

LLM Enhancement with Domain Expert Mental Model to Reduce LLM Hallucination with Causal Prompt Engineering

Boris Kovalerchuk
Central Washington University
USA
borisk@cwu.edu

Brent D. Fegley
Aptima Inc.
USA
bfegley@aptima.com

Abstract. Difficult decision-making problems abound in various disciplines and domains. The proliferation of generative techniques, especially large language models (LLMs), has excited interest in using them for decision support. However, LLMs cannot yet resolve missingness in their training data, leading to hallucinations. Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) enhances LLMs by incorporating external information retrieval, reducing hallucinations and improving accuracy. Yet, RAG and related methods are only partial solutions, as they may lack access to all necessary sources or key missing information.

Even everyday issues often challenge LLMs' abilities. Submitting longer prompts with context and examples is one approach to address knowledge gaps, but designing effective prompts is non-trivial and may not capture complex mental models of domain experts. For tasks with missing critical information, LLMs are insufficient, as are many existing systems poorly represented in available documents.

This paper explores how LLMs can make decision-making more efficient, using a running example of evaluating whether to respond to a call for proposals. We propose a technology based on optimized human-machine dialogue and monotone Boolean and k -valued functions to discover a computationally tractable personal expert mental model (EMM) of decision-making. Our EMM algorithm for LLM prompt engineering has four steps: (1) factor identification, (2) hierarchical structuring of factors, (3) generating a generalized expert mental model *specification*, and (4) generating a detailed generalized expert mental *model* from that specification.

Keywords. Large language models (LLMs); Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG); hallucination mitigation; decision support; missing information; domain experts; prompt engineering; expert mental model

1. Introduction

1.1. Motivation

Difficult decision-making problems abound in science, engineering, medicine, finance, and many other disciplines and domains. Historically, one handled such problems using a variety of methods, but the current proliferation of generative techniques, especially those involving large language models (LLMs), has excited interest in using LLMs and their ilk for decision support. Although the set of problems that LLMs can help resolve is growing quickly, LLMs cannot yet resolve missingness in their training data. The peril of missing information is that to arrive at a conclusion, LLMs, like humans, will hallucinate an answer—bridging information gaps creatively unless checked in the process.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) is an artificial intelligence (AI) technique that enhances the capabilities of LLMs by incorporating *external information retrieval*. RAG converts reference data into embeddings, retrieves relevant documents based on some measure of semantic similarity between the user's query and the embeddings, augments the LLM prompt with the retrieved information, and generates a

response based on both the query and retrieved data. RAG provides new, relevant information from external sources, by which it reduces **AI hallucinations**, improves factual accuracy, relevance, and the up-to-date responses by referencing authoritative knowledge sources [Gao et al., 2023]. Correspondingly, **in-context learning (ICL)** can also enrich prompts (e.g., [Malik, 2024, Feng et al, 2024]).

However, RAG and related methods (such as KG-RAG, Knowledge Graph RAG) are only **partial solutions** to hallucination mitigation. First, such methods may not have access to all sources needed to resolve an LLM’s **knowledge gaps**. Second, the **external sources** used in the embedding process may not possess the key missing information either. Sometimes, key missing information exists only in the **heads of humans** who are domain experts. Often, **new problems** have insufficient recorded history; for example, (1) deciding to start a *new* multi-year research project that requires an award of external funding from a competition, (2) setting up a *new* cybersecurity framework for a large organization with unique challenges, and (3) testing a *new* complex system that will involve multiple diverse stakeholders.

Even the everyday issues, which people know how to address often are beyond the abilities of large language models. The example is buying a paint to paint the walls in the living room with a prompt: “Please recommend a paint of my lovely wall color to buy.” We cannot expect that LLM will know a lovely wall color of all possible people. As a result, the answer will be either hallucination or something like LLM Perplexity produced” : If your 'lovely color' is lavender, BEHR PRO’s Lovely Lavender offers a soft, elegant hue in a flat finish, perfect for walls and larger decorating projects. “

Submitting longer user **prompts with context and examples** to LLMs is now commonplace and seemingly one way to address the knowledge gap resolution challenge. For example, **Direct preference alignment (DPA)**—and its algorithmic realization in **Direct Preference Optimization (DPO)**, based on binary classification—is a strategy for fine-tuning LLMs to respect human preferences [Richardson et al, 2024] and is among other approaches in the emerging area of **advanced prompt engineering**. Designing effective prompts is non-trivial and dependent on the LLM. Moreover, the prompts may not be capable of capturing the **complex mental model of the domain expert** when such a model is required. In many complex, high-stakes, time-critical situations, humans continue to base decisions on limited combinations of salient factors. Although LLMs present opportunities and challenges in this space, LLM hallucinations and the “black box” nature of deep learning techniques demand other approaches to help humans understand, interpret, and explain the outputs of these content generation systems. In other words, for LLMs, a complex **mental model of the domain expert** needs to become a **Mental Model of the Prompt Engineer (MMPE)** or a **Mental Model of Professional Expertise (MMPE)** incorporated into the prompts.

If current LLMs are insufficient for tasks with missing critical information, they are not alone. Missing information imperils the design of **new engineering systems**, new recommender systems, and many others that are at the *planning and scheming* stages. The same challenge persists in existing engineering systems that are *poorly represented* in available documents to train large language models.

In this paper, we explore how much an LLM can help make the decision-making process more efficient. To illustrate the challenges and promising approaches, we will use the following running example: the goal of a group of people to (1) evaluate whether to respond to a call for proposals from a funding agency and (2) produce a list of yes/no questions that each of them will answer before the decision meeting.

1.2. Approach outline

For tasks with knowledge gaps or missing information, we propose a technology, based on an **optimized dialogue between human and machine based on the theory of monotone Boolean and k -valued functions**, to discover a computationally tractable personal **expert mental model (EMM)** of decision-making. In this work, we leverage results of our prior work [Kovalerchuk et al., 1996, 2001, 2012, 2024,

Huber, 2025] in combination with Retrieval-Augmented Generation (**RAG**) to mitigate hallucinations and enhance the responsiveness of large language models (**LLMs**).

Our **EMM algorithm for LLM prompt engineering** has four steps: (1) factor (attribute) identification, (2) hierarchical structuring of factors, (3) generating a generalized expert mental model *specification* based on the identified factors with monotone Boolean or k -valued functions, and (4) generating a detailed generalized expert mental *model* based on Step 3. (See Algorithm 1.)

ALGORITHM 1: EXPERT MODEL ENGINEERING

Input: *Description of decision to be made (or question to be answered) and its valid values (ordinal k -valued).*

Output: *An expert mental model (EMM), an encoding of tacit knowledge.*

- 1 produce as many relevant and specific supporting factors as possible for the Input with LLM support, through appropriate prompt engineering.** // *This technique lies in contrast to the classical machine learning (ML) approach where domain experts have no such support and where deep learning avoids the need for feature engineering by learning patterns without pre-definition from raw images and texts.*
- 2 use an LLM to generate a hierarchy of factors and analyze the hierarchy's consistency with human expectation.** // *We do this when the number of factors identified in step 1 is large or beyond the abilities of the domain experts to deal with their combinations. (For example, 20 binary factors lead to $2^{20} = 1,048,576$ combinations.) This approach also differs from the traditional approach of creating a hierarchy and taxonomy by hand.*
- 3 generate a generalized expert mental model specification based on the factors produces in step 2 and with LLM support.** // *Here, we ask the LLM to classify the combinations of generalized factors and compare these classifications to those of the domain experts. If the LLM is unable to answer the questions, then we rely on the answers of domain experts only. The presentation of questions to the LLM and domain experts is based on the theory of monotone Boolean and k -valued functions to minimize the number of those questions.*
- 4 generate a detailed generalized expert mental model based on results of the step 3, using the same methodology (ordering questions to the LLM and domain experts given the theory monotone Boolean and k -valued functions to minimize the number of those questions).**

By executing these steps, we can obtain an **expert mental model** $M(E, S_m)$ for domain expert E and each scenario S_m . A scenario S has an ordinal k -valued set of valid values represented by a set of factors (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) that are children of a single parent factor; the parent factor will have a set of k -valued values too from which the expert will draw the classification label for its set of children. The subscript m indicates that a model may comprise one or more scenarios corresponding to factors and their immediate children. For ease of explanation, we will remove the subscript m in what follows. Additionally, note that the Boolean set {no = 0; yes = 1} is a special case of ordinal k -valued values.

To illustrate, if $M(E, S) = \text{yes}$, then scenario S is acceptable to expert E ; correspondingly, if $M(E, S) = \text{no}$, then S is unacceptable to E . When $k = 3$, we can obtain $M(E, S) = 1, M(E, S) = 2$, or $M(E, S) = 3$, where the set of k valid values could be {unacceptable = 1, unsure = 2, acceptable = 3}.

