

# OntoMetric: An Ontology-Guided Framework for Automated ESG Knowledge Graph Construction

Mingqin Yu\*  
mingqin.yu@unsw.edu.au  
School of Computer Science and  
Engineering, University of New South  
Wales  
Sydney, Australia

Fethi Rabhi  
f.rabhi@unsw.edu.au  
School of Computer Science and  
Engineering, University of New South  
Wales  
Sydney, Australia

Boming Xia  
boming.xia@adelaide.edu.au  
Faculty of Sciences, Engineering and  
Technology, The University of  
Adelaide  
Adelaide, Australia

Zhengyi Yang  
zhengyi.yang@unsw.edu.au  
School of Computer Science and  
Engineering, University of New South  
Wales  
Sydney, Australia

Felix Tan  
f.tan@unsw.edu.au  
School of Information Systems and  
Technology Management, University  
of New South Wales  
Sydney, Australia

Qinghua Lu  
qinghua.lu@data61.csiro.au  
CSIRO's Data61  
Sydney, Australia




Figure 1: OntoMetric Framework

## Abstract

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) disclosure frameworks such as SASB, TCFD, and IFRS S2 require organizations to compute and report numerous metrics for compliance, yet these requirements are embedded in long, unstructured PDF documents that are difficult to interpret, standardize, and audit. Manual extraction is unscalable, while unconstrained large language model (LLM) extraction often produces inconsistent entities, hallucinated relationships, missing provenance, and high validation failure rates. We present **OntoMetric**, an ontology-guided framework that transforms ESG regulatory documents into validated, AI- and web-ready knowledge graphs. OntoMetric operates through a three-stage pipeline: (1) structure-aware segmentation using table-of-contents boundaries, (2) ontology-constrained LLM extraction that embeds ESGMKG schema into prompts while enriching entities with semantic fields for downstream reasoning, and (3) two-phase validation that combines LLM-based semantic verification with rule-based schema checking across entity, property, and relationship levels (VR001–VR006). The framework preserves both segment-level and page-level provenance for audit traceability. Evaluated on five ESG standards (SASB Commercial Banks, SASB Semiconductors, TCFD, IFRS S2, AASB S2) totaling 228 pages and 60 segments, OntoMetric achieves 65–90% semantic accuracy and 80–90% schema compliance, compared to 3–10% for baseline unconstrained extraction,

at \$0.01–\$0.02 per validated entity. Our results demonstrate that combining symbolic ontology constraints with neural extraction enables reliable, auditable knowledge graphs suitable for regulatory compliance and web integration, supporting downstream applications such as sustainable-finance analytics, transparency portals, and automated compliance tools.

## Keywords

Ontology-Guided LLM Extraction, ESG Knowledge Graphs, Two-Phase Validation, Provenance Preservation, Regulatory Document Processing, AI-Ready Knowledge Representation

## 1 Introduction

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) disclosure frameworks such as the Sustainability Accounting Standards Board (SASB) [20], the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) [21], and the International Sustainability Standards Board’s IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures [11] require organizations to compute and report a wide range of metrics for regulatory and stakeholder accountability. These metrics are defined in long, unstructured PDF documents whose narrative structure embeds definitions, formulas, units, and dependencies across paragraphs, tables, and cross-referenced sections. Practitioners must manually interpret the text, identify required inputs, follow implicit references, and trace elements back to authoritative pages. This process is time-consuming,

\*Corresponding author.

error-prone, and increasingly difficult as standards evolve. Moreover, these standards are published and consumed on the Web, where transforming static PDFs into machine-actionable knowledge graphs is essential for automated compliance checking, stakeholder transparency, and integration with sustainable-finance applications.

Frequent updates to ESG frameworks further heighten the need for accurate and auditable interpretation. Misunderstanding a metric’s scope, boundary, or computation logic is a common source of reporting inconsistencies, while missing provenance complicates both internal reviews and external audits. These challenges underscore the need for reliable methods that extract, structure, and validate regulatory requirements with high fidelity.

Traditional automation approaches based on keyword matching or handcrafted rules lack the semantic coverage needed to capture complex metric definitions and compositional dependencies across frameworks[1, 2]. Large language models (LLMs)[4, 18] provide strong text understanding, but unconstrained extraction often yields incomplete or inconsistent entities, hallucinated relationships, and missing provenance[12, 18]. Prior ontology-guided work improves structural consistency in legal and biomedical domains[3, 15], but existing methods do not achieve the regulatory fidelity required for ESG compliance. Moreover, most ESG ontologies provide formal schemas but lack the natural-language descriptions needed for integration with modern LLM-based reasoning and retrieval systems[10].

To address these challenges, we present **OntoMetric**, an ontology-guided framework for automated ESG knowledge graph construction using LLMs. OntoMetric transforms regulatory text into validated, provenance-preserving knowledge graphs through a three-stage pipeline: (1) structure-aware segmentation using table-of-contents boundaries to preserve document context; (2) ontology-guided extraction using prompts enriched with ESGMKG definitions [23], producing entities with rich semantic fields (labels, descriptions, structured properties); and (3) two-phase validation combining LLM-based semantic type verification with six rule-based schema validators (VR001–VR006) that enforce entity, property, and relationship constraints. The framework preserves segment-level and page-level provenance and uses low-temperature generation to ensure stable, schema-consistent outputs. By producing knowledge graphs with semantically enriched entities alongside explicit provenance, OntoMetric provides an AI-ready representation that supports LLM-based reasoning, retrieval-augmented generation, and automated compliance analysis.

## 1.1 Motivation and Problem Statement

Manual ESG metric extraction suffers from three persistent limitations. First, conceptually similar metrics appear under different names, scopes, and compositions across SASB, TCFD, and IFRS S2[11, 20, 21], complicating cross-framework alignment. Second, many ESG metrics are inherently compositional: their formulas depend on multiple inputs (e.g., emissions, revenue, organizational boundaries), but these dependencies are embedded in narrative text, tables, or multi-paragraph definitions that are difficult to detect automatically [7, 14]. Third, manually created spreadsheets or databases often omit page references, identifiers, and version metadata, reducing transparency, reproducibility, and auditability[17].

