

# Generate then Retrieve: Conversational Response Retrieval Using LLMs as Answer and Query Generators

Zahra Abbasiantaeb and Mohammad Aliannejadi

University of Amsterdam

Amsterdam

The Netherlands

## Abstract

Conversational information seeking (CIS) is a prominent area in information retrieval (IR) which focuses on developing interactive knowledge assistants. These systems must adeptly comprehend the user’s information requirements within the conversational context and retrieve the relevant information. To this aim, the existing approaches model the user’s information needs by generating a single query rewrite or a single representation of the query in the query space embedding. However, to answer complex questions, a single query rewrite or representation is often ineffective. To address this, a system needs to do reasoning over multiple passages. In this work, we propose using a *generate-then-retrieve* approach to improve the passage retrieval performance for complex user queries. In this approach, we utilize large language models (LLMs) to (i) generate an initial answer to the user’s information need by doing reasoning over the context of the conversation, and (ii) ground this answer to the collection. Based on the experiments, our proposed approach significantly improves the retrieval performance on TREC iKAT 23, TREC CAsT 20 and 22 datasets, under various setups. Also, we show that grounding the LLM’s answer requires more than one searchable query, where an average of 3 queries outperforms human rewrites.

## 1 Introduction

Conversational information seeking (CIS) is a well-established topic in information retrieval (IR) (Zamani et al., 2022), where a knowledge assistant interacts with the user to fulfill their information needs. While conversations can be complex (Radlinski and Craswell, 2017), involving various types of interactions such as revealment and clarifi-




Figure 1: An example conversation with a complex user request. The system in this case generates three distinct queries from the initial answer and searches for every query in the passage collection. Then it reads and reasons over the top passages to generate the final grounded answer.

cation, one of the main goals of the system is to provide accurate responses to users’ queries during the conversation. The TREC Retrieval Conference (TREC) Conversational Assistance Track (CAsT) 2019–2022 (Dalton et al., 2020) focuses on the development of conversational knowledge assistants, while the main focus of this track is on evaluating passage retrieval and dialogue context modeling. TREC Interactive Knowledge Assistance Track (iKAT) (Aliannejadi et al., 2024) evolves CAsT into emphasizing the development of personalized conversational knowledge assistants, where each dialogue is coupled with a knowledge base describing the user. This knowledge base contains various types of information, ranging from personal details to past experiences and exchanges with the system (Aliannejadi et al., 2024).

To ensure the groundedness and accuracy

of responses (Semnani et al., 2023), existing methods follow a **retrieve-then-generate (RG)** pipeline, breaking the task into several subtasks: dialogue context modeling, retrieval, and answer generation (Voskarides et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2021). The user’s information need is often represented either by a single rewritten query (Voskarides et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2020) or by a single representation in the query embedding space (Yu et al., 2021; Hai et al., 2023).

Representing complex information needs using only one query leads to several limitations, especially in cases where the information cannot be answered using a single passage and requires complex reasoning over multiple facts in a chain-of-thought scenario (Aliannejadi et al., 2024; Lyu et al., 2023). Take the user query of Figure 1 as an example. Clearly, it is unlikely to find a passage that has distance information about all these universities compared to the user’s address. Therefore, the system would need to gather relevant information from different sources (i.e., issue multiple queries) and reason over the gathered evidence to generate the final response. Existing RG methods often fail to answer such complex queries (Aliannejadi et al., 2024). This is because existing ranking methods rely solely on semantic similarity between a query and a passage, without high-level reasoning or control over the set of retrieved passages. For example, they do not ensure that the top results contain address information about all three universities the user is interested in.

To address these challenges, in this work, we propose to rely on the knowledge and reasoning capabilities of large language models (LLMs) to respond to complex user queries in a dialogue. Specifically, inspired by the relevant literature (Shuster et al., 2022b), we study several methods based on the **generate-then-retrieve (GR)** pipeline. We first prompt the LLM to generate an answer for a given dialogue, followed by various retrieval strategies to ground the generated answer in the passage collection. These strategies include: (i) using the generated answer as a query to rank passages (Gao et al., 2023); and (ii) a novel approach of breaking the answer into several searchable queries. We hy-

pothesize that leveraging an LLM’s knowledge and reasoning capacity leads to a more accurate response, enabling the model to generate more effective queries based on the generated answer. For example, in Figure 1, the LLM’s answer that compares the distance of the three universities helps it generate more effective queries, as shown in the figure.