The advantage of obtaining an expert mental model for all scenarios for a given set of factors is for the scenarios that change over time that need to be **adapted**. We can use the model without further involvement of the domain expert, meaning we can query the model as if querying the expert in all scenarios covered by the model. However, obtaining an expert model can be unrealistic and time consuming. Therefore, limiting the number of experts and scenarios will be needed as a practical consideration for some tasks. We explain a method for doing just this in the following sections.

1.3. Dialog optimization

The number of questions posed to an oracle (presently a domain expert or LLM) for building an expert mental model can be non-trivial and unwieldy. Consider an example with three questions:

1. Have you thoroughly read and understood the call for proposals?
2. Does the proposed project align with the funding agency's priorities and goals?
3. Is your proposed project innovative or unique in its approach?

If each question has a binary outcome (no or yes, N or Y, respectively), then the subset of three questions has a total of $2^3 = 8$ combinations of answers from (N,N,N) to (Y,Y,Y). (The answers correspond to the given questions in their numerical order as indices, from left to right.). Crucially, these questions are supporting attributes for our decision point (our driving question)—one we could phrase as “Should we respond to the call for proposals?”. We want to build an expert mental model that will output Y or N (an answer to our driving question) for combination of values of our 3 supporting questions. To achieve this objective without optimization, we must elicit 8 answers from the expert (oracle or LLM). So, for example, if presented with the combination (Y,N,Y), the expert E needs to answer whether this combination is acceptable for further work on the proposal, $M(E, (Y, N, Y)) = Y$ or $M(E, (Y, N, Y)) = N$.

One popular way to avoid exponential explosion in the number of questions is discovering an **aggregation logic** that can synthesize individual N/Y responses into a single N/Y outcome—for example, a voting aggregation logic with the answer “Yes, if at least two out of three are Yes”. This aggregation logic needs to be tested by asking the domain expert to confirm it. If this logic cannot be applied, we could ask the expert to confirm an alternative aggregation logic.

The effort to generate and test alternative aggregation logics could be based on the relative importance of each question and account for the possibility that a single "No" does not necessarily invalidate the proposal outcome (whether to respond to the proposal). The exploration of alternative aggregation logics might require more than 8 questions and, conceivably, none may be acceptable to the expert (such as if the expert were unable to assign weights to the attributes). Thus, using aggregation logic to shortcut the number of questions that might otherwise be asked of the expert (or LLM) is not straightforward.

Another approach to **minimizing the combinatorial number of questions** is based on monotone Boolean (broadly, ordinal k -valued) functions, with **monotonicity** as the key operating principle. If a combination (Y,N,N) is acceptable to expert E , then we do not need to ask E about (Y,N,Y). Why? Formally, if $M(E, (Y, N, N)) = Y$, then $M(E, (Y, N, Y)) = Y$, because $N < Y$. Similarly, if (Y,N,Y) is unacceptable to expert E , then we do not need to ask E about (Y,N,N), because it should be unacceptable too. Formally, if $M(E, (Y, N, Y)) = N$, then $M(E, (Y, N, N)) = N$, because $N < Y$.

Later in this paper, we *expand the monotonicity approach by combining it with aggregation logic and a question hierarchy* to further reduce the number of questions.

Generally, challenges are that not every hierarchy and not every *aggregation logic* will help to cut out the number of questions while ensuring the correctness of answers.

1.4. Hierarchy of questions

The key idea of a hierarchy of questions is to formulate the questions so that a domain expert can answer them without explicitly answering the more detailed questions of the next layer. Consider an example with the leading generalized question “Is the project aligned with the funding opportunity?” (assuming work has already begun on a response to the request for proposals). If the answer is “yes”, then we might ask more detailed questions such as:

- Have you thoroughly read and understood the call for proposals?

- Does our proposed project align with the funding agency's priorities and goals?
- Is our proposed project innovative or unique in its approach?

If the domain expert had answered “no” to the leading question, we would have had no reason for the detailed questions because “no” dictates stopping work on the proposal response. LLMs can be helpful in formulating generalized questions to build a hierarchy of questions. In fact, Perplexity AI generated the leading generalized question and the detailed questions, which we reviewed and considered acceptable.

This top-down approach is not the only way to approach hierarchy construction. Might a domain expert answering a generalized question have different detailed questions in mind? Perhaps showing detailed questions to the domain expert, without asking for an answer to each of them, would allow the domain expert to ascertain the meaning of the generalized question. In building the hierarchy, the domain expert can add or edit more questions so the generalized question will be consistent with this expert’s view of the underlying issues.

A **methodological question** arises from the above: “How is it possible for a person to answer a generalized question without explicitly answering the underlying questions?” Consider a real-life situation where somebody asks us: “Do you like this person?” We may answer yes or no easily. When somebody asks us for a **reason**, we can provide some detailed factors: for example, “that person is always doing what he/she promised to do”, or “that person does all these things on time”. In this example, we presume the existence of a shared, generalized concept of a “likeable person”. Formulating different versions of the generalized questions, questions that a person will feel comfortable answering, is why LLMs can be helpful in building a hierarchy of questions.

Two different issues are at play in the above: (1) *building a personal mental model* of the domain expert and (2) *getting a reason* of a particular answer in that model. When the domain expert answered “no” to the generalized question, we skipped the detailed questions, because that answer was a sufficient stopping criterion for hierarchy construction. In contrast to getting an answer for the reason we need to go to the detailed questions and answer them.

Questions within the hierarchy of questions are the **explanations** of the expert decision at different levels of organization (or detail). For example, if the explanation for the decision (to pursue or abandon a proposal response) needs to be provided to executives, the answer can be given at a high level—for example, that the project is not aligned with the funding opportunity. The answer (explanation) is sufficient if it does not trigger follow-up questions. Otherwise, follow-up questions demand we seek pursue answers to the detailed questions.

Here we must distinguish between an **Expert Mental Model (EMM)** and the **Explanation Model of EMM (2EMM)**. The relations between these models are complicated. As our example of proposal response suggests, when an answer is negative, we need an explanation model (2EMM) to expand the mental model (EMM) with detailed factors. If the answer is positive, then the explanation model 2EMM will be subsumed by the expert mental model EMM, because the detailed questions will have been answered.

When we have a **team of experts** who need to make a collective decision, then we would need both expert mental models and explanation models of the experts to align personal mental models.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents related work; Section 3 outlines the approach; Sections 4-6 describe cases studies from different domains; and Section 7 presents a conclusion with future work.

2. Related work

2.1. Humans as primary sources of information

The challenges outlined above with humans as primary information sources have been prevalent in recommender systems and expert systems for years. The need for human-labelled cases in current artificial intelligence/machine learning (AI/ML) systems, including deep learning (DL) systems and large language models (LLMs) have only increased the scale of the challenges.

A relevant paper on LLMs [Zhang et al., 2023] proposes to solve tasks requiring *both symbolic and numeric reasoning* with natural language embedded programs. A prompt to an LLM requests the LLM to generate and execute full Python programs that define functions over data structures that contain natural language representations of structured knowledge. The paper claims that “the generated programs are **interpretable** since they outline the **exact reasoning process** followed by the program interpreter” (emphasis added). The claim is reasonable assuming the *prompt and produced algorithm are interpretable*. However, the interpretability of the prompt depends on the expert mental model used to produce it, and that mental model typically defies inspection. We introduce a method to make the expert mental model explicit.

Microsoft’s AutoGen project (<https://github.com/microsoft/autogen>) is among other relevant work. The project focuses on improving the completeness and adequacy of generated output via communication among agents, including humans (illustrated in Figure 1 from [Burger, 2023]). However, it is *not operating with an explicitly present domain expert mental model* as a guide. Thus, opportunity exists to enhance the system by incorporating expert mental models.




Figure 1. The assistant agent plays the role of an AI assistant like Bing Chat. The user proxy agent simulates users’ behavior such as code execution. AutoGen automates the chat between the two agents, while allowing human feedback or intervention [Burger, 2023].

2.2. Methods to derive personal and group aggregation logic

Recall that discovering an expert’s aggregation logic is one way to build an expert mental model for that expert. For a group of experts, we must aggregate multiple factors to reach a final judgment in a **collaborative process** that reflects the preferences and reasoning of all group members into a consensus-based judgment.

The literature on aggregation logics is extensive [e.g., Badreddine, Spranger, 2021; Dujmovic, 2018; Beliakov et al., 2020]. Algorithm 2 presents a step-by-step process tailored to personal and group aggregation logic in the spirit of the current state of the art in this area.

