical question-answering issues. To address this, we propose LOGIPT, which directly imitates the solver’s reasoning ability and outputs the answer.

Augmented LMs for Reasoning. Recent work has begun to augment LMs to overcome their inherent limitations such as the incapacity to access up-to-date information or conduct accurate mathematical reasoning. They augment with external tools and resources, such as the information retriever (Shi et al., 2023; Lazaridou et al., 2022), planner (Liu et al., 2023a) and other pre-trained models (Shen et al., 2023). Specifically, to enhance the reasoning capacity, recent work resort to external off-the-shelf **Solvers** including programmatic interpreters (Chen et al., 2022; Gao et al., 2023), satisfiability solvers (Ye et al., 2023), logical solvers (Pan et al., 2023) or their hybrids (Poesia et al., 2023). Most of them utilize the LMs to parse the NL question to symbolic representations and then invoke solvers to reason in SL. In this paper,

we concentrate on logical solvers, automated tools for validating the truth value of logical formulas.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel LOGIPT that can directly act as a logical solver for deductive reasoning tasks. LOGIPT can output all facts implied from NL logical questions, while bypassing the syntax or grammatical errors derived from NL-to-SL parsing of solver-augmented LMs. We conducted numerous analytical experiments on two public deductive reasoning benchmarks. Evaluation results show that LOGIPT can significantly outperform state-of-the-art solver-augmented LMs, and surpass or be comparable with few-shot prompting methods on competitive LLMs like ChatGPT or GPT-4.

References

- Stefano Ceri, Georg Gottlob, Letizia Tanca, et al. 1989. What you always wanted to know about datalog (and never dared to ask). *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 1(1):146–166.
- Wenhu Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W Cohen. 2022. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12588*.
- Zhipeng Chen, Kun Zhou, Beichen Zhang, Zheng Gong, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. Chatcot: Tool-augmented chain-of-thought reasoning on chat-based large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14323*.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality.
- Peter Clark, Oyvind Tafjord, and Kyle Richardson. 2020. Transformers as soft reasoners over language. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-20*, pages 3882–3890. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Main track.
- William F Clocksin and Christopher S Mellish. 2003. *Programming in PROLOG*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bruce Frederiksen. 2008. Applying expert system technology to code reuse with pyke. *PyCon: Chicago*.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Pal: Program-aided language

- models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10764–10799. PMLR.
- Google. 2023. [Google bard](https://bard.google.com/). <https://bard.google.com/>.
- Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. Training compute-optimal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15556*.
- Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2023. [Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1049–1065, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213.
- Philipp Körner, Michael Leuschel, João Barbosa, Vítor Santos Costa, Verónica Dahl, Manuel V Hermenegildo, Jose F Morales, Jan Wielemaker, Daniel Diaz, Salvador Abreu, et al. 2022. Fifty years of prolog and beyond. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, 22(6):776–858.
- Angeliki Lazaridou, Elena Gribovskaya, Wojciech Stokowiec, and Nikolai Grigorev. 2022. Internet-augmented language models through few-shot prompting for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05115*.
- Zhan Ling, Yunhao Fang, Xuanlin Li, Zhiao Huang, Mingu Lee, Roland Memisevic, and Hao Su. 2023. Deductive verification of chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03872*.
- Bo Liu, Yuqian Jiang, Xiaohan Zhang, Qiang Liu, Shiqi Zhang, Joydeep Biswas, and Peter Stone. 2023a. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*.
- Hanmeng Liu, Ruoxi Ning, Zhiyang Teng, Jian Liu, Qiji Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023b. Evaluating the logical reasoning ability of chatgpt and gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03439*.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13379*.
- OpenAI. 2022. [Chatgpt: Optimizing language models for dialogue](https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/). <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>.
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Liangming Pan, Alon Albalak, Xinyi Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2023. Logic-lm: Empowering large language models with symbolic solvers for faithful logical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12295*.
- Gabriel Poesia, Kanishk Gandhi, Eric Zelikman, and Noah D Goodman. 2023. Certified reasoning with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04031*.
- David L Poole and Alan K Mackworth. 2010. *Artificial Intelligence: foundations of computational agents*. Cambridge University Press.
- Connor Pryor, Charles Dickens, Eriq Augustine, Alon Albalak, William Wang, and Lise Getoor. 2022. Neupl: Neural probabilistic soft logic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14268*.
- Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Deepspeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 3505–3506.
- Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. 2023. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*.
- Abulhair Saparov and He He. 2023. Language models are greedy reasoners: A systematic formal analysis of chain-of-thought. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. 2023. Hugging-gpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in huggingface. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17580*.
- Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12652*.
- Oyvind Tafjord, Bhavana Dalvi, and Peter Clark. 2021. [ProofWriter: Generating implications, proofs, and abductive statements over natural language](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 3621–3634, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Oyvind Tafjord, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, and Peter Clark. 2022. [Entailer: Answering questions with faithful and truthful chains of reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2078–2093, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jidong Tian, Yitian Li, Wenqing Chen, Liqiang Xiao, Hao He, and Yaohui Jin. 2022. Weakly supervised neural symbolic learning for cognitive tasks. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 5888–5896.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023a. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023b. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Karthik Valmeekam, Alberto Olmo, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2022. Large language models still can’t plan (a benchmark for llms on planning and reasoning about change). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10498*.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022a. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Kaiyu Yang, Jia Deng, and Danqi Chen. 2022. [Generating natural language proofs with verifier-guided search](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 89–105, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xi Ye, Qiaochu Chen, Isil Dillig, and Greg Durrett. 2023. Satisfiability-aided language models using declarative prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09656*.
- Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. 2023. Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05653*.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V Le, et al. 2022. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