This leads us to our first research question: **(RQ1)** *Can we leverage LLMs’ internal knowledge and reasoning capacity to enhance conversational passage retrieval in a GR pipeline?* To answer this question, we propose various GR retrieval pipelines based on GPT-4 and LLaMA. Regarding the GR-based methods, we address our next research question: **(RQ2)** *Can we leverage LLMs’ reasoning capabilities to generate related searchable queries to enhance retrieval?* We answer this question by comparing our proposed query generation method with two alternatives: (i) using the generated answer as a query and (ii) prompting the LLM to generate the query rewrite. We conduct extensive experiments on three conversational search datasets, where we find that GR pipelines significantly outperform their RG counterparts by a large margin, and generating multiple queries leads to more effective queries and retrieval. We find that more than a single query is required for retrieving the answer to complex user utterances. For example, we show that we need an average number of 3 queries on the conversational search datasets. In addition, we see that predicting the number of required queries for each user utterance is a crucial and challenging task. Using such a model, our proposed models can outperform the retrieval performance compared to using human-resolved utterance for retrieval (see Section 5).

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- We propose three GR-based conversational passage retrieval models, leveraging the LLM’s internal knowledge to (i) generate an answer and break it down into multiple queries and (ii) generate multiple search queries.
- We implement our method using commercial and open-source LLMs, demonstrating its effectiveness in both settings.
- We conduct extensive experiments, show-

casing the effectiveness of our proposed approach under various datasets.

## 2 Related Work

**Conversational information seeking.** Recently, CIS has gained significant popularity in both IR and natural language processing (NLP) communities (Anand et al., 2020). Similar to knowledge-intensive dialogues (Dinan et al., 2019; Feng et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022), a key challenge in CIS is to model the dialogue context to better understand the user information need and perform effective retrieval (Zamani et al., 2022). TREC CAsT 2019–2022 (Dalton et al., 2020) and iKAT 2023 (Aliannejadi et al., 2024) aim at addressing these challenges through a common evaluation framework where complex and knowledge-intensive dialogues were provided to the participants, as well as several passage collections. The goal was to retrieve relevant passages for each turn in a dialogue and generate a response synthesizing several passages.

**Modeling dialogue context.** Most existing methods tackle this problem by query rewriting where the goal is to address the ambiguity and dependence of a user utterance by resolving its dependencies and making it self-contained (Voskarides et al., 2019, 2020; Lin et al., 2021c). The rewritten query is supposed to be a self-contained and context-independent query that represents the user’s information needs per turn. CRDR (Qian and Dou, 2022) forms the rewritten query by modifying the query by disambiguation of the anaphora and ellipsis. The existing work trains GPT-2 (Yu et al., 2020; Vakulenko et al., 2021) and T5 (Dalton et al., 2020) models on CANARD (Elgohary et al., 2019) to generate the rewritten query. The CANARD dataset (Elgohary et al., 2019) is widely used for training such models, including the manually rewritten queries of QuAC (Choi et al., 2018), which is a conversational machine reading comprehension dataset that is collected manually by pairing a teacher and a student annotator. ConvGQR (Mo et al., 2023) model expands the query rewrite with potential answers. They train two separate models for the query rewrite and answer generation. CON-

QRR (Wu et al., 2022) trains the T5 model using reinforcement learning techniques to generate query rewrite based on the retrieval performance and achieves a better performance compared to the T5QR (Raffel et al., 2020) model. Ye et al. (2023) propose using LLMs as zero- and few-shot learners in two steps including query rewriting and rewrite editing to form the query rewrite. LLM4CS (Mao et al., 2023a) employs different prompting strategies and creates multiple query rewrites and answers. The embedding of query rewrites and answers are combined using various methods and the aggregated representation is used for retrieval. Although our proposed method is also based on generating queries, we leverage the intrinsic knowledge of LLMs to do reasoning and respond to the user utterance, and generate multiple searchable queries to retrieve this response from the collection.