ALGORITHM 2: AGGREGATION LOGIC DEVELOPMENT

Input: *A set of generalized questions including the main question representing the decision point.
// questions have ordinal k-valued valid values; for simplicity, choose binary*

Output: *Categorized questions and documentation of associated aggregation logics.*

Step 1: use generalized questions as anchors // focus on high-level preferences first to reduce complexity

- 1 group related questions under generalized categories
- 2 rank the importance of each category // e.g., Impact > Dissemination > Risk
- 3 specify whether any single “no” in the category should override other answers // critical threshold rule
- 4 decide whether majority rule or weighted aggregation should apply within the category

Step 2: elicit preferences for specific questions

- 5 for each category
- 6 ask team members to assign weights to individual questions based on question importance // e.g., on a scale of [0,10]
- 7 normalize these weights so they sum to 1.0
- 8 identify any critical questions in the category // i.e., a single “no” would result in a generalized “no”
- 9 end

Step 3: test aggregation logic with scenarios

- 10 present team members with a few example scenarios for each category of questions // for a category containing three binary questions, the scenarios would include (Y,N,Y), (N,Y,Y), etc.
- 11 for each scenario
- 12 ask team members for a no/yes response for the associated category
- 13 compare responses to stated preferences (weights or critical thresholds) to validate consistency
- 14 if inconsistencies arise
- 15 refine the aggregation logic by discussing edge cases
- 16 end
- 17 end

Step 4: derive personal aggregation logic

- 18 formalize the team’s aggregation logic // using majority rule, weighted rule, or critical threshold rule
- 19 document the selected logic in a simple format

Step 5: combine team preferences into group logic

- 20 aggregate individual preferences by calculating averages or medians for weights and thresholds // example: if three members assign weights to Q1 as 0.5, 0.6, and 0.4, use the average weight of 0.5.
- 21 discuss and resolve differences through group discussion or voting
- 22 test the collective logic on example scenarios and refine it if necessary

A few things to consider about Algorithm 2:

- Step 2 helps capture individual decision-making logic without requiring evaluation of all combinations.
- Step 4 is based on responses and preferences with a focus on the following methods (and assuming binary response):
 - *majority rule*: Generalized “yes” if at least two out of three answers are “yes”.
 - *weighted rule*: Use assigned weights to calculate a score and set a threshold for the generalized “yes”.
 - *critical threshold rule*: If any critical question is “no”, the generalized answer would be “no” too; otherwise, apply majority rule or weighted rule.
- The aggregation logic applied to a category of three questions could be documented as follows: “*weighted rule with weights: $Q1 = 0.5, Q2 = 0.3, Q3 = 0.2$; generalized “yes” if sum score ≥ 0.6* ”

The five steps presented in Algorithm 2 are representative of what can be found in the literature, with multiple variations in the aggregation logics used. Fundamentally, these steps rely on **computationally defined aggregation logic**. If an expert accepts none of them, alternative methods must be found or developed. A typical form of context-specific aggregation logic involves LLMs in personalized product recommendations [Malik et al, 2002]. However, several other approaches have broader applicability, like creating a structured representation of preferences from filter key-value pairs [Malik et al, 2002], extracting preferences from a few positive examples in instructed text [Kim et al, 2003], and ensuring consistency in the extracted preferences by incorporating logical reasoning [Richardson et a, 2024].

3. Expert mining with monotone Boolean and k-valued functions

3.1. Personal aggregation logic

To avoid **combinatorial explosion** when building an expert mental model and its aggregation logic, we propose a method that exploits the hierarchical grouping of questions into categories, the property of monotonicity, heuristics, and iterative refinement.

The **hierarchical grouping of questions into categories** focuses on high-level categories first and drills down into specific questions only when necessary. Section 4 explores this concept in detail.

The **monotonicity property** is used as follows. For illustration, assume that we have:

- six detailed binary factors (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_6) comprising $2^6 = 64$ questions to be answered for building the mental model.
- two high-level categories (themselves binary factors), w_1 and w_2 , each generalizing a disjoint set of three of the six binary factors and resulting in 4 factor combinations: (Y,Y), (N,Y), (Y,N), and (N,N).

If an expert can answer w_1 and w_2 without drilling down to answer the detailed questions, then we can dramatically reduce the number of questions (elicitations) of the expert. If an expert selects the category (N,N) as acceptable (Y), then drilling down is redundant. If an expert selects the category (Y,N) or (N,Y) as acceptable (Y), then we can skip asking if (Y,Y) is acceptable.

This result follows the property of **monotonicity** provided $N < Y$. Thus, we would only need to drill down for (Y,N) or (N,Y) depending on which one was selected by the expert and answer $2^3 = 8$ questions formed

by combinations of three factors for w_1 only, because for w_2 the answer is N. The property of monotonicity here also allows us to cut out the number of questions for w_1 . If the expert will accept the triple (Y,N,N), then questions about acceptance of (Y,Y,N), (Y,N,Y) and (Y,Y,Y) will be redundant and can be avoided due to monotonicity cutting the number of questions further.

The use of **heuristics** includes generation of pilot questions that can guide the order of question that will eliminate more redundant questions [Huber, Kovalerchuk, 2024].

Iterative refinement of the elicitation process is based on the already obtained answers to adjust the order of the next questions, where we start with a smaller number of generalized questions and refine the mental model with feedback.

A detailed description of the monotonicity approach including its formalization can be found in [Kovalerchuk et al., 1996; Huber, Kovalerchuk, 2024]. The applications of this approach have broad applicability, including medical diagnostics, real estate, and software enhancement (e.g., integration of the monotone function approach into a Microsoft Teams bot with the UI/UX of monotone Boolean and k-valued functions logic), visualization and visual-analytics with MBF and k-values functions [Kovalerchuk et al, 1996, 2022, 2012; Huber, Kovalerchuk, 2024; Huber, 2025]. Further expansion is feasible in the agent-based applications, where several agents/players solve a task together and an optimal configuration the team needs to be selected like an ensemble of machine learning algorithms to build a machine learning model.

3.2. Group aggregation logic

How might we combine the mental models of several experts into a consensus-based judgment? Algorithm 3 shows one way to accomplish this feat in a step-by-step process tailored to our problem.

ALGORITHM 3: AGGREGATION OF EXPERT MENTAL MODELS

***Input:** Key questions and scenarios around a decision point, itself a question to be answered.*

***Output:** An expert mental model (EMM) based on aggregation of personal mental models.*

- 1 gather individual preferences for identified key questions and scenarios
- 2 compare group of personal mental models // identify points of agreement and disagreement
- 3 discuss differences in personal mental models // establish reasons for any disagreements
- 4 aggregate personal mental models into a group mental model // document how decisions were made

In an application of Algorithm 3, consider a scenario (Y,N,Y) with three answers: $E_1(Y, N, Y) = Y$, $E_2(Y, N, Y) = N$, and $E_3(Y, N, Y) = Y$, for three experts E_1, E_2 , and E_3 . The **majority voting** rule will lead to $E_{\{1,2,3\}}(Y, N, Y) = Y$, completing the aggregation process.


An alternative **reasoning-based process** would occur if the team decides against majority voting and asks expert E_2 , who rejects (Y,N,Y) by answering N, for clarity about her decision. Perhaps E_2 has different weights in mind for the scenario and the N in the scenario is so heavily weighted that the scenario becomes unacceptable. In this case the opinion of a single expert can prevail if this expert has better situational awareness or domain awareness than the other team members. The reasoning-based process is not a generic aggregation logic rule for all scenarios but for a specific scenario.

Imagine that the experts' conclusion from their discussion is that the scenario is underspecified and that an additional question will resolve the ambiguity and lead to unanimity. In that case, the scenario now has four elements instead of three—e.g., (Y,N,Y,N) vs. (Y,N,Y), respectively. At the mathematical level, the experts have **rebuilt individual mental models** (functions) with this addition (as proposed in [Huber, Kovalerchuk,

2024]). This example shows the advantages of a **reasoning-based process** over the traditional **majority voting** and can be used instead of voting.

3.3. Visualization support

The fundamental difference of the proposed approach from the traditional computational aggregation logic rules or functions is that Boolean and ordinal k -valued functions may not produce such a compact rule or a formula. Result visualization is a natural way to represent complexity and allow domain experts to analyze and manipulate their mental model. Figure 2 [Kovalerchuk et al, 2012] illustrates such a visualization for all combinations of 11 binary questions (no/yes). It shows two mental models of the expert radiologist for the mammographic X-ray images. The first EMM is for breast cancer diagnostics, the second for making a biopsy decision.



2a) Expert breast cancer mental model

(b) Expert biopsy breast cancer model

Figure 2. Examples of visualization of expert mental models [Kovalerchuk et al, 2012].