Beyond extraction challenges, existing ESG ontologies typically define formal schemas with URI-based identifiers and structured relationships but lack the natural-language descriptions, contextual metadata, and compositional detail needed for integration with modern AI systems[10, 25]. As a result, they provide limited support for LLM-based reasoning, retrieval-augmented generation, or agentic compliance workflows, all of which rely on semantically rich and human-readable entity representations.

An effective solution must therefore ensure semantic fidelity, structural validity, and traceable provenance links to authoritative regulatory text, while also producing AI-ready knowledge representations with rich semantic fields that support downstream reasoning, retrieval, and automated compliance analysis.

## 1.2 Contributions

This paper makes three primary contributions:

- **Ontology-Guided Extraction with Semantic Enrichment.** A structured prompt design that embeds ESGMKG ontology constraints (5 entity types, 5 relationship predicates, 7 structural rules) into LLM extraction. Beyond schema compliance, the method enriches each extracted entity with semantic fields (labels, descriptions, structured properties) derived from source text, producing AI-ready knowledge graphs that support downstream LLM-based reasoning, retrieval-augmented generation, and automated compliance analysis. This demonstrates a reusable pattern for integrating domain ontologies into LLM extraction pipelines.
- **Two-Phase Validation.** A validation architecture combining: (1) LLM-based semantic validation that verifies entity content against ESGMKG type definitions, leveraging the semantically enriched extraction outputs; and (2) rule-based schema validation through six validators (VR001–VR006) that enforce structural constraints across three levels: entity integrity (unique IDs, required fields), property validity (metric codes, units, model inputs), and relationship correctness (approved predicates, CalculatedMetric–Model links). The framework preserves segment-level and page-level provenance throughout for audit traceability.
- **Empirical Evaluation.** Systematic evaluation across five ESG standards (SASB Commercial Banks, SASB Semiconductors, TCFD, IFRS S2, AASB S2) comprising 228 pages and 60 segments. Results demonstrate 65–90% semantic accuracy and 80–90% schema compliance, compared to 3–10% semantic accuracy for baseline unconstrained extraction, at a cost of \$0.01–\$0.02 per validated entity.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 ESG Ontologies and Knowledge Representation

ESG knowledge modelling has progressed from general sustainability vocabularies to ontologies addressing disclosure requirements [8, 14, 25]. Existing ESG ontologies define entity hierarchies and reporting relationships, but often lack the metric-level structure needed to represent compositional dependencies across frameworks [10]. ESGMKG addresses this gap by introducing five entity types

(Industry, ReportingFramework, Category, Metric, Model) with predicates capturing hierarchical and compositional relationships between metrics [23]. This metric-level modeling enables structured representation of how disclosure requirements relate across different reporting standards.

However, ESGMKG and similar ontologies focus primarily on schema definition rather than semantic enrichment for downstream AI applications. Entities are represented as identifiers with basic type information, lacking the rich contextual descriptions needed for embedding generation, retrieval augmentation, and reasoning tasks [18]. OntoMetric builds on this foundation by introducing richer semantic fields, including natural language labels, contextual descriptions, and domain properties. These additions allow the extracted knowledge graphs to be used directly in AI workflows without requiring further manual annotation.

## 2.2 Knowledge Graph Construction and Validation

Knowledge graph construction methods range from manual curation to automated extraction pipelines. Traditional automated approaches rely on named entity recognition and relation extraction trained on domain-specific corpora [2], but struggle with ESG documents where definitions span tables, multi-paragraph narratives, and compositional formulas [1]. Existing ESG ontologies such as ESGMKG rely on manual population, limiting scalability across evolving regulatory frameworks [23]. Large language models offer strong zero-shot extraction capabilities that reduce manual effort [5], yet unconstrained LLM outputs often contain incorrect types, invalid relationships, or hallucinated content [12]. Ontology-guided extraction in biomedical [15] and legal domains [3] improves structural consistency by constraining outputs to predefined schemas, but these approaches typically stop at extraction with limited post-extraction validation.

Validation methods for knowledge graphs generally fall into two categories: schema-level constraints (required fields, valid predicates, cardinality rules) and semantic-level verification (type correctness, factual accuracy) [19, 24]. Most pipelines enforce only schema constraints, leaving semantic validation to manual review—an approach that does not scale for regulatory contexts requiring auditability. OntoMetric addresses both levels through a two-phase validation architecture: Phase 1 uses LLM-based semantic type verification to filter extraction errors, while Phase 2 applies six rule-based validators (VR001–VR006) for schema compliance. This combination achieves automated quality assurance while preserving segment-level provenance for regulatory traceability.

## 3 The OntoMetric Framework Design

### 3.1 Overview of the OntoMetric Framework

OntoMetric is a three-stage, ontology-guided framework that transforms unstructured ESG regulatory documents into validated, provenance preserving knowledge graphs. As shown in Figure 1, the framework integrates: (1) structure-aware segmentation to isolate coherent text units, (2) ontology-constrained LLM extraction to ensure schema-aligned outputs, and (3) two-phase validation (semantic and rule-based) to enforce correctness.




Figure 2: Structure-aware segmentation in Stage 1.

Each stage addresses a distinct challenge. Stage 1 segments lengthy PDFs into coherent, context-preserving units while retaining structural metadata. Stage 2 applies the ESGMKG ontology schema (5 entity types, 5 relationship predicates, 7 structural rules) to extract structured entities and relationships from each segment. Stage 3 performs semantic type checking with an LLM followed by rule-based schema validation (VR001–VR006). The modular design yields interpretable intermediate artefacts, consistent behaviour across documents, and explicit audit trails—producing validated ESGMKG-compliant knowledge graphs with rich semantic fields (labels, descriptions, structured properties) that support downstream applications including compliance checking, cross-framework alignment, retrieval-augmented generation, and LLM-based ESG reasoning.