Another line of research aims at learning to represent the dialogue context directly for passage retrieval (Yu et al., 2021; Hai et al., 2023), where a distillation loss learns to map the representation of the whole dialogue context to the one of the gold resolved query, hence improving the dense retrieval performance. The INSTRUCTOR (Jin et al., 2023) model trains the document encoder model by using the relevance score predicted by LLMs. LeCoRE (Mao et al., 2023b) is an extension of the SPLADE model (Formal et al., 2021) obtained by denoising the representation of the context. The denoising model works by distilling knowledge from query rewrite.

**Grounding LLM-generated responses.** Document retrieval is a common approach to ground LLM-generated responses and build grounded chatbots. BlenderBot 2–3 (Shuster et al., 2022b) utilizes the results of web search for this purpose, while SeeKer (Shuster et al., 2022a) employs a three-step approach in which it generates search queries, extracts useful knowledge from the top passages, and generates the final answer. Semnani et al. (2023) learns to avoid hallucination and improve the factuality of the generated responses by searching and grounding the responses on Wikipedia articles. The retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) (Lewis et al., 2020) model combines retrieval with response generation

to enhance the accuracy and relevance of the generated response. It uses the retrieved passages to guide the response generation model to ground its response to the collection. Other approaches such as GenRead (Yu et al., 2023) study the effectiveness of LLMs in generating multiple passages for a given question and use the generated passages to generate the final response. Differently, in this work, we focus on modeling the dialogue context through LLMs’ response and query generation and use that to enhance passage retrieval performance. Our goal is to leverage the LLM’s response as a means to model and expand the user utterance, enhancing retrieval performance. Our work can be classified as a generation-augmented retrieval (GAR) approach, leveraging the power of LLMs to model dialogue context and generate the answer and then using this answer in our retrieval pipeline to ground it on the collection. We propose using multiple queries rather than relying on one single query rewrite to improve the passage retrieval for complex user utterances.

### 3 Methodology

**Task definition.** Each conversation revolves around a topic  $t$  and starts with a user utterance. A conversation includes several turns, where a turn starts with a user utterance  $u_i$ , followed by a system response called  $r_i$ . A conversation, which comprises a set of turns, is represented as  $(u_1, r_1), \dots, (u_n, r_n)$ . Unlike TREC CAsT 19-22 datasets, the TREC iKAT dataset also contains the user’s persona. The user’s persona is a knowledge base, consisting of a set of statements shown as  $PTKB = \{s_1, \dots, s_l\}$ , where each statement  $s_i$  is a natural language sentence. The task of conversational assistants is defined as follows: (i) retrieving relevant passages to the current user utterance from the collection  $D = \{d_1, \dots, d_{|D|}\}$ , and (ii) generating the response  $r_i$  given the user utterance  $u_i$  and context of the conversation at this turn  $c_i = \{(u_1, r_1), \dots, (u_{i-1}, r_{i-1})\}$ , grounded on the retrieved passages. Our focus in this task is on passage retrieval.

**Retrieval pipeline.** Most existing methods follow a two-step pipeline for retrieval

which includes first-stage retrieval and re-ranking (Lin et al., 2021b). First-stage retrieval aims to extract as many relevant passages from the collection. In this step, the recall is more important. The goal of re-ranking is to improve the precision by bringing the most relevant passages to the top of the list of passages returned by retrieval. We follow the same retrieval pipeline in this work by using BM25 for first-stage retrieval and the Cross-encoder model for re-ranking.

**Proposed models.** Inspired by existing work (Gao et al., 2023), we propose a set of approaches that rely on the answer generated by the LLM. Our goal is to leverage the LLM’s internal knowledge and reasoning capability to improve passage retrieval, by generating multiple queries given the current user utterance  $u_i$  and the context of the conversation:

- **Generate Answer as Query (AQ):** The LLM is prompted to generate the initial answer  $r'_i$  to the user utterance given the context of the conversation and PTKB (if any). In Equation 1,  $AG$  function represents the LLM used for generating the initial answer. We treat the LLM’s answer  $r'_i$  as a single long query and pass it to both the first-stage retrieval and re-ranker models (Figure 2b). First-stage retrieval and re-ranking models are represented as  $Ret$  and  $ReRank$  functions respectively, in Equation 2. The sorted list of the passages returned by re-ranker for user utterance  $u_i$  is shown as  $D'_i$  which is a subset of the collection  $D$ .