All 11-dimensional points that represent the answer “yes” are shown as black bars and all 11-dimensional points that represent the answer “no” are shown as white bars. This visualization exploits the concept of Hansel chains for monotone Boolean functions [Kovalerchuk et al., 2012]. The red and yellow circles show the areas where these models differ. Other visualizations are required for k -valued functions for $k > 2$, which can be built by adapting lossless visualization techniques for multidimensional data [Kovalerchuk, 2018; Kovalerchuk et al., 2024].

4. Case study: research proposal submission decision

We used Perplexity AI [Perplexity, 2025] to determine if it could generate useful questions for decision-making about whether to respond to a request for proposal. Typically, such questions would be generated by a team. Perplexity AI has the advantage of leveraging **multiple LLMs** working in tandem, including GPT-4, Mistral Large, Claude 3, and proprietary models, to process user queries efficiently, allowing us to indirectly evaluate capabilities of several LLMs for our study. Next, Perplexity AI accesses the **web in real time**, getting the most current information available. This feature overcomes the limitation of static knowledge cutoffs present in many other LLMs. Web scraping and parsing techniques allow it to extract relevant paragraphs from webpages, which are then fed to the LLM. Below we preset our prompts, Perplexity AI responses, and our analysis of these responses. We set text in bold to highlight significant passages or phrases.

4.1. Proposing questions

Prompt. A goal of a group people is to evaluate their standing to respond to a call for proposals from a funding agency. They want to produce a list of Yes/No questions that each of them will answer before the meeting. Please propose questions.

Answer. Here's a list of Yes/No questions that a group could use to evaluate their readiness to respond to a call for proposals from a funding agency:

1. Have you thoroughly read and understood the call for proposals?
2. Does the proposed project align with the funding agency's priorities and goals?
3. Do you meet all the eligibility criteria specified in the call?
4. Is your organization legally qualified to receive and manage the grant funds?
- 5. Do you have the necessary expertise within your team to execute the proposed project?**
- 6. Can you meet the proposal submission deadline?**
7. Do you have the capacity to complete the project within the specified timeframe?
8. Is the proposed budget within the funding limits set by the agency?
9. Can your organization provide any required matching funds or in-kind contributions?
10. Do you have access to all the resources (e.g., facilities, equipment) needed for the project?
- 11. Have you identified potential partners or collaborators if required by the call?**
- 12. Do you have experience managing similar grants or projects?**
13. Can you fulfill all reporting and compliance requirements specified in the call?
- 14. Do you have letters of support or commitment from key stakeholders?**
15. Have you reviewed, and can you adhere to the agency's data management and sharing policies?
- 16. Is your proposed project innovative or unique in its approach?**
- 17. Can you demonstrate the potential impact and significance of your project?**
- 18. Do you have a clear plan for disseminating the results of your project?**
- 19. Have you identified potential risks and mitigation strategies for your project?**
20. Are all team members available and committed to working on this proposal and project?

These questions cover various aspects of proposal readiness, including alignment with the funding agency's goals, team capacity, resource availability, and compliance with requirements. Answering these questions before the meeting can help the group assess their strengths and weaknesses in responding to the call for proposals.

Our analysis of LLM answer. Above we put in bold questions, which require some analysis and professional expertise for answering. However, even these questions are quite generic. Consider question 11 about identified potential partners. At first glance, this is an easy question. Is it already happened or not? A more difficult issue is when partners are identified but the team never worked with them and needs to establish a relationship and mutual interests. Therefore, a new question is needed: "Have you established a relationship with the potential partners?" The practical conclusion is that the expert review and adjustment of LLM output questions is needed. The automating of this process can be done in the form of a larger **Bank of questions** and support software for a user to select questions from this bank and/or modify questions to fit the individual proposals.

4.2. Proposing hierarchy of questions

Prompt. Assume that each person in the team needs to answer a Yes/No question: Should we spend next two months to produce the proposal for scenario S? Each scenario S is represented by as combination Yes/No answers to questions like 20 questions you listed. Here we have $2^{20} = 1,048,576$ such scenarios. We want to avoid asking so many questions by using a hierarchy of questions. Could you propose a hierarchical grouping your 20 questions so each node will have no more than 5 child questions. Each node itself should be a Y/N question from those 20 questions or should be their generalization.

Answer. To reduce the complexity of evaluating 2^{20} scenarios (1,048,576 combinations) and avoid asking all 20 questions for each scenario, we can create a **hierarchical structure** where each node represents a higher-level Yes/No question that generalizes or groups related questions. Each node will have no more than 5 child questions,

and the hierarchy will guide the team through a logical decision-making process. Here's a proposed hierarchical grouping of the 20 questions:

Level 1: Overall Feasibility

1. **Does the project align with the funding agency's priorities and goals?**
 - If "No," stop further evaluation.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 2.

Level 2: Eligibility and Capacity

2. **Are we eligible to apply for this funding opportunity?**
(Generalization of Questions 3, 4, and 12)
 - If "No," stop further evaluation.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 3.
3. **Do we have the internal capacity and expertise to execute the project?**
(Generalization of Questions 5, 6, 7, and 10)
 - If "No," **consider adding collaborators or resources.**
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 4.

Level 3: Strategic Fit

4. **Does this project align with our organization's strategic priorities?**
(Generalization of Questions 1, 2, and 16)
 - If "No," consider revising the project scope or focus.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 4.
5. **Can we realistically complete the proposal within the given timeframe?**
(Generalization of Question 6)
 - If "No," stop further evaluation.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 4.

Level 4: Resources and Budget

6. **Do we have access to sufficient resources (funding, facilities, staff) for this project?**
(Generalization of Questions 8, 9, and 10)
 - If "No," consider identifying additional funding sources or partnerships.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 5.
7. **Can we develop a competitive budget that meets agency requirements?**
(Generalization of Questions 8 and 9)
 - If "No," consider revising the budget or scope.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 5.

Level 5: Collaboration and Stakeholders

8. **Do we have strong collaboration or stakeholder support for this project?**
(Generalization of Questions 11 and 14)
 - If "No," consider obtaining letters of support or building partnerships.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 6.
9. **Have we identified potential risks and mitigation strategies?**
(Generalization of Question 19)
 - If "No," consider conducting a risk assessment.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 6.

Level 6: Compliance and Impact

10. **Can we meet all compliance requirements (reporting, data management)?**
(Generalization of Questions 13 and 15)
 - If "No," stop further evaluation or plan for compliance strategies.
 - If "Yes," proceed to Level 7.
11. **Does our project demonstrate significant impact or innovation?**
(Generalization of Questions 16, 17, and 18)
 - If "No," consider revising the proposal focus.
 - If "Yes," proceed to final decision.

Final Decision Node:

12. **Should we spend the next two months producing this proposal?**
(This is the final synthesis question based on answers from all previous levels.)

How this Hierarchy Works:

- Each level focuses on a specific aspect of feasibility (e.g., eligibility, capacity, resources).

- Each node generalizes related questions into one overarching Yes/No question.
- By answering higher-level questions first, you eliminate irrelevant branches early in the process (e.g., if you're not eligible or lack capacity).
- No node has more than **5 child questions**, ensuring clarity and manageability.

This hierarchy reduces complexity while systematically evaluating readiness for each scenario S. It avoids asking all 2^{20} combinations by pruning irrelevant paths early in the process.

Our analysis of LLM response. For each No answer it suggests either to exit from the working on the proposal or doing some extra activities like revising the proposal focus. This hierarchy is quite efficient in decreasing the number of questions. Each expert will answer 11 questions instead of 20 original questions and a final decision question based on this 11-dimensional binary vector of Yes/No answers like (11110001110). The key source of the efficiency is removing the original 20 questions and substituting them by 11 more general questions. The side effect of this benefit is that the actual 20 questions are not answered explicitly. The next section is to explore if LLM will be able to resolve this issue.

4.3. Preserving actual questions

Prompt. We cannot substitute actual 20 questions by generalized questions. We can only answer generalized questions to go further to the actual questions. Please update this hierarchy so that individual questions will be considered and answered.

Answer. Here's an updated hierarchical structure:

Level 1: Overall Feasibility

1. Is the project aligned with the funding opportunity?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q1: Have you thoroughly read and understood the call for proposals?
- Q2: Does the proposed project align with the funding agency's priorities and goals?
- Q16: Is your proposed project innovative or unique in its approach?

Level 2: Eligibility and Capacity

2. Are we eligible and capable of executing this project?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q3: Do you meet all the eligibility criteria specified in the call?
- Q4: Is your organization legally qualified to receive and manage the grant funds?
- Q5: Do you have the necessary expertise within your team to execute the proposed project?
- Q12: Do you have experience managing similar grants or projects?