### 3.2 Structure-Aware Segmentation

OntoMetric divides each regulatory document into meaningful, context-aligned segments using its table of contents (TOC). ESG standards such as SASB and IFRS S2 organize content hierarchically by topics (e.g., “Data Security,” “Greenhouse Gas Emissions”), with each section containing metric definitions, calculation methodologies, and reporting guidance. As shown in Figure 2, OntoMetric uses TOC page detection and title extraction to identify natural segmentation boundaries, avoiding fixed size chunking that often breaks coherent content in legal and technical documents [9, 13, 22].

For each detected section, OntoMetric extracts the full text and tables within the associated page range (Algorithm 1, Appendix A.1). Tables spanning multiple pages are merged, and light cleanup removes layout artefacts. Each resulting segment preserves metadata such as titles, page spans, and section identifiers. This TOC aligned strategy ensures that segments correspond to complete conceptual units such as metric definitions, formulas, or category descriptions, supporting high fidelity extraction and provenance tracking.

Prior work shows that context-preserving segmentation improves information extraction accuracy by reducing fragmentation and maintaining semantic coherence [6, 16]. OntoMetric adopts this approach to maximize LLM extraction quality.

**Table 1: Components of the ontology-guided extraction prompt. Full prompt specification is provided in Appendix B.1.**

Component	Description
System context	Defines LLM role and extraction objective.
Ontology connection map	Lists all valid ESGMKG predicate patterns.
Entity definitions	Required fields for Metric, Model, Category, Industry, ReportingFramework.
Relationship rules	Cardinality and allowed connections.
ID conventions	Deterministic naming rules.
Extraction workflow	Four-step segment extraction process.
JSON schema	Structure of meta, entities, relationships.
Few-shot examples	Templates for Metric and Model extraction.
Segment content	Stage 1 segment appended for processing.

### 3.3 Ontology-Guided LLM Extraction

Stage 2 transforms each segment from Stage 1 into structured entities and relationships through ontology-guided extraction. As shown in Figure 3, the process operates in two phases: per-segment extraction followed by cross-segment consolidation.

The ESGMKG ontology [23] defines the foundational schema with five core entity types—Industry, ReportingFramework, Category, Metric, and Model—and five relationship types capturing regulatory framework hierarchies and metric computation dependencies. We extend this schema with semantic fields including human-readable labels, detailed descriptions, and domain-specific properties to support both machine processing and human interpretation. Figure 4 shows each entity type with its key properties and extraction specifications that guide the LLM, along with relationship cardinality constraints between entities.

For each segment, the system: (1) applies an ontology-guided prompt that combines segment content with ESGMKG schema definitions (entity types, allowed predicates, cardinality constraints); (2) calls Claude Sonnet 4.5 (temperature 0.1) to generate structured JSON containing entities with semantic fields (labels, descriptions, domain properties); (3) parses the output and performs an extraction quality check based on type validity and field completeness to support human-in-the-loop monitoring; (4) adds provenance metadata linking each entity to its source segment and page range [17]; and (5) accumulates results for consolidation. The nine-component prompt template (Table 1) encodes ESGMKG rules, extraction workflow, and output schema, with full specification in Appendix B.1.

After processing all segments, a three-pass consolidation algorithm produces a unified knowledge graph: ID resolution normalizes identifiers across segments, entity deduplication merges duplicates, and relationship deduplication removes redundant triples[19]. The output is a unified knowledge graph  $G = (E, R)$  ready for Stage 3 validation.

This design offers a reusable pattern for ontology-guided LLM extraction: segment-level processing ensures each extraction operates on coherent, self-contained units; schema constraints embedded directly in prompts guide the LLM toward compliant outputs without post-hoc filtering [18]; and provenance annotation at extraction

**Table 2: Validation rules grouped by validation type.**

ID	Name	Description
<b>Entity Validation</b>		
VR001	ID Uniqueness	IDs must be globally unique.
VR002	Required Fields	Entities must contain type-specific fields.
<b>Property Validation</b>		
VR003	Metric Values	Metric code and unit must be non-empty.
VR004	Model Inputs	Models must have at least one valid input variable.
<b>Relationship Validation</b>		
VR005	Predicate Validity	Only ESGMKG predicates are allowed.
VR006	CM–Model Link	Each CalculatedMetric must link to exactly one Model.

time maintains traceable links to source text for regulatory auditability. The low temperature setting (0.1) ensures reproducible extractions across runs. This pattern can be adapted to other domains by substituting the ontology schema and adjusting prompt templates accordingly.

### 3.4 Two-Phase Validation

After consolidation, Stage 3 performs two-phase validation (Figure 5) that combines semantic verification with rule-based schema checking (Algorithm 3). This validation architecture provides a systematic approach to quality assurance, applying complementary checks across entities, properties, and relationships.

**Phase 1: Semantic Validation.** An LLM verifies whether each entity’s label and description match its assigned ESGMKG type. Entities belonging to unknown types are rejected immediately to reduce API usage. Incorrect entities are removed along with dependent relationships.

#### Phase 2: Schema Validation.

Six rule-based validators (Table 2) enforce ontology constraints across three levels: entity-level checks (unique IDs, required fields), property-level checks (valid values, non-empty model inputs), and relationship-level checks (approved predicates, one-to-one links between CalculatedMetric and Model). Violations trigger removal with detailed logs.

This two-phase architecture separates concerns: semantic validation catches type misassignments that schema rules cannot detect, while schema validation enforces structural constraints that LLMs may overlook. The combination achieves higher precision than either approach alone.

The system computes three quality metrics after validation: (1) Semantic Accuracy, (2) Schema Compliance, and (3) Relationship Retention. The final output is a validated graph  $G' = (E', R')$  plus a detailed validation log, supporting reproducibility and audit requirements.

## 4 Evaluation

This section evaluates OntoMetric’s ability to transform ESG regulatory documents into semantically valid, structurally consistent, and cost-efficient knowledge graphs.




Figure 3: Stage 2: Ontology-guided LLM extraction. Each segment is processed using an ESGMKG-informed prompt, producing structured entities(labels, descriptions, properties), relationships, and provenance. Outputs are then merged across segments to form a unified knowledge graph  $KG(E, R)$ .




Figure 4: ESGMKG Ontology Structure with semantic field specifications. Each entity type displays key properties extracted by the LLM (field name: extraction description). Arrows show relationships between entities, with numbers indicating how many of each entity can be linked.