$$r'_i = AG(u_i, c_i, PTKB) \quad (1)$$

$$D'_i = ReRank(Ret(D, r'_i), r'_i) \quad (2)$$

- **Multiple Query generation (MQ):** We prompt the LLM to directly generate a maximum of  $\phi$  queries to find the answer to the user’s utterance. The query generation function is represented as  $QG$  in Equation 3. The input to the LLM is user utterance, the context of the conversation, and PTKB (if any). Each generated query for turn  $i$ , denoted as  $q_k^i$  where  $k \leq \phi$ , is then passed to both the first-stage retrieval model and the re-ranker model (Figure 2d). The output of the




Figure 2: Architecture of the proposed models.

re-ranker for query  $k$  is demonstrated as  $D'_{k,i}$ . Subsequently, we interleave the results of all the queries to obtain the final ranking  $D'_i$ .

$$q_1^i, \dots, q_j^i = QG(u_i, c_i, \text{PTKB}, \phi) \quad (3)$$

$$j \leq \phi$$

$$D'_{k,i} = \text{ReRank}(\text{Ret}(D, q_k^i), q_k^i)$$

$$\text{for each } q_k^i, 1 \leq k \leq \phi \quad (4)$$

$$D'_{k,i} = \{d_1, \dots, d_n\}$$

$$D'_i = \text{Interleave}(D'_{1,i}, \dots, D'_{j,i})$$

- **Multiple Query generation from Answer (MQA)**: Here, we combine two other approaches: (i) prompting the LLM to generate an initial response  $r'_i$ , and (ii) prompting the LLM to generate up to  $\phi$  queries to refine its own generated answer  $r'_i$ . The  $QGA$  function in Equation 5, represents the LLM used for generating multiple queries given the initial answer. Similar to the MQ model, we then pass these generated queries  $q_1^i$  to the first-stage retrieval and re-ranking model and interleave the ranked list of all queries (Figure 2a).

$$q_1^i, \dots, q_j^i = QGA(r'_i, u_i, c_i, \text{PTKB}, \phi) \quad (5)$$

$$j \leq \phi$$

- **MQA re-ranked with Answer (MQA\_A)**: Interleaving the results of the generated

queries in MQA is sub-optimal, as some of the generated queries may be of low quality. To tackle this problem, we propose a variant to the MQA approach, where we re-rank the final ranking list for each query, based on the predicted relevance to the generated response  $r'_i$  (Figure 2c).

$$D'_i = \text{ReRank}((D'_{1,i}, \dots, D'_{j,i}), r'_i) \quad (6)$$

- **Oracle**: The Oracle model is defined as the model that picks the optimal value of  $\phi$  for each user utterance  $u_i$  based on the model's performance on the test set. Each user utterance needs a different number of queries depending on the complexity of the information need. The performance of the Oracle model is considered as the upper bound because in this setting, for each user utterance, different values for  $\phi$  parameter are tested and the best performance is chosen. Each of the MQ, MQA, and MQA\_A methods can have an Oracle version.

**Prompts:** The GPT-4 model is used as a zero-shot learner for MQA and MQ approaches. The prompts used for these approaches are shown in Tables 12 and 12, respectively. The LLaMA model is given a few-shot prompt for query generation in MQA and MQ approaches as is shown in Tables 13 and 14, respectively. As our preliminary experiments on using the zero-shot prompts for LLaMA model showed low performance, we progressed into using the few-shot prompts

Table 1: Passage retrieval results on TREC CAsT 2020 and 2022 datasets. The best results that are significantly (t-test  $p\_value \leq 0.05$ ) better are indicated by \* (Our comparison doesn’t include the LLM4CS model). The best results are shown in **bold** and the second best results are shown with underline. The best result outperforming all models is indicated by \*. The results for theLLM4CS model are reported from the original paper. In these experiments, we use the  $\phi = 5$ .