Level 3: Timeline and Resources

3. Can we meet the project timeline and resource requirements?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q6: Can you meet the proposal submission deadline?
- Q7: Do you have the capacity to complete the project within the specified timeframe?
- Q10: Do you have access to all the resources (e.g., facilities, equipment) needed for the project?
- Q20: Are all team members available and committed to working on this proposal and project?

Level 4: Budget and Funding

4. Can we meet the budgetary requirements?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q8: Is the proposed budget within the funding limits set by the agency?
- Q9: Can your organization provide any required matching funds or in-kind contributions?

Level 5: Partnerships and Support

5. Do we have necessary partnerships and support?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q11: Have you identified potential partners or collaborators if required by the call?
- Q14: Do you have letters of support or commitment from key stakeholders?

Level 6: Compliance and Reporting

6. Can we meet compliance and reporting requirements?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q13: Can you fulfill all reporting and compliance requirements specified in the call?
- Q15: Have you reviewed and can you adhere to the agency's data management and sharing policies?

Level 7: Impact and Risk Management

7. Have we addressed project impact and risks?

If Yes, proceed to:

- Q17: Can you demonstrate the potential impact and significance of your project?
- Q18: Do you have a clear plan for disseminating the results of your project?
- Q19: Have you identified potential risks and mitigation strategies for your project?

Final Decision Node:

8. Based on all previous answers, should we spend the next two months producing this proposal?

This structure maintains the hierarchy with generalized questions at each level, while ensuring that all 20 original questions are answered. The team progresses through the levels, answering the specific questions under each generalized node. This approach allows for early exit if a major issue is identified at a higher level, while still ensuring all relevant questions are considered if the team proceeds through the entire hierarchy.

Our analysis of LLM response. The LLM produced 7 generalized questions and one final decision question. It is also quite efficient cutting out the number of questions due to abilities to exit in the case of negative answers. However, a single negative answer should not necessitate the exit. In the next section we explore if the LLM can fix this deficiency producing a hierarchy without this issue.

4.4. Formulating generalized question

Prompt. With, say, answers for Q17,Q18, Q19 like (Yes, No, Yes), a single negative answer No for Q18 is not a reason to stop the proposal process. The same is applied to many other questions and their combinations. We need to produce a generalized answer out of Q17,Q18, Q19 having Yes, No, Yes. How would you formulate such generalized Y/N question for them and similarly for other nodes with a redesign of the structure?

Answer. Thank you for the clarification. You're right that a single "No" answer shouldn't necessarily stop the proposal process, and we need to formulate generalized Yes/No questions that synthesize the answers from their child questions. Let's redesign the structure with this in mind:

Level 1: Project Alignment and Innovation

Generalized Q1: Is the project sufficiently aligned with the funding opportunity and innovative?

- Q1: Have you thoroughly read and understood the call for proposals?
- Q2: Does the proposed project align with the funding agency's priorities and goals?
- Q16: Is your proposed project innovative or unique in its approach?

(Answer Yes if at least two out of three are Yes)

Level 2: Organizational Readiness

Generalized Q2: Is the organization sufficiently prepared to undertake this project?

- Q3: Do you meet all the eligibility criteria specified in the call?
- Q4: Is your organization legally qualified to receive and manage the grant funds?
- Q5: Do you have the necessary expertise within your team to execute the proposed project?
- Q12: Do you have experience managing similar grants or projects?

(Answer Yes if at least three out of four are Yes)

Level 3: Project Feasibility

Generalized Q3: Is the project feasible within the given constraints?

- Q6: Can you meet the proposal submission deadline?
- Q7: Do you have the capacity to complete the project within the specified timeframe?
- Q10: Do you have access to all the resources (e.g., facilities, equipment) needed for the project?
- Q20: Are all team members available and committed to working on this proposal and project?

(Answer Yes if at least three out of four are Yes)

Level 4: Financial Viability

Generalized Q4: Is the project financially viable?

- Q8: Is the proposed budget within the funding limits set by the agency?
- Q9: Can your organization provide any required matching funds or in-kind contributions?

(Answer Yes if both are Yes)

Level 5: Collaborative Support

Generalized Q5: Do we have sufficient collaborative support for the project?

- Q11: Have you identified potential partners or collaborators if required by the call?
- Q14: Do you have letters of support or commitment from key stakeholders?

(Answer Yes if at least one is Yes)

Level 6: Compliance Capability

Generalized Q6: Can we meet the compliance requirements?

- Q13: Can you fulfill all reporting and compliance requirements specified in the call?
- Q15: Have you reviewed and can you adhere to the agency's data management and sharing policies?

(Answer Yes if both are Yes)

Level 7: Impact and Risk Management

Generalized Q7: Is the project's potential impact sufficiently high and risks manageable?

- Q17: Can you demonstrate the potential impact and significance of your project?
- Q18: Do you have a clear plan for disseminating the results of your project?
- Q19: Have you identified potential risks and mitigation strategies for your project?

(Answer Yes if at least two out of three are Yes)

Final Decision Node:

Generalized Q8: Based on all previous answers, should we spend the next two months producing this proposal?

(Answer Yes if at least six out of seven generalized questions are Yes) This redesigned structure allows for a more nuanced evaluation where a single "No" doesn't necessarily disqualify the proposal. The generalized questions at each level synthesize the answers from their child questions, providing a balanced assessment. The final decision is based on the overall picture rather than individual "No" answers.

Our analysis of LLM response. The LLM produced 7 generalized questions and one final decision question. It is also quite efficient cutting out the number of questions. However, a threshold solution like “Yes if at least two out of three are Yes”, and “Yes if at least six out of seven generalized questions are Yes” can be unacceptable and needs to need to be justified separately. It can be rejected by domain experts. Different experts may have different thresholds or make their decision without any threshold. In the next section we explore if the LLM can fix this deficiency producing a hierarchy with without this issue.

4.5. Checking accuracy of generalized answers

Prompt. How can we ensure that the generalized answer accurately reflects the responses to original questions like Q17, Q18, and Q19?

Answer. To ensure that the **generalized answer** accurately reflects the responses to **Q17, Q18, and Q19**, we need to establish a **clear decision rule** or **aggregation logic** that synthesizes the individual Yes/No answers into a single Yes/No outcome. This rule should reflect the relative importance of each question and account for the possibility that a single "No" does not necessarily invalidate the proposal. Here’s how we can approach this:

Step 1: Define the Purpose of the Generalized Question

The generalized question for **Q17, Q18, and Q19** is:

"Is the project's potential impact sufficiently high and risks manageable?" This question aims to evaluate whether the combined responses to these three questions provide enough confidence to move forward with the proposal.

Step 2: Establish Aggregation Logic

We can use one of the following approaches to aggregate the answers:

a) Majority Rule (Simple Aggregation)

- If at least two out of three answers are "Yes", then the generalized answer is "Yes."
- This approach assumes equal weight for all three questions and ensures that a single "No" does not disproportionately affect the decision.

b) Weighted Rule (Importance-Based Aggregation)

- Assign weights to each question based on its relative importance:
 - **Q17 (Impact): Weight = 50%**
 - **Q18 (Dissemination Plan): Weight = 25%**
 - **Q19 (Risk Management): Weight = 25%**
- Calculate a weighted score:
 - $\text{Score} = (1 \text{ if } Q17 = \text{Yes}) \times 0.5 + (1 \text{ if } Q18 = \text{Yes}) \times 0.25 + (1 \text{ if } Q19 = \text{Yes}) \times 0.25$
- If the score ≥ 0.5 , then the generalized answer is "Yes."
- This approach reflects that demonstrating impact (Q17) is more critical than dissemination or risk management.

c) Critical Threshold Rule

- Identify any "critical" questions where a "No" would automatically result in a generalized "No."
- For example:
 - If Q17 = No (low impact), then generalized answer = No regardless of other answers.
 - If Q17 = Yes, then follow majority rule for Q18 and Q19.
- This approach ensures that critical deal-breakers are prioritized.

Step 3: Apply Aggregation Logic to Example Responses

Let's apply these rules to the example responses:

Q17 = Yes, Q18 = No, Q19 = Yes

Using Majority Rule:

- Two out of three answers are "Yes" (Q17 and Q19).
- Generalized Answer = **Yes**

Using Weighted Rule:

- $\text{Score} = (1 \times 0.5) + (0 \times 0.25) + (1 \times 0.25) = 0.75$
- Since $\text{Score} \geq 0.5$, Generalized Answer = **Yes**

Using Critical Threshold Rule:

- Q17 = Yes, so we proceed to evaluate Q18 and Q19.
- Majority rule applies to Q18 and Q19: One "Yes" out of two is sufficient.
- Generalized Answer = **Yes**

Step 4: Document and Communicate the Decision Rule

To ensure consistency across evaluations:

1. Clearly define which aggregation logic will be used (e.g., Majority Rule, Weighted Rule, or Critical Threshold Rule).
2. Share this decision rule with all team members before they begin answering questions.
3. Use a structured template or scoring system to record individual answers and calculate the generalized outcome.