#### 4.1 Research Questions

The evaluation addresses three research questions:

- **RQ1 – Extraction Quality:** How does ontology-guided prompting compare to baseline LLM extraction in terms of semantic accuracy and schema compliance?
- **RQ2 – Validation Effectiveness:** How effectively does two-phase validation (semantic + schema) filter semantically incorrect and structurally non-compliant entities?
- **RQ3 – Cost Efficiency:** What is the cost per validated entity, and what percentage of extraction effort is wasted on entities that fail validation?

To answer these questions, we define five evaluation metrics aligned with the research questions. Metrics are calculated after Stage 3 validation completes.

**Semantic Accuracy.** Measures the percentage of entities with correct type assignments according to ESGMKG definitions, validated by LLM in Phase 1:

$$\text{Semantic Accuracy} = \frac{\text{Semantically Correct Entities}}{\text{Total Entities}} \times 100\%.$$




Figure 5: Stage 3: Two-phase validation. Phase 1 applies LLM-based semantic validation to ensure correct type assignments. Phase 2 enforces ESGMKG schema rules (VR001–VR006), removing invalid entities and relationships to produce the validated graph  $KG'(E', R')$ .

**Schema Compliance.** Measures structural validity as the average compliance score across the six validation rules (VR001–VR006). Each rule score is calculated as the percentage of items passing that rule, and the overall compliance is their average:

$$\text{Schema Compliance} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{\text{Items Passing VR}_i}{\text{Total Items for VR}_i} \times 100\%.$$

**Relationship Retention.** Indicates the percentage of extracted relationships that survive validation, reflecting validation strictness:

$$\text{Relationship Retention} = \frac{\text{Validated Relationships}}{\text{Extracted Relationships}} \times 100\%.$$

**Cost per Entity.** Measures the API cost (Stage 2 extraction + Stage 3 semantic validation) required to produce one validated entity:

$$\text{Cost per Entity} = \frac{\text{Stage 2 Cost} + \text{Stage 3 Cost}}{\text{Validated Entities}} \text{ (USD)}.$$

**Table 3: ESG regulatory documents used in the evaluation.**

Document	Pages	Segments
SASB Commercial Banks	23	10
SASB Semiconductors	27	13
IFRS S2	46	10
AASB S2 (Australia)	58	8
TCFD Report	74	19

**Cost Waste Ratio.** Captures the percentage of extraction effort spent on entities that are subsequently filtered during validation:

$$\text{Cost Waste Ratio} = \frac{\text{Filtered Entities}}{\text{Total Extracted Entities}} \times 100\%.$$

Lower values indicate more efficient extraction (fewer wasted API calls on invalid entities).

## 4.2 Datasets and Experimental Setup

We evaluate OntoMetric on five ESG regulatory documents widely used in practice, each differing in length, structure, and disclosure style: two SASB industry standards (Commercial Banks and Semiconductors), one international climate standard (IFRS S2), one regional adaptation (AASB S2 for Australia), and one cross-sector framework (TCFD Final Report). Together, they represent diverse ESG reporting formats, ranging from metric-specific requirements with structured tables and explicit codes (SASB) to principle-based narrative guidance (TCFD).

All PDFs were processed using Stage 1 structure-aware segmentation with TOC-guided boundaries and page-level provenance tracking. Stage 2 extraction was performed using Claude Sonnet 4.5 with temperature 0.1 and max\_tokens 16000 to ensure reproducible, schema-consistent outputs. After per-segment extraction, results were consolidated using a three-pass merging algorithm (ID resolution, entity deduplication, relationship deduplication). Stage 3 validation applies two-phase validation: (1) LLM-based semantic validation to verify entity type correctness, and (2) six rule-based schema validators (VR001–VR006). Knowledge graphs were constructed in Python 3.11 using RDFLib 6.3 and NetworkX 3.1. Table 3 summarises the documents pages and segmentation.

We compare two extraction configurations on the same five documents:

- **Baseline LLM Extraction:** Uses a minimal 15-line prompt (see Appendix B.2) that requests JSON output with entities and relationships but provides no entity type definitions, relationship constraints, or extraction workflow. No provenance tracking or validation applied. Represents standard LLM extraction without ontology guidance.
- **OntoMetric (Ontology-Guided):** Uses a nine-component prompt (Table 1, Appendix B.1) embedding ESGMKG schema (5 entity types, 5 predicates, 7 structural rules), deterministic ID conventions, four-step extraction workflow, and few-shot examples. Includes provenance tracking (segment\_id, page\_range) and two-phase validation (semantic + six schema rules VR001–VR006).

**Table 4: Extraction and validation results comparing ontology-guided and baseline approaches. E = entities, R = relationships. “—” indicates zero entities survived validation.**

Document	Stage 2 (Extracted)		Stage 3 (Validated)	
	Ontology	Baseline	Ontology	Baseline
SASB Commercial Banks	53E, 53R	123E, 161R	42E, 42R	3E, 0R
SASB Semiconductors	69E, 71R	149E, 200R	62E, 64R	—
IFRS S2	80E, 65R	126E, 176R	68E, 58R	—
AASB S2 (Australia)	74E, 75R	96E, 117R	66E, 65R	3E, 0R
TCFD Report	88E, 86R	235E, 286R	57E, 54R	—

Both configurations use Claude Sonnet 4.5 with identical temperature (0.1) and max\_tokens (16000) settings to isolate the impact of ontology-guided prompting.

## 4.3 Results and Discussion

This subsection reports OntoMetric’s performance across five evaluated documents (Table 4) and contrasts the ontology-guided approach with baseline LLM extraction. We evaluate three dimensions: extraction quality (RQ1), validation effectiveness (RQ2), and cost efficiency (RQ3).


**4.3.1 RQ1: Extraction Quality.** Table 4 presents extraction and validation results across five ESG regulatory documents, comparing ontology-guided and baseline approaches. The ontology-guided method extracts 53-88 entities per document (Stage 2), with 79-85% successfully validated (Stage 3). In contrast, baseline extraction produces 96-235 entities per document, but suffers catastrophic validation failure: three documents yield zero validated entities, while the remaining two retain only 2.4% (Commercial Banks: 3 of 123) and 3.1% (AASB S2: 3 of 96).

