# Sample Design Engineering: An Empirical Study on Designing Better Fine-Tuning Samples for Information Extraction with LLMs

Biyang Guo<sup>1+</sup>, He Wang<sup>1+</sup>, Wenyilin Xiao<sup>1+</sup>, Hong Chen<sup>2+</sup>, Zhuxin Lee<sup>3</sup>, Songqiao Han<sup>4,1\*</sup>, Hailiang Huang<sup>1,5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>AI Lab, SIME, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics <sup>2</sup>Ant Group <sup>3</sup>Guangdong Yunxi Technology <sup>4</sup>Key Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Research of Computation and Economics, Ministry of Education, China <sup>5</sup>Shanghai University of Finance and Economics-Ant Group Joint Laboratory of Frontier Financial Intelligence

### Why do we need Sample Design Engineering(SDE) compared to Prompt Engineering(PE)

- The efficacy of PE relies on the size of LLMs.
- Companies prefer customizing smaller, open-source models for their needs due to high costs and privacy risks of large models.

### **Information extraction (IE) require our focus**

- IE tasks is highly valuable in a wide range of industrial scenarios.
- There's a fundamental challenge arises from the discrepancy between the unstructured nature of the LLMs' generative paradigm and the requirement for structured output.

### **SDE Options**

**Input** Design Optic

**Output** Design Option Natural

Prompt

Engineering

For zero-shot/ICL

Sample Design

A1: S1, A2: S2, A3: S3, ..., A6: S6

Motivation

-> Input

For downstream-tuning Trainable, smaller open-source LLMs

→Output

LLMS

Frozen, very large LLMs

**Input Design Options** (1)Instruction Placement (2)Input Modeling

**Output Design Options** (1) Multiple Predictions Formatting (2) Handling of Unmentioned Targets (3)Textual or numerical labels

**Reasoning Design Options** 



## **Experiments I: Evaluating The Impact** of Each SDE Option



## **Experiments II: A Robust Integrated SDE Strategy**



#### **Evaluate from 2 perspectives**

- Sentiment analysis performance
- Format adherence

### **KEY CONCLUSIONS:**

- Better to place *instruction first*
- *Lines* format is reliable
- **Placeholders for Unmentioned** targets is better than Omit them Subtle impact of *CoT* on ID, while significant on OOD



(a) Performance of different sample design strategies with increasing training sizes: 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000. (b) Robustness on decoding sampling randomness, training size = 500. (c) Robustness on instruction content variation, training size = 500.

### **Empirically Strong SDE Strategy (ES-SDE)**

Use the well performing options in Experiments I: Inst-first, No-MI input designs Lines, PU(Placeholders for Unmentioned), TxtLabel output designs

#### **KEY CONCLUSIONS:**

ES-SDE maintains advantages across tasks and training sizes ES-SDE is stable on decoding randomness ES-SDE is robust to instruction variation