A Instructions for NL-to-SL Parsing on ProofWriter

Task Description: You are given a problem description and a question. The task is to:

- 1) define all the predicates in the problem
- 2) parse the problem into logic rules based on the defined predicates
- 3) write all the facts mentioned in the problem
- 4) parse the question into the logic form

Problem:

Anne is quiet. Erin is furry. (... more context here ...) All red people are young.

Question:

Based on the above information, is the following statement true, false, or unknown? Anne is white.

Predicates:

Quiet(\$x, bool) ::: Is x quiet?

Furry(\$x, bool) ::: Is x furry?

(... more predicates here ...)

Young(\$x, bool) ::: Is x young?

Facts:

Quiet(Arne, True) ::: Anne is quiet.

Furry(Erin, True) ::: Erin is furry.

(... more facts here ...)

Quiet(Harry, True) ::: Harry is quiet.

White(Harry, True) ::: Harry is white.

Rules:

Young(\$x, True) >>> Furry(\$x, True) ::: Young people are furry.

Quiet(Arne, True) >>> Red(\$x, True) ::: If Anne is quiet then Anne is red.

(... more rules here ...)

Red(\$x, True) >>> Young(\$x, True) ::: All red people are young.

Query:

White(Arne, True) ::: Anne is white.

Problem:

(new problem here)

Question:

(new question here)

B Instructions for NL-to-SL Parsing on PrOntoQA

Task Description: You are given a problem description and a question. The task is to:

- 1) define all the predicates in the problem
- 2) parse the problem into logic rules based on the defined predicates
- 3) write all the facts mentioned in the problem
- 4) parse the question into the logic form

Problem:

Each jompus is fruity. Every jompus is a wumpus. (... more context here ...) Alex is a tumpus.

Question:

True or false: Alex is not shy.

Predicates:

Jompus(\$x, bool) ::: Does x belong to Jompuses?

Fruity(\$x, bool) ::: Is x fruity?

(... more predicates here ...)

Liquid(\$x, bool) ::: Is x liquid?

Zumpus(\$x, bool) ::: Does x belong to Zumpuses?

Facts:

Tumpus(Alex, True) ::: Alex is a tumpus.

Rules:

Jompus(\$x, True) >>> Fruity(\$x, True) ::: Each jompus is fruity.

Jompus(\$x, True) >>> Wumpus(\$x, True) ::: Every jompus is a wumpus.

(... more rules here ...)

Rompus(\$x, True) >>> Liquid(\$x, True) ::: Each rompus is liquid.

Rompus(\$x, True) >>> Zumpus(\$x, True) ::: Rompuses are zumpuses.

Query:

Shy(Alex, False) ::: Alex is not shy.