Quality metrics reveal the root cause of baseline failure. Ontology-guided extraction achieves **Semantic Accuracy** of 64.8-89.9% and **Schema Compliance** of 80.1-83.3% across documents. Baseline extraction, however, produces semantically incorrect entities at rates of 90.2% (Commercial Banks) to 100% (IFRS S2, Semiconductors, TCFD), demonstrating that ontology guidance is essential for valid ESG knowledge graph construction.

Figure 6 illustrates the fundamental difference in entity type distributions. Baseline extraction (left column, n=23→6 total) captures only 2 of 5 ESGMKG entity types (Industry and Metric), with 74% of extracted entities filtered during validation. Ontology-guided extraction (right column, n=364→295 total) successfully identifies all 5 entity types (Industry, ReportingFramework, Category, Metric, Model) at both Stage 2 (extraction) and Stage 3 (validation). The distribution stability between stages—with Metrics comprising the majority (73% post-validation) as expected for ESG regulatory documents—confirms high initial extraction quality. This stability contrasts sharply with baseline’s 74% rejection rate, indicating that ontology-guided prompting prevents the generation of invalid entity types (e.g., “Standard”, “Organization”, “Sector”) that plague unconstrained LLM extraction.

**4.3.2 RQ2: Validation Effectiveness.** Two-phase validation (semantic + schema) effectively filters invalid extractions while preserving high-quality entities. Figure 7 shows ontology-guided extraction





**Figure 6: Entity type distribution comparison.** Baseline (left,  $n=23 \rightarrow 6$ ) extracts only 2 entity types, while ontology-guided (right,  $n=364 \rightarrow 295$ ) captures all 5 ESGMKG entity types across extraction (top row) and validation (bottom row) stages.

achieves **Schema Compliance** of 80.1-83.3%, **Semantic Accuracy** of 64.8-89.9%, and **Relationship Retention** of 62.8-90.1% across five documents. High retention rates indicate that ontology-constrained prompting produces structurally valid outputs requiring minimal filtering. SASB documents achieve the highest metrics (Semiconductors: 89.9% semantic accuracy, 90.1% relationship retention), where tabular metric definitions align well with ESGMKG’s entity-relationship structure.

Baseline validation reveals catastrophic failure across all quality dimensions. Table 4 shows that despite extracting 2-4 $\times$  more entities than ontology-guided approaches (Commercial Banks: 123 vs. 53; TCFD: 235 vs. 88), only 0-3.1% survive two-phase validation. Three documents (Semiconductors, IFRS S2, TCFD) yield zero validated entities, while two retain only 3 entities each (Commercial Banks, AASB S2: 2.4-3.1% retention). Phase 1 semantic validation rejects 90-100% due to semantically incorrect entity types (e.g., “Standard”, “Organization” instead of ESGMKG types). Phase 2 schema validation eliminates remaining entities through violations of VR002 (missing required properties) and VR005 (invalid relationship predicates). This 96.9-100% filtering rate demonstrates that unconstrained LLM extraction produces hallucinated content fundamentally unsuitable for structured knowledge graphs, validating the necessity of ontology-guided constraints.

**4.3.3 RQ3: Cost Efficiency.** Ontology-guided extraction achieves consistent cost efficiency across document types. Figure 8 shows **Cost per Validated Entity** ranging from \$0.013 (IFRS S2, 68 entities) to \$0.021 (TCFD, 57 entities), with variation driven by document complexity and entity density. **Cost Waste Ratio**—the percentage of Stage 2 extraction effort spent on entities subsequently filtered in Stage 3—ranges from 10.1% (Semiconductors) to 35.0% (TCFD). Structured tabular standards (SASB Semiconductors, IFRS S2, AASB S2) exhibit lower waste ratios (10-13%) due to

alignment with ESGMKG’s entity schema, while narrative-heavy documents (TCFD: 35%, Commercial Banks: 21%) require more filtering despite ontology guidance.

Figure 9 demonstrates the critical efficiency advantage of ontology-guided extraction. Baseline extraction costs \$0.747 per validated entity (6 entities total from 219 extracted), compared to \$0.0155 for ontology-guided (295 entities from 364 extracted)—a **48 $\times$  efficiency improvement**. This disparity stems from baseline’s 97% Cost Waste Ratio: despite similar per-entity extraction costs, 97% of baseline’s API expenditure produces entities that fail validation, versus only 19% waste for ontology-guided. The comparison validates that ontology-constrained prompting is not merely a quality improvement but a fundamental cost efficiency requirement: unconstrained LLM extraction wastes computational resources on hallucinated entities that cannot survive semantic and schema validation.


**4.3.4 Error Analysis and Insights.** Analysis of validation failures in ontology-guided extraction (Figure 7) reveals three interpretable error categories aligned with the two-phase validation process (Section ??).

**Semantic Misclassifications (Phase 1 Failures).** Between 10–35% of extracted entities fail semantic validation, with failure rates inversely correlated to document structure (Semiconductors: 10.1%, TCFD: 35.0%). The LLM incorrectly assigned entity types despite ontology constraints: financial performance metrics (“Net Income”, “Return on Equity”) were mislabeled as ESG Metrics, and narrative guidance paragraphs extracted as Metric entities. These failures occurred when documents mixed ESG and financial disclosures without clear delineation, demonstrating that LLM-based semantic validation serves as an essential quality gate even with ontology-guided prompting.


**Schema Compliance Failures (Phase 2 Failures).** Among semantically correct entities, 16–20% fail schema validation (100% - Schema Compliance from Figure 7). The dominant violation is VR003 (Metric Property Values), accounting for 4–10% of failures, where Metric entities lack valid code or unit fields. This occurs predominantly in narrative-heavy documents (TCFD, Commercial Banks) that describe metrics qualitatively without explicit SASB-style codes. VR002 (Type-Specific Schema) violations are rare (0–2%), indicating the prompt’s entity property specifications effectively guide field extraction. VR005 (Relationship Predicate Validity) and VR006 (CalculatedMetric-Model Links) each contribute 1–3% of failures, occurring when the LLM identifies composite metrics but omits corresponding Model entities or uses invalid predicates.