Method	CAsT 2020					CAsT 2022				
	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR
GPT4QR	<b>46.8*</b>	53.3	<u>19.8</u>	55.7	76.2	<u>34.8</u>	34.6	<u>7.6</u>	28.4	65.0
T5QR	38.7	43.9	16.5	45.6	65.1	30.2	27.8	6.4	23.2	56.4
ConvGQR	35.7	45.4	15.6	46.7	59.6	25.0	25.9	5.3	20.4	51.8
LLaMAQR	33.3	41.2	13.7	42.4	59.1	24.2	25.3	6.0	21.3	49.1
LLM4CS (Mao et al., 2023a)	<u>45.5</u>	-	-	48.9	61.5	-	-	-	-	-
HumanQR	50.5	58.0	21.8	61.4	79.0	42.3	40.6	10.5	35.0	73.0
GPT-4-AQ	45.2	52.5	17.8	49.5	71.5	31.3	37.0	7.2	26.8	58.8
GPT-4-MQA	44.8	<u>59.6</u>	19.5	<b>60.9</b>	<u>77.4</u>	33.2	<u>42.3</u>	7.0	<u>31.1</u>	<u>68.7</u>
GPT-4-MQA <sub>A</sub>	45.0	57.6	18.2	<b>54.5</b>	73.3	32.5	41.8	7.4	<u>31.1</u>	60.5
GPT-4-MQ	44.8	<b>60.5*</b>	<b>20.6*</b>	<b>62.5*</b>	<b>77.7*</b>	<b>35.0*</b>	<b>45.1*</b>	<b>8.0*</b>	<b>32.5*</b>	<b>71.8*</b>
LLaMA-AQ	37.2	43.9	15.2	40.4	61.0	26.1	32.3	6.8	24.1	51.7
LLaMA-MQA	14.2	33.8	7.8	33.8	34.9	13.3	27.9	3.8	20.1	39.1
LLaMA-MQA <sub>A</sub>	36.3	43.2	14.7	40.8	61.0	29.1	<b>33.6</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>27.1</b>	55.1
LLaMA-MQ	20.1	40.0	8.9	38.9	50.0	22.1	25.6	5.4	20.2	48.4
<b>Oracle</b>										
GPT-4-MQA	63.6	66.3	26.0	69.0	88.8	55.6	49.6	10.7	38.6	86.6
GPT-4-MQA <sub>A</sub>	66.0	65.3	25.3	63.5	91.7	56.0	49.0	10.7	37.4	89.4
GPT-4-MQ	60.0	66.1	26.6	71.0	86.8	53.7	50.2	10.9	39.6	84.5

for the LLaMA model. The examples of few-shots are from the pruned turns of the same dataset and output of the GPT-4 model. For answer generation in MQA we design a zero-shot prompt. The same answer generated in MQA approach is used for AQ approach. Also, the MQA and MQA<sub>A</sub> approaches use the same prompt for query generation.

## 4 Experimental Setup

We explain our (i) hyper-parameters, (ii) datasets, (iii) metrics, and (iv) baselines in Appendix A.

## 5 Results and Discussions

### Passage Ranking Results using GPT-4.

Our experiments indicate that our proposed GPT-4-based models outperform the baselines on all three datasets including TREC CAsT 20, 22 (Table 1), and TREC iKAT 23 (Table 2). In addition, our proposed GPT4QR baseline outperforms the existing baselines including T5QR, ConvGQR, and LlamaQR over all three datasets (addressing RQ1). The better performance of MQ approach compared to the GPT4QR indicates that a single rewritten query is not enough and we need more

than one query to retrieve relevant passages for complex user utterances. The MQ approach generally outperforms the AQ model. These findings indicate that using the LLM’s knowledge to generate searchable queries for response retrieval is more effective than directly using the response generated by the LLM as the query. The effectiveness of MQ model indicates the effectiveness of LLMs in generating searchable queries (addressing RQ2). Looking at the Tables 1 and 2, we see that our MQ method exhibits more improvement over GPT4QR model (the best query rewriting baseline) on the iKAT dataset compared to the CAsT datasets, indicating that our approach performs better on more complex datasets (i.e., iKAT), compared to less complex datasets (i.e., CAsT 20 and 22). However, the MQ model outperforms the MQA and MQA<sub>A</sub> methods over some metrics, the MQA and MQA<sub>A</sub> methods also outperform the baselines over some metrics. The MQA models outperform the baseline runs (i) over all metrics on iKAT 23, and (ii) over nDCG, R@10, and MRR metrics on CAsT 20 and 22. The MQA<sub>A</sub> model outperforms the baseline runs over nDCG and R@100 metrics. The ex-