Problem:

(new problem here)

Question:

(new question here)

C A Comprehensive Training Example of our Instruction-tuning Data

<p>Turn-1 (from human): Task Description: Given a statement containing logical facts and rules in natural languages as context, the task is to: 1. define all the predicates in logic forms from the context 2. parse the statement into known facts and rules based on the defined predicates 3. begin reasoning to obtain all implied facts</p> <p>Context: Charlie is green. Charlie is white. Dave is blue. Dave is furry. Dave is white. Fiona is blue. Fiona is green. Fiona is nice. Fiona is rough. Fiona is white. All furry people are quiet. All green, white people are nice. If someone is blue and quiet then they are green.</p> <p>Reasoning:</p>	<p>Use rule2: $\text{Green}(\\$x, \text{True}) \wedge \text{White}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Nice}(\\$x, \text{True})$ Bind \$x to 'Charlie' Obtain a new implied fact: $\text{Nice}('Charlie', \text{True})$ Unbind \$x Bind \$x to 'Fiona' Obtain an already known or implied fact: $\text{Nice}('Fiona', \text{True})$ Unbind \$x Finish implied with rule2</p> <p>Use rule3: $\text{Blue}(\\$x, \text{True}) \wedge \text{Quiet}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Green}(\\$x, \text{True})$ Bind \$x to 'Dave' Obtain a new implied fact: $\text{Green}('Dave', \text{True})$ Reuse rule2: $\text{Green}(\\$x, \text{True}) \wedge \text{White}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Nice}(\\$x, \text{True})$ Bind \$x to 'Dave' Obtain a new implied fact: $\text{Nice}('Dave', \text{True})$ Finish implied with rule2 Unbind \$x Bind \$x to 'Fiona' Unbind \$x Finish implied with rule3</p>
<p>Turn-2 (from LM): We first define following predicates and corresponding natural language explanations: $\text{Green}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ green?}$ $\text{White}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ white?}$ $\text{Blue}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ blue?}$ $\text{Furry}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ furry?}$ $\text{Nice}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ nice?}$ $\text{Rough}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ rough?}$ $\text{Quiet}(\\$x, \text{bool}) :: \text{Is } x \text{ quiet?}$</p> <p>We have following known facts from the context: $\text{Green}('Charlie', \text{True})$ $\text{Green}('Fiona', \text{True})$ $\text{White}('Charlie', \text{True})$ $\text{White}('Dave', \text{True})$ $\text{White}('Fiona', \text{True})$ $\text{Blue}('Dave', \text{True})$ $\text{Blue}('Fiona', \text{True})$ $\text{Furry}('Dave', \text{True})$ $\text{Nice}('Fiona', \text{True})$ $\text{Rough}('Fiona', \text{True})$</p> <p>We have following known rules from the context: rule1: $\text{Furry}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Quiet}(\\$x, \text{True})$ rule2: $\text{Green}(\\$x, \text{True}) \wedge \text{White}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Nice}(\\$x, \text{True})$ rule3: $\text{Blue}(\\$x, \text{True}) \wedge \text{Quiet}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Green}(\\$x, \text{True})$</p> <p>Now begin reasoning to obtain all implied facts:</p>	<p>Finally, we obtain following implied facts: $\text{Green}('Dave', \text{True})$ $\text{Nice}('Charlie', \text{True})$ $\text{Nice}('Dave', \text{True})$ $\text{Quiet}('Dave', \text{True})$</p> <p>Finish reasoning</p> <p>Turn-3 (from human): Question: Based on the above information, is the following comment true, false, or unknown? Dave is not green.</p> <p>Options: A) True B) False C) Unknown</p> <p>Now you should: 1. reason first carefully with the above known facts and implied facts 2. then output your answer strictly in the format of "So, the correct option is: X". The X should be replaced by "A) True", "B) False" or "C) Unknown"</p>
<p>Use rule1: $\text{Furry}(\\$x, \text{True}) \rightarrow \text{Quiet}(\\$x, \text{True})$ Bind \$x to 'Dave' Obtain a new implied fact: $\text{Quiet}('Dave', \text{True})$ Unbind \$x Finish implied with rule1</p>	<p>Turn-4 (from LM): The comment can be parsed into: $\text{Green}('Dave', \text{False})$ According to the implied fact: $\text{Green}('Dave', \text{True})$ The comment contradicts the fact. So, the correct option is: B) False</p>

Figure 4: The full version of the comprehensive 4-turn training example of our instruction-tuning data shown in Figure 3.