Step 5: Validate the Generalized Answer

After applying the aggregation logic:

1. Review how well the generalized answer aligns with individual responses.
2. Discuss any discrepancies or edge cases as a team.
3. Refine weights or thresholds if necessary to better reflect team priorities.

Conclusion

By using one of these aggregation methods—Majority Rule, Weighted Rule, or Critical Threshold Rule—you can ensure that the generalized answer accurately reflects the combined responses to **Q17, Q18, and Q19** in a fair and

transparent way. The same approach can be applied to other nodes in your hierarchy to synthesize answers while respecting their relative importance.

Our analysis of LLM response. This response assumes that one of those three options (Majority Rule, Weighted Rule, or Critical Threshold Rule) will be accepted by a domain expert. as a personal mental model.

At the mathematical level they correspond to three simple rules like if $n(\text{yes}) > n(\text{no}) \Rightarrow \text{yes}$ for the majority rule, where $n(\text{yes})$ and $n(\text{no})$ are number of yes and no answers, respectively. If the domain expert does not accept any of them, this response does not provide any alternatives. Many more aggregation rules exist in the literature [Beliakov et al., 2020; Dujmovic, 2018], and the selection the appropriate one can be a long and complex process. Therefore, in this paper, we propose an alternative approach based on the **monotonicity principle**, which allows to build an expert mental model that avoids building an arithmetic aggregation formulas like generated by LLM.

In conclusion, the experiment presented in this case study shows that the LLM can produce a meaningful set of questions, meaningful set of generalized questions, and a meaningful hierarchy of the questions, but the process of combining them with simplified aggregation rules are insufficient. More sophisticated methods are needed, like we suggested based on the monotonicity principle.

4.6. Human built questions in comparison with LLM generated questions

Determining whether to respond to a request for proposal (RFP) from a grant-awarding organization requires careful thought, especially for a small business with limited resources. For example, the award amount may be incompatible with the time and effort required to prepare a coherent and compliant response, due in part to the diversion of resources from other tasks. Moreover, the proposal may describe a problem for which the business may not have the requisite expertise to address fully, meaning the need for partnership with others external to the business. Thus, committing to a response is an investment that requires decision-making under uncertainty, informed by experience and circumstances.

We can formalize decision-making as an explanatory process by systematically identifying the factors, their valid values, and the levels of organization that contribute to the decision. Algorithm 4 shows one way to operationalize this process, beginning with a clear and concise description of the decision to me made.

ALGORITHM 4: CONSTRUCT DECISION MODEL SPECIFICATION

Input: Description of decision to be made (or question to be answered) and its valid values (ordinal k -valued). // the top-most factor or attribute

Output: Tree with one root node (the Input) and as many other nodes (branches and leaves) as necessary to explain how the root node is derived.

```
1 create a tree with Input as its root (and sole) node.
2 updating ← true
3 while (updating) do
4     if you can identify another factor (attribute) for any parent node in the tree
5         update the tree, creating a node for the factor, including its valid values (ordinal  $k$ -valued)
        and link to its parent.
6     else
7         updating ← false
8     end
9 end
```

Line 4 of Algorithm 4 is not as straightforward to adjudicate as it may seem. Each node in the tree is a construct (each element in the hierarchy is an abstraction). Each factor applied to a parent increases the specificity (levels of organization) of explanation. One could argue, philosophically, that no end exists to the degree of possible explanation. However, we know from experience that practical limits help make problem-solving *expedient, tractable, and explainable*. For the kind of model specification construction considered here, that limit occurs when the factor is known or perceived to be *observable, calculable, or computable*. Such a factor will become a leaf in the tree. Ultimately, that leaf will be tied to something that can provide the requisite input. That input could be cast as a question to the user of the model learned from the model specification. It could also be in the form of output from a measurement device, sensor, computer-based function, or intelligent agent.

Figure 3 provides one example of a model specification for the driving question “Should we respond to the RFP?” One could argue that the specification is incomplete and should be wider and deeper, with many more levels of organization. Indeed! Model specification construction/development is a process of iterative refinement. If the answer to a question like “how do you make a decision about X ?” is that “it depends”, then we seek teasing out those dependencies as an objective, in as great a specificity as practicable, with self-imposed limits to make the model learning tractable. If the monotonicity principle holds, each level within the hierarchy (any below the root node) will inform or support the one above it.

For clarity, the model specification is not a model. The specification defines the parameters by which a model may be learned. The model will manifest itself as an equation, formula or another mathematical expression, the root node with a designated valid value on the left-hand side, and a formula (in disjunctive normal form, ORs of ANDs of factor-value combinations) on the right-hand side. A single specification could support multiple models. After all, the specification is an opinionated representation of a decision-making process but so are the models learned from it.

The model comprises a specific combination of factors and values. The utility of the model is that we can apply it to new situations. Presently, we could apply it to the next RFPs we see. Multiple experts could have their own models that lead to the root decision point. In each case, the results can be explained in natural language, because each node in the tree is defined by a construct and valid values, also in natural language. So, explainability is built in. Couple that explanation with support that comes from answering questions in the leaf nodes, and you have the ingredients of support for a decision.

One way in which this approach to model specification construction differs from the LLM-based techniques above is that the LLMs currently do not have the requisite degree of practical or applied knowledge to **operationalize** a leaf node. In fairness, the human expert creating the model specification may not have such knowledge either, due to knowledge gaps in where the information of interest lives and the mechanics of extracting it, for example. However, in creating the specification, the expert asserts some degree of domain awareness and understanding. Moreover, owing to the abstractness and semantics of each factor in the hierarchy, the expert is presumably better positioned than the LLM to identify the appropriate explanatory level of organization that addresses tradeoffs between specificity, tractability, and explainability. Although this difference may not persist given the current pace of technological advancement, to the extent that human decision-making still matters in human affairs, the approach presented here provides a way to encode and record tacit knowledge in a way that is tractable and explainable.

```

{
  "Should we respond to the RFP?": {
    "What is the strength of our history with the Technical Monitor (TM)?": {
      "Do we know the TM?": {},
      "Have we worked with the TM?": {},
      "Have we interacted with the TM in the last year?": {},
      "Would we work with the TM again?": {}
    },
    "What is the strength of our history with the customer/sponsor?": {
      "Do we have related work with the customer?": {},
      "Have we interacted with the customer in the last year?": {},
      "Would we work with the customer again?": {}
    },
    "Does the topic of (or do topics within) the RFP align?": {
      "With our capabilities?": {},
      "With our strategic business objectives?": {},
      "With our prior work?": {}
    },
    "Do we have personnel with qualifications?": {
      "To write the proposal?": {},
      "To be key personnel?": {}
    },
    "Can we earn a fee?": {}
  }
}

```

Figure 3. Document in Javascript Object Notation (JSON) representing a model specification for answering the question “Should we respond to the RFP (Request for Proposal)?”. The specification is a tree with one root node, four branch nodes, and thirteen leaf nodes. For simplicity, each node is assumed to have a binary (Boolean) outcome: “no” (zero) and “yes” (one), in that order. However, nothing precludes an outcome from being one of a set of ordinal k -valued values (such as may be found in a Likert-type scale).

5. Case study: cybersecurity system design

5.1. Motivation and approach

Fundamentally, designing a new engineering system requires expert input that is unavailable to an LLM to help develop such a system. Designing and maintaining a cybersecurity system for a large organization is one example we consider in this section. The effort requires domain expertise, like identifying categories of information that need to be protected and judging the security impact associated with each of them as low, medium, or high. The effort also requires that a domain expert define, analyze, and evaluate numerous combinations of risk factors and their mitigations—judgments that could be difficult under ordinary circumstances, but that uncertainty exacerbates.

For system resilience, the evaluation and mitigation of risks is not a singular activity but a process. The process must be revisited as system use and external threats challenge assumptions about the system in operation. For an **expert mental model** to have utility beyond the reason for its original creation, to avoid having to re-enlist a domain expert in its update, forethought must be given to the variety of factors that impinge on the challenge the model addresses. For perspective, a mental model with just 5 factors will require $3^5 = 243$ elicitations of an expert if each factor has only 3 answer options (e.g., low, medium, high). Similarly, with 8 factors and 3 values for each, the total space contains $3^8 = 6561$ alternatives. As the number of factors increases, so does the value of framing challenges to respect the monotonicity principle.