**Rule Adherence Observations.** No violations of VR001 (Entity Uniqueness) or VR004 (Model Property Values) occurred across 364 extracted entities in five documents, confirming that deterministic ID conventions (`metric_{doc}_{page}_{nn}`) and structured Model property requirements are consistently followed when specified in prompts.


**Key Insights.** Error patterns reveal that ontology-guided extraction substantially reduces but does not eliminate validation failures. The 10–35% waste ratio (Figure 8) represents a pragmatic trade-off: stricter prompting could reduce over-extraction but risks missing valid entities in varied document formats. Semantic validation remains necessary as the LLM occasionally misinterprets



**Figure 7: Validation quality metrics across five ESG documents for ontology-guided extraction. Schema Compliance (80-83%), Semantic Accuracy (65-90%), and Relationship Retention (63-90%) demonstrate consistent validation effectiveness. Baseline results omitted (catastrophic failure: 0-3.1% retention).**



**Figure 8: Per-document cost efficiency for ontology-guided extraction. Cost per validated entity ranges \$0.013-\$0.021; cost waste ratio (extraction effort spent on filtered entities) ranges 10-35% across five documents.**



**Figure 9: Method comparison: ontology-guided vs. baseline extraction. Baseline achieves only \$0.747 per validated entity (6 entities total) with 97% cost waste, while ontology-guided achieves \$0.0155 per entity (295 entities) with 19% waste—a 48× efficiency improvement.**

context, while schema validation enforces structural consistency that prompts alone cannot guarantee. The 62-87 percentage point reduction in cost waste versus baseline (Figure 9) demonstrates that ontology constraints provide sufficient guidance for practical knowledge graph construction, with residual errors addressable through automated validation.

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

OntoMetric addresses a central tension in regulatory document processing. Large language models provide strong text understanding but lack the structural guarantees required for compliance applications, while ontology-based systems ensure consistency but cannot effectively interpret narrative regulatory text. By embedding ESGMKG constraints directly into LLM prompts and validating outputs through semantic and schema checks, OntoMetric bridges this gap, achieving 65–90% semantic accuracy and 80–90% schema compliance compared with 3–10% for unconstrained extraction.

Three design choices were essential to this performance. First, enriching entities with semantic fields (labels, descriptions, properties) rather than assigning bare identifiers enables AI-ready knowledge representations that support reasoning and retrieval. Second, separating validation into semantic type verification and structural rule enforcement isolates two distinct failure modes: hallucinated content versus schema violations. Third, capturing provenance during extraction ensures that every entity and relationship remains traceable to authoritative source text. These design choices enable OntoMetric to produce AI- and web-ready knowledge graphs that can be exposed as linked data or APIs, supporting downstream applications such as sustainable-finance analytics, transparency portals, and automated compliance tools.



Several limitations motivate future work. OntoMetric currently depends on table-of-contents structures for segmentation; extending this to documents with implicit boundaries is a natural next step. Validation costs remain driven by LLM calls, and hybrid classifiers or open-source models may reduce this burden. Cross-framework metric alignment also remains unexplored, as different standards often define overlapping concepts with varying terminology. Finally, OntoMetric’s rich graph structure offers opportunities for interactive compliance tools, agentic systems, and reasoning interfaces.

More broadly, this work shows that combining symbolic constraints with neural extraction and deterministic validation provides a practical pattern for building trustworthy AI systems. OntoMetric demonstrates that this hybrid approach can transform LLMs from unreliable extractors into auditable knowledge graph builders suitable for high-stakes regulatory applications.

## References

- [1] Kiran Adnan and Rehan Akbar. 2019. Limitations of Information Extraction Methods and Techniques for Heterogeneous Unstructured Big Data. *International Journal of Engineering Business Management* 11 (2019). doi:10.1177/1847979019890771
- [2] Tareq Al-Moslimi, Marc Gallofre Ocana, Andreas L. Opdahl, and Csaba Veres. 2020. Named Entity Extraction for Knowledge Graphs: A Literature Overview. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 32862–32881. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2973928
- [3] Michael J. Bommarito, Daniel Martin Katz, and Eric Detterman. 2018. LexNLP: Natural Language Processing and Information Extraction for Legal and Regulatory Texts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03688* (2018).
- [4] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A. Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, and Others. 2021. On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258* (2021).
- [5] Salvatore Carta, Alessandro Giuliani, Leonardo Piano, Alessandro Sebastian Podda, Livio Pompianu, and Giuseppe Cascavilla. 2023. Iterative Zero-Shot LLM Prompting for Knowledge Graph Construction. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01128*.
- [6] Nam Dao and Others. 2025. Generative Artificial Intelligence for Automated Data Extraction from Clinical Notes. *JAMIA Open* (2025).
- [7] Claudia Diamantini, Domenico Potena, and Emanuele Storti. 2016. SemPI: A Semantic Framework for the Collaborative Construction and Maintenance of a Shared Dictionary of Performance Indicators. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 54 (2016), 352–365.
- [8] Ahmed Elhussein and Others. 2025. ESGOnt: An Ontology-Based Framework for Enhancing Environmental, Social, and Governance Assessments and Aligning with Sustainable Development Goals. *Environmental Challenges* (2025). doi:10.1016/j.envc.2025.101074
- [9] Nathalie Groenendijk and Others. 2023. Legal Document Structure Extraction: A Survey and Benchmark. In *Proceedings of the Computational Semantics Workshop*.
- [10] Aidan Hogan, Eva Blomqvist, Michael Cochez, and Others. 2021. Knowledge Graphs. *Comput. Surveys* (2021).
- [11] IFRS Foundation. 2023. IFRS S2 Climate-related Disclosures. Issued Standard.
- [12] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, and Others. 2023. Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 12 (2023).
- [13] Anoop Katti and Others. 2018. Chargrid: Towards Understanding 2D Documents. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- [14] Agnieszka Konys. 2018. An Ontology-Based Knowledge Modelling for a Sustainability Assessment Domain. *Sustainability* 10, 2 (2018), 300. doi:10.3390/su10020300
- [15] Jinhyuk Lee and Others. 2020. BioBERT: A Pre-trained Biomedical Language Representation Model for Biomedical Text Mining. *Bioinformatics* 36, 4 (2020).
- [16] Kiho Lee and Others. 2025. Enhancing Security and Applicability of Local LLM-Based Document Retrieval Systems in Smart Grid Isolated Environments. *Electronics* (2025).
- [17] Luc Moreau, Paul Groth, Paolo Missier, and Others. 2013. PROV-O: The PROV Ontology. W3C Recommendation. <https://www.w3.org/TR/prov-o/>
- [18] Shirui Pan, Linhao Luo, Yufei Wang, Chen Chen, Jiapu Wang, and Xindong Wu. 2024. Unifying Large Language Models and Knowledge Graphs: A Roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 36, 7 (2024), 3580–3599. doi:10.1109/TKDE.2024.3352100
- [19] Heiko Paulheim. 2017. Knowledge Graph Refinement: A Survey of Approaches and Evaluation Methods. *Semantic Web* 8, 3 (2017), 489–508. doi:10.3233/SW-160218
- [20] Sustainability Accounting Standards Board. 2023. SASB Standards. Available from the SASB Standards Board website.
- [21] Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures. 2021. Recommendations of the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures. Final Report.
- [22] Yiheng Xu, Ying Xu, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, and Others. 2021. LayoutLMv2: Multi-modal Pre-training for Visual Document Understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.
- [23] Mingqin Yu, Fethi A. Rabhi, and Madhusi Bandara. 2024. Ontology-Driven Architecture for Managing Environmental, Social, and Governance Metrics. *Electronics* 13, 9 (2024), 1719. doi:10.3390/electronics13091719
- [24] Amrapali Zaveri, Anisa Rula, Andrea Maurino, Ricardo Pietrobon, Jens Lehmann, and Sören Auer. 2016. Quality Assessment for Linked Data: A Survey. *Semantic Web* 7, 1 (2016), 63–93. doi:10.3233/SW-150175
- [25] Siyu Zhou and Alexander Perzylo. 2023. OntoSustain: Towards an Ontology for Corporate Sustainability Reporting. In *ISWC 2023 Posters and Demos*. [https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3632/ISWC2023\\_paper\\_462.pdf](https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3632/ISWC2023_paper_462.pdf)