Table 2: Passage retrieval results on TREC iKAT 2023 dataset. The best results that are significantly (t-test  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ ) better are indicated by \*. The best results are shown in **bold** and the second best results are shown with underline. In these experiments, we use the  $\phi = 5$ .

Method	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR
GPT4QR	21.9	18.5	<b>6.8*</b>	18.6	42.1
T5QR	14.1	16.6	4.4	13.4	30.2
ConvGQR	14.7	16.7	4.0	13.1	33.9
LlamaQR	12.0	15.8	3.0	12.8	28.2
HumanQR	30.7	35.4	10.7	30.3	57.9
GPT-4-AQ	15.0	24.2	5.2	18.2	36.5
GPT-4-MQA	<b>23.0*</b>	<u>29.9</u>	<b>6.8*</b>	<u>22.5</u>	<u>50.3</u>
GPT-4-MQA <sub>A</sub>	18.1	26.8	4.9	21.2	42.9
GPT-4-MQ	<u>22.6</u>	<b>31.1*</b>	<u>6.4</u>	<b>25.1*</b>	<b>52.8*</b>
LLaMA-AQ	13.0	14.8	4.6	16.8	33.7
LLaMA-MQA	12.8	19.7	3.3	14.1	30.5
LLaMA-MQA <sub>A</sub>	11.8	19.7	3.6	15.3	29.1
LLaMA-MQ	6.2	15.0	1.5	10.5	19.7
<b>Oracle</b>					
GPT-4-MQA	40.6	38.5	11.3	32.0	71.3
GPT-4-MQA <sub>A</sub>	34.2	33.5	9.3	30.8	65.1
GPT-4-MQ	37.7	36.8	9.8	30.4	69.6

ample shown in Table 3 represents how effectively the LLM models the context of the conversation, generates the answer to the user utterance, and generates the queries required to retrieve the answer.

### Passage Ranking Results using LLaMA.

The MQA<sub>A</sub> method using LLaMA achieves better performance compared to the baselines in nDCG, R@10, and R@100 metrics on the CAsT 22 dataset (Table 1). Note, that we do not consider the GPT4QR model as a baseline for our experiments with LLaMA model as it is not fair. The LLaMA model is used as a few-shot learner for generating the queries in the MQA approach while the ConvGQR and T5QR baselines are fine-tuned for query rewriting task. Considering the LlamaQR baseline which is used as a zero-shot learner, the MQA<sub>A</sub> method using LLaMA performs better than LlamaQR baseline over all three datasets and metrics. According to Table 2, MQA<sub>A</sub> and MQA methods perform better than baselines over nDCG, and AQ model performs better than baselines over R@10 and R@100 metrics.

**Impact of initial answer generated by LLM.** The experiments over all three datasets reveal that the initial answer generated by GPT-4 is more effective compared to LLaMA in AQ method. We repeat the MQA method

Table 3: Example of queries and answers generated in Oracle version of GPT-4-MQA approach from iKAT 23 dataset.

**Utterance:** How about their screen resolution? Are any of them better than what I have?

**Human resolved:** How about their screen resolution? Are any of the **Samsung Galaxy S22**, **Xiaomi 12 and 12 Pro**, and **OPPO Find X5 Pro** better than Samsung Galaxy Note 10 in terms of screen resolution?

$r'$ : To check if any of the phone’s screen resolution is better than your current one, I would need to know what phone and model you have. However, **The Samsung Galaxy S22 has a screen resolution of 2340 x 1080 pixels, Xiaomi 12 and 12 Pro have a resolution of 3200 x 1440 pixels, and OPPO Find X5 Pro boasts a resolution of 3216 x 1440 pixels.**

$q_1$ . What is the screen resolution of **Samsung Galaxy S22**?