The main benefit of using monotone Boolean or ordinal k -valued functions is in **cutting out the number of questions** needed to ask the domain expert to build the expert’s mental model. The major difference of this cybersecurity task from the research proposal decision task considered above is that the set of cybersecurity questions that need to be addressed by domain experts can be taken directly from a standard [FIPS, 2024].

5.2. Cybersecurity questions and answers formalized

In the US, the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) standardizes and consolidates security review and reporting across government agencies. It requires that agencies complete the authorization to operate (ATO) process [ATO, 2025] before using, buying, or building software to minimize and manage risk. Below we present a subset of security impact questions at two levels as defined in the standard [FIPS, 2024], wherein the questions are already organized to respect the monotonicity principle, and formalize it with the introduction of mathematical notation:

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Description</i>
x_1	How confidential is the system's data?
x_{11}	Are there secrets or private information that you need to protect?
x_{12}	Is there personal identifiable information (PII), contract data, or other special kinds of data?
x_2	What is the importance of the system's integrity?
x_{21}	What would be the impacts of the system getting defaced?
x_{22}	What could happen if the data was altered?
x_3	How important is the availability of the data?

Let x_1, x_2 , and x_3 be answers for the upper-level questions 1-3, x_{ij} for the respective sub-questions. For each question, the standard [FIPS, 2024] establishes the security impact level by the highest answer to the three questions (FISMA low, FISMA moderate, or FISMA high, which we encode as 1, 2, and 3, respectively). Respectively, we define 3-valued functions F_1, G_1 , and G_2 :

$$F_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = k(k = 1, 2, 3)$$

$$G_1(x_{11}, x_{12}) = x_1(x_1 = 1, 2, 3)$$

$$G_2(x_{21}, x_{22}) = x_2(x_2 = 1, 2, 3)$$

We combine these functions as follows:

$$F_1(G_1(x_{11}, x_{12}), G_2(x_{21}, x_{22}), x_3) = k(k = 1, 2, 3)$$

So, for example, if $G_1(1, 2) = 2$, $G_2(3, 1) = 3$, and $x_3 = 2$, we have

$$F_1(G_1(1, 2), G_2(3, 1), 2) = F_1(2, 3, 2) = \max(2, 3, 2) = 3 \text{ [FISMA high]}$$

The standard defines the value of integration by a simple **maximum (max)** formula, which differs from the three aggregation rules presented earlier in Section 2.2 and confirms our concern that the set of rules suggested by the LLM in Section 2.2 is limited. Also, the maximum formula represents the worst-case security approach, where out of several impact factors the impact of the most severe factor is assigned to the set of these factors. Although this approach seems justified for a high-risk application, it may not represent what the domain expert thinks in some situations. The standard enforces the worst-case approach. The role of the domain expert is only to provide answers for the lower-level questions, because answers to the upper-level questions are automatically generated by the max aggregation formula.

The standard provides a useful starting point for organizations not obliged to use it, but not using the max formula as the aggregation rule has consequences. For $G_1(x_{11}, x_{12})$, we have 3 values of x_{11} and 3 values of x_{12} representing 9 combinations. Each of these 9 combinations can have 3 values of x_1 for a total 27 combinations. In the same way, $G_2(x_{21}, x_{22})$ will have 27 combinations. Thus, $G_1(x_{11}, x_{12})$, $G_2(x_{21}, x_{22})$, and x_3 will have $27 * 27 * 3 = 2187$ combinations total. In other words, the expert mental model at this level will require 2187 answers. The value of k of F_1 also has 3 values. Thus, the dimension of the space of the total function $F_1(G_1(x_{11}, x_{12}), G_2(x_{21}, x_{22}), x_3) = k$ is $2187 * 3 = 6561$. Recall that the use of the max formula allows a domain expert to answer only $3^5 = 243$ questions for producing the full model at this level. Given this combinatorial explosion, the key issue in constructing an expert mental model is arranging a dialog with a domain expert and LLM to get 5 answers to independent factors $x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{21}, x_{22}$, and x_3 .

Consider an example of questions where the sample answers appear after the colon (:) and factors such as y_1 have natural language descriptions:

1. *Please list secrets and private information that need to be protected:* A, B, C
2. *Please list factors that define security impact of item A today:* y_1, y_2
3. *Please list factors that define security impact of item B today:* y_3, y_4
4. *Please list factors that define security impact of item C today:* y_5, y_6, y_7, y_8
5. *What is the likely presence of factor y_1 today (low, medium, high) for item A?:* medium
6. *What is the likely presence of factor y_2 today (low, medium, high) for item A?:* low
7. *What is the likely presence of factor y_3 today (low, medium, high) for item B?:* high
8. *What is the likely presence of factor y_4 today (low, medium, high) for item B?:* medium
9. *What is the likely presence of factor y_5 today (low, medium, high) for item C?:* low
10. *What is the likely presence of factor y_6 today (low, medium, high) for item C?:* low
11. *What is the likely presence of factor y_7 today (low, medium, high) for item C?:* high
12. *What is the likely presence of factor y_8 today (low, medium, high) for item C?:* high
13. *What is the security impact of medium y_1 and low y_2 on item A?:* medium
14. *What is the security impact of high y_3 and medium y_4 on item B?:* medium
15. *What is the security impact of low y_5 and y_6 and high y_7 and y_8 on item C?:* high
16. *What is the security impact on A, B, and C when the impact on A and B is medium and the impact on C is high?:* high

Formalizing the outcomes, we have security questions S with answers for security impact of factors A, B , and C at the current time:

$$S_A(y_1, y_2) = S_A(\text{medium, low}) = S_A(2,1) = \text{medium} = 2$$

$$S_B(y_3, y_4) = S_B(\text{high, medium}) = S_B(3,2) = \text{medium} = 2$$

$$S_C(y_5, y_6, y_7, y_8) = S_C(\text{low, low, high, high}) = S_C(1,1,3,3) = \text{high} = 3$$

The total security impact T of factors A, B , and C may be described as follows:

$$T(S_A(y_1, y_2), S_B(y_3, y_4), S_C(y_5, y_6, y_7, y_8)) = T(2,2,3) = \max(2,2,3) = 3$$

Note that factors A, B , and C were described as valid only at the current time (*today*). Building a resilient expert model would need to ask about many other possible values of variables and their combinations. The theory of monotone Boolean and ordinal k -valued functions allow to decrease the number of these questions in the same way as we presented in Section 4 for the research proposal decision task. The difference is that in Section 4 we consider the Boolean functions with 2 values and now we consider 3-valued functions. We abstractly presented factors y_1, \dots, y_8 above. The actual sources of these factors are not limited to domain experts. Doctrine (e.g., [FIPS, 2024; ATO, 2025]; see Table 1) could be used directly or to prompt an LLM to generate candidate factors. (We presented an LLM-based approach in Section 4.)

Table 1. Potential impact definitions for security objectives [FIPS, 2024].

Security Objective	POTENTIAL IMPACT		
	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
<p>Confidentiality Preserving authorized restrictions on information access and disclosure, including means for protecting personal privacy and proprietary information. [44 U.S.C., SEC. 3542]</p>	<p>The unauthorized disclosure of information could be expected to have a limited adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>	<p>The unauthorized disclosure of information could be expected to have a serious adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>	<p>The unauthorized disclosure of information could be expected to have a severe or catastrophic adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>
<p>Integrity Guarding against improper information modification or destruction, and includes ensuring information non-repudiation and authenticity. [44 U.S.C., SEC. 3542]</p>	<p>The unauthorized modification or destruction of information could be expected to have a limited adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>	<p>The unauthorized modification or destruction of information could be expected to have a serious adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>	<p>The unauthorized modification or destruction of information could be expected to have a severe or catastrophic adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>
<p>Availability Ensuring timely and reliable access to and use of information. [44 U.S.C., SEC. 3542]</p>	<p>The disruption of access to or use of information or an information system could be expected to have a limited adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>	<p>The disruption of access to or use of information or an information system could be expected to have a serious adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>	<p>The disruption of access to or use of information or an information system could be expected to have a severe or catastrophic adverse effect on organizational operations, organizational assets, or individuals.</p>

Direct use of doctrine could take the form illustrated in Table 2, where we draw our example from placeholder factors *A*, *B*, and *C* above, this time with

- descriptive labels (“public information”, “investigative information”, and “administrative information”, respectively),
- a different set of sub-factors (*confidentiality*, *integrity*, and *availability*), and
- their valid values (NOT APPLICABLE [NA] = 0, LOW = 1, MODERATE = 2, HIGH = 3).

Table 2. Security Classification (SC) applied to information types [FIPS, 2024].