## A Algorithm Specifications

This appendix summarises the three-stage OntoMetric pipeline in algorithmic form. The descriptions are consistent with the implementation described in Section 3.

### A.1 Stage 1 – Structure-aware Segmentation

Stage 1 converts each regulatory PDF into a set of semantically coherent segments, preserving page-level provenance and table structure. The output of this stage is a JSON file that serves as input to ontology-guided extraction.

**Table 5: Algorithm 1: Segmentation (Stage 1).**

<b>Input:</b> PDF document $D$
<b>Output:</b> Segments $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$
1. $title \leftarrow \text{EXTRACTTITLE}(D, \text{page} = 1)$
2. $tocPage \leftarrow \text{FINDTOCPAGE}(D)$
3. $toc \leftarrow \text{PARSETOC}(D, \text{page} = tocPage)$
4. <b>for each</b> section $sec$ in $toc$ <b>do</b>
4.1 $s.id \leftarrow \text{GENERATEID}(sec.number)$
4.2 $s.title \leftarrow sec.title$
4.3 $s.pages \leftarrow [sec.start, sec.end]$
4.4 $s.content \leftarrow \text{EXTRACTTEXT}(D, s.pages)$
4.5 $s.tables \leftarrow \text{EXTRACTTABLES}(D, s.pages)$
4.6 $s.tables \leftarrow \text{MERGEMULTIPAGETABLES}(s.tables)$ // merge split tables
4.7 $s.content \leftarrow \text{CLEANTEXT}(s.content)$ // remove headers/footers, noise
4.8 $S \leftarrow S \cup \{s\}$
5. <b>return</b> $S$

### A.2 Stage 2 – Ontology-Guided LLM Extraction

Stage 2 takes the segmented JSON and applies ontology-guided prompts to Claude 4.5 Sonnet. It parses the JSON response into entities and relationships, attaches provenance, and aggregates outputs across segments.

**Table 6: Algorithm 2: Ontology-Guided Extraction (Stage 2).**

<b>Input:</b> Segments $S$ , ontology $O$ , LLM $\mathcal{L}$
<b>Output:</b> Raw extracted entities $\mathcal{E}$ and relationships $\mathcal{R}$
1. Initialise sets $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{R} \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
2. <b>for each</b> segment $s \in S$ <b>do</b>
2.1 $prompt \leftarrow \text{BuildPrompt}(s, O)$
2.2 $resp \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(prompt, \text{temperature} = 0.1)$
2.3 $ext \leftarrow \text{ParseJSON}(resp)$
2.4 <b>for each</b> entity $e \in ext.entities$ <b>do</b>
$e.prov \leftarrow \{s.id, s.title, s.pages\}$ // attach provenance
$\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \cup \{e\}$
2.5 <b>for each</b> relationship $r \in ext.relationships$ <b>do</b>
$r.prov \leftarrow \{s.id, s.title, s.pages\}$
$\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \mathcal{R} \cup \{r\}$
3. <b>return</b> $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R})$

### A.3 Stage 3 – Two-Phase Validation

Stage 3 performs two-phase validation: (1) semantic validation using an LLM gate-keeper to verify entity type correctness, and (2) schema validation enforcing six ontology compliance rules (VR001–VR006). It computes the evaluation metrics used in Section 4 (Schema Compliance, Semantic Accuracy, Relationship Retention), and produces a validated knowledge graph plus a detailed validation report.