$q_2$ . What is the screen resolution of **Xiaomi 12 and 12 Pro**?

$q_3$ . What is the screen resolution of **OPPO Find X5 Pro**?

$q_4$ . Are the screen resolutions of **Samsung Galaxy S22, Xiaomi 12 and 12 Pro, OPPO Find X5 Pro** high-definition?

$q_5$ . How does the screen resolution of **Samsung Galaxy S22, Xiaomi 12 and 12 Pro, OPPO Find X5 Pro** compare to each other?

Table 4: Retrieval performance of LLaMA model in MQA method using answer generated by GPT-4 compared to using answer generated by LLaMA. The results are comparable to LLaMA-MQA from the main results table.

Dataset	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR
iKAT 23	19.9	20.6	5.4	16.4	42.5
CAsT 22	16.2	29.9	4.5	20.2	39.1
CAsT 20	15.5	37.1	8.5	37.3	39.0

using LLaMA model and pass the answer generated by GPT-4 instead of the answer generated by LLaMA. The results are shown in Table 5. Comparing these results with LLaMA-MQA model from the corresponding table we observe that LLaMA model can generate better queries in MQA method given a better answer. This fact indicates the potential of improving the performance of LLaMA model by fine-tuning the LLaMA model for answer generation.

**Impact of number of generated queries ( $\phi$ ).** Although in MQA, MQ, and MQA methods, the LLM is prompted to generate required queries and no more than  $\phi$  queries, it cannot determine the optimal number of queries based on the complexity of the user utterance and is

Table 5: Average of the optimal value of  $\phi$  parameter for each user utterance in our datasets.

Model	Dataset	nDCG@3	R@10	R@100
MQA	iKAT 23	<b>2.965</b>	<b>2.936</b>	2.968
	CAsT 22	2.774	2.756	2.893
	CAsT 20	2.832	2.839	<b>3.146</b>
MQ	iKAT 23	<b>3.013</b>	<b>2.956</b>	<b>2.926</b>
	CAsT 22	2.852	2.768	2.895
	CAsT 20	2.815	2.753	2.888

biased to generate exactly  $\phi$  number of queries. We repeat our experiments by changing the value of  $\phi$  parameter between 1-5 and We report the retrieval performance in Appendix B. We use these results and select the best-performing value to report the Oracle models. The Oracle results in Tables 1 and 2, represent that given the optimal value of  $\phi$  for each user utterance, the performance of the proposed models will improve further and outperform the HumanQR. This finding represents the importance of predicting the value of  $\phi$  for each user utterance. We show the average optimal value of  $\phi$  for each user utterance in Table 5. Given a user utterance and performance of the model using different values of  $\phi$ , we select the values of  $\phi$  with the maximum performance as optimal. The results indicate that user utterances from these datasets need on average 3 queries. As can be seen in Table 5, the user utterances from iKAT need on average more queries compared to the CAsT datasets. This finding is expected as the iKAT dataset is supposed to be a more complex dataset compared to the other two.

### Turn-level and topic-level performance.

Figure 3 plots the performance of our proposed methods and the best baseline (i.e., GPT4QR) on nDCG@3 metric per depth of the conversation and different topics. As the conversation goes the context modeling gets more complicated. The performance of the MQA model is more robust to the conversation depth compared to the other models (Figure 3a). In addition, the MQA model shows a more effective performance on different topics (Figure 3b).




Figure 3: The nDCG@3 value of proposed methods using GPT-4 on iKAT 23 dataset.

## 6 Conclusion

We propose three different models based on the GR pipeline for enhancing the retrieval performance of complex user queries in CIS. We rely on the power of LLMs to (i) understand the user’s information need by doing reasoning over the context and persona of the user and (ii) generate an initial response. In MQA approach, we prompt LLM to generate multiple searchable queries to refine the initial answer. The MQA<sub>A</sub> model is similar to the MQA model with the difference that it combines the ranking list of the queries and re-ranks them instead of interleaving these lists. In MQ approach we directly prompt the LLM to generate the searchable queries required for finding the answer to the user’s query. Our experiments reveal that the MQ model using GPT-4 as LLM outperforms the other models and baselines significantly over TREC CAsT 20, 22, and TREC iKAT 