Security Classification	Scenario	Formulation
public information	{(confidentiality, NA), (integrity, MODERATE), (availability, MODERATE)}	$SC_{pi}(0,2,2)$
investigative information	{(confidentiality, HIGH), (integrity, MODERATE), (availability, MODERATE)}	$SC_{ii}(3,2,2)$
administrative information	{(confidentiality, LOW), (integrity, LOW), (availability, LOW)}	$SC_{ai}(1,1,1)$

6. Case study: Healthcare decisions

The current state of the art in explainable AI/machine learning (XAI) models in healthcare is far from ideal. The major challenge is how to put domain experts in control of AI/ML and XAI processes to ensure the required quality of high-stakes diagnostic and predictive model outputs. Addressing this challenge requires resolving two issues: (1) giving domain expert tools to observe, analyze, and discover patterns in high-dimensional data without loss of information for ML models, and (2) extracting and encoding expert models that can be compared and integrated with ML models.

Building expert mental models for healthcare tasks is like the other case studies we visited in previous Sections. Consider a situation with 20 tests conducted on patient blood draws, where each test can be characterized by 5 qualitative values like “normal”, “slightly below normal”, “significantly below normal”, “slightly above normal”, and “significantly above normal”. Here, the discrete values represent consecutive, ordinal bins of continuous data, a typical accommodation if not optimization to decrease the number of alternatives a clinician must consider. Despite this decrease, we still have many alternatives: $5^{20} = 9.53674 * 10^{13}$. The number of numeric alternatives is much larger. The conversion of continuous data to qualitative (nominal) values creates some uncertainty because different people will use different thresholds or prefer fuzzy thresholds as shown in Figure 4 with a gradual change of colors.




Figure 4. Illustration of a continuous scale binned with qualitative labels. [Values taken from <https://ada.com/biomarkers/triglycerides/>]

Only a small fraction of the 5^{20} alternatives with suggested treatments might be recorded somewhere for a doctor to reference, meaning that, in practice, some kind of aggregated logic is used by a doctor to focus on critical factors. Developing a doctor’s personal mental model can be beneficial in this situation, because it will allow the doctor to work more efficiently. It also allows comparing the model with empirical data and correcting the model based on those data. Moreover, it allows one to explain and correct machine learning models built on insufficient or biased data [Kovalerchuk et al., 2012; Huber, Kovalerchuk, 2024]. Studies that built personal expert models with monotone and k -valued functions for breast cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease diagnostics can be found in [Kovalerchuk et al., 1996, 2001, 2005, 2012; Huber, Kovalerchuk, 2024]. These studies relied on an expert-in-the-loop as the core; machine learning approach,

combining expert knowledge and machine intelligence to create more effective machine learning algorithms. In this approach humans are involved in both the training and testing stages of building an algorithm.

7. Conclusion

Our experiments with Perplexity AI revealed gaps in its information on data aggregation methods. It proposed solutions based on simple aggregation functions like voting. Nevertheless, it generated meaningful questions and a hierarchy of questions in the proposal response task. The questions it generated were comparable with a domain expert's suggestions.

The cybersecurity system design task differed in that questions for use in expert mental model (EMM) development could be used directly from the standard (doctrine). However, identification of impact factors and related questions were not in the standard and needed to be generated. Expert mental models for medical tasks built in previous work were reviewed briefly. Other successful studies also exist, such as real estate decisions [Huber, Kovalerchuk, 2024].

Using LLMs to formulate questions is a promising approach toward building question hierarchies meant to drive the development and encoding of expert mental models—models meant to fill knowledge gaps that mitigate LLM hallucinations and provide meaningful causal explanations in natural language to aid human decision-making.

Without an EMM, we could ask a general question of an LLM like “Should we submit a proposal?”, attaching the call for proposals, relevant prior proposals and funded projects as context. However, completely outsourcing a complex decision-making task to an LLM will likely produce decision-altering hallucinations, because critical information bearing on the decision will be missing (say, about a potential collaborator or conducted pilot studies for the project).

In contrast, with an EMM, we have a domain-relevant and situationally-aware decision guide for identifying strengths and weaknesses in a decision to respond to a request for proposals (such as identifying missing information or knowledge gaps) and a mechanism for focusing attention on factors that matter to the decision-making organization. The EMM offers further support when consolidating the opinions of multiple domain experts. Asking an LLM to generate the actual proposal based on a task-relevant EMM should be more successful than without the EMM, as the EMM will control the meaning of the resulting generation as a blueprint guides an engineering task.

We expect further research to build one or more EMMs as a guide for generating a research proposal with the support of an LLM. At this stage, we hypothesize that an LLM will generate a valuable proposal with EMM support. However, that work is far beyond the first challenge of developing criteria to measure that the guiding EMM is specific enough. Potentially, an EMM capable of addressing a specific problem could be composed with others to address even more demanding decision structures.

8. Acknowledgement

This work has been supported by MDA contract # HQ0860-24-C-7602 and approved for Public Release 25-MDA-12135 (30 Jun 25).

References

- [1] ATO: An introduction to ATOs, GSA, <https://digital.gov/resources/an-introduction-to-ato/?dg>, 2025
- [2] Badreddine S, Spranger M. Extending Real Logic with Aggregate Functions. In: NeSy 2021 (pp. 115-125). <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2986/paper9.pdf>
- [3] Beliakov G, James S, Wu J. Discrete fuzzy measures. Springer, 2020.
- [4] Burger D. Enabling next-generation large language model applications, Microsoft, 2023. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/autogen-enabling-next-generation-large-language-model-applications/>
- [5] Dujmovic J. Soft computing evaluation logic: The LSP decision method and its applications. John Wiley & Sons, 2018
- [6] FIPS: Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) 199 worksheet (PDF, 80 KB, 13 pages), NIST, 2024 <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/fips/nist.fips.199.pdf>
- [7] Gao Y, Xiong Y, Gao X, Jia K, Pan J, Bi Y, Dai Y, Sun J, Wang H, Wang H. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997. 2023 Dec 18;2.
- [8] Kim BM, Li Q, Kim BW. Extraction of user preferences from a few positive documents. In: Proceedings of The Sixth International Workshop on Information Retrieval with Asian Languages 2003 Jul (pp. 124-131).
- [9] Kovalerchuk B, Nazemi K, Andonie R, Datia N, Banissi E, (Eds). Artificial Intelligence and Visualization: Advancing Visual Knowledge Discovery, Springer, 2024
- [10] Kovalerchuk B., Schwing J. (Eds) Visual and Spatial Analysis: Advances in Data Mining, Reasoning and Problem Solving, Springer, 2005
- [11] Huber H, Kovalerchuk B. Monotone Functions and Models for Explanation of Machine Learning Models, 2024 28th International Conference Information Visualisation (IV), pp.227-235, 2024, IEEE.
- [12] Huber H., Monotone Ordinal Expert Knowledge Acquisition for Explanation of Machine Learning Models [Master's Thesis], Central Washington University, 2025. <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3037&context=etd>
- [13] Kovalerchuk, B., Delizy, F., Riggs, L. Visual Data Mining and Discovery with Binarized Vectors, In: Data Mining: Foundations and Intelligent Paradigms, Springer, 2012, 24: 135-156
- [14] Kovalerchuk, B., Vityaev E., Ruiz J.F., Consistent and Complete Data and "Expert" Mining in Medicine, In: Medical Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, Springer, 2001, pp. 238-280.
- [15] Kovalerchuk, B., Triantaphyllou, E., Ruiz, J.F. Monotonicity and logical analysis of data: a mechanism for evaluation of mammographic and clinical data. In: Computer applications to assist radiology, Symposia Foundation, Carlsbad, CA, 1996, pp. 191-196.
- [16] Kovalerchuk, B., Triantaphyllou, E., Deshpande, A.S., and Vityaev, E. Interactive Learning of Monotone Boolean Functions, Information Sciences, Vol. 94, issue 1 4, 1996, pp. 87 118.
- [17] Malik V, Jagatap A, Puranik V, Majumder A. PEARL: Preference extraction with exemplar augmentation and retrieval with LLM agents. In: Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track 2024 Nov (pp. 1536-1547). <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-industry.112.pdf>
- [18] Perplexity AI, 2025, <https://www.perplexity.ai>
- [19] Richardson K, Srikumar V, Sabharwal A. Understanding the Logic of Direct Preference Alignment through Logic. arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.17696. 2024 Dec 23. [t/10508902/https://arxiv.org/html/2412.17696v1](https://arxiv.org/html/2412.17696v1)
- [20] Zhang T, Ge J, Luo H, Chuang YS, Gao M, Gong Y, Wu X, Kim Y, Meng H, Glass J. Natural language embedded programs for hybrid language symbolic reasoning. 2023. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10814>