**Table 7: Algorithm 3: Two-Phase Knowledge Graph Validation (Stage 3).**

**Input:** Graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R})$ , rules  $\mathcal{V} = \{v_1, \dots, v_6\}$ , LLM  $\mathcal{L}$   
**Output:** Validated graph  $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{R}')$ , metrics  $M$

#### Phase 1: Semantic Validation (LLM gate)

1. **for each** entity  $e$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  **do**
  - 1.1  $isCorrect \leftarrow \mathcal{L}(\text{ValidateSemanticType}(e))$
  - 1.2 **if**  $\neg isCorrect$  **then** mark  $e$  for removal
2.  $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \setminus \{\text{marked entities}\}$
3.  $\mathcal{R} \leftarrow \{r \in \mathcal{R} : r.subject, r.object \in \mathcal{E}\}$  // cascade filtering

#### Phase 2: Schema Validation (six rules)

4. **initialise**  $violations \leftarrow []$
5. **for each** rule  $v_i$  in  $\mathcal{V}$  **do**
  - 5.1  $viol_i \leftarrow \text{ExecuteRule}(v_i, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{R})$
  - 5.2 **if**  $|viol_i| > 0$  **then**  $violations \leftarrow violations + viol_i$
6.  $\mathcal{E}' \leftarrow \{e \in \mathcal{E} : e.id \notin violations\}$
7.  $\mathcal{R}' \leftarrow \{r \in \mathcal{R} : r.subject, r.object \in \mathcal{E}'\}$

#### Quality metrics computation

8.  $M.schemaCompliance \leftarrow \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{\text{items passing } v_i}{\text{total items for } v_i} \times 100$
9.  $M.semanticAccuracy \leftarrow \frac{|\mathcal{E}|}{|\mathcal{E}_{original}|} \times 100$  // from Phase 1
10.  $M.relationshipRetention \leftarrow \frac{|\mathcal{R}'|}{|\mathcal{R}_{original}|} \times 100$
11. **return**  $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{E}', \mathcal{R}'), M$

## B Prompt Engineering Specifications

### B.1 Ontology-Guided Prompt

Ontology-guided extraction in Stage 2 uses a structured prompt template. The template is organised into the key components summarised below, covering the system role, ontology constraints, entity definitions, and relationship rules that guide the LLM during extraction. These components collectively ensure that all extracted outputs conform to ESGMKG and maintain structural consistency.

#### A. System context and extraction goal

You are an ESG Knowledge Graph Extractor.  
 Goal: Convert ESG regulatory text (e.g., SASB, TCFD, IFRS S2) into ESGMKG-compliant JSON.  
 Follow these rules: - Obey the ESGMKG ontology; - Use only information explicitly stated in the text; - Preserve page- and segment-level provenance for every entity and relationship; - Return JSON only, no natural-language explanations.

**B. ESGMKG connection map (Entity → Relationship → Entity)**

Use only the following patterns:

Industry → ReportUsing → ReportingFramework

ReportingFramework → Include → Category

Category → ConsistOf → Metric

CalculatedMetric → IsCalculatedBy → Model

Model → RequiresInputFrom → InputMetric

Do not invent new predicates or entities. Every entity must appear in at least one valid relationship (no orphans).

The next components define the ontology entities, structural rules, extraction steps, and segment text used by the LLM during extraction.

**C. Entity definitions (5 types with required properties)**

All entities share: id, type, label, source{doc\_id, page, start, end, quote}.

Industry: sector (optional), country (optional), standard\_reference (optional).

ReportingFramework: name, version (optional), year (optional), publisher (optional).

Category: section\_title, section\_id (optional), page\_range (optional).

Metric (DirectMetric / CalculatedMetric / InputMetric): measurement\_type ∈ {Quantitative, Qualitative}, metric\_type ∈ {DirectMetric, CalculatedMetric, InputMetric}, unit, code, description, disaggregations[] (optional).

Model: description, equation, input\_variables[[]].

**D. Relationship constraints (7 rules)**

(1) Each Industry uses exactly one ReportingFramework.  
(2) Each ReportingFramework includes one or more Categories.

(3) Each Category contains one or more Metrics; a Metric belongs to exactly one Category.

(4) Each CalculatedMetric has exactly one IsCalculatedBy link to a Model; DirectMetric and InputMetric must not have IsCalculatedBy links.

(5) Each Model has one or more InputMetrics linked by RequiresInputFrom.

(6) Quantitative metrics must specify a unit.

(7) No Category, Metric, or Model may be orphaned (must participate in at least one valid edge).

**F. Four-step extraction workflow**

**Step 1: Context and Category Detection** Identify the Industry and ReportingFramework context. Extract Categories from section headings. Create

edges: Industry→ReportUsing→ReportingFramework, ReportingFramework→Include→Category.

**Step 2: Metric Identification** Detect all metrics in the segment. Classify each as: - DirectMetric (descriptive, no formula); - CalculatedMetric (uses formula or "calculated from"); - InputMetric (component variable in formulas). Add Category→ConsistOf→Metric edges.

**Step 3: Model Identification and Creation** When formulas or calculations appear, create Model entities with equation and input\_variables. Link: CalculatedMetric→IsCalculatedBy→Model and Model→RequiresInputFrom→InputMetric.

**Step 4: Validation** Verify: (a) CalculatedMetrics count = IsCalculatedBy count; (b) Each Model has ≥1 RequiresInputFrom; (c) Quantitative metrics have units; (d) No orphan entities.

**I. Current segment content**

The Stage 1 segment text is appended at the end of the prompt between markers: \$\$\$SEGMENT\_START\$\$\$

(regulatory text from one segment)

\$\$\$SEGMENT\_END\$\$\$ Only information inside this block may be used to create entities and relationships for the output JSON.

These components form the full ontology-guided prompt used in Stage 2. They constrain the LLM to produce ESGMKG-compliant JSON without requiring additional procedural instructions or segment-wrapping directives.

**B.2 Baseline Prompt**

For comparison, the baseline prompt provides only minimal output format guidance without ontology constraints, entity definitions, or extraction procedures:

**Baseline Extraction Prompt**

Extract ESG metrics and related information from the document text below.

Return JSON with entities and relationships:

```
{
  "entities": [
    {
      "id": "...",
      "label": "...",
      "type": "...",
      "description": "...",
      "unit": "..."
    }
  ],
  "relationships": [
    {
      "subject": "...",
      "predicate": "...",
      "object": "..."
    }
  ]
}
```

Document: {document\_name}

Section: {section\_title}

Extract from this text:

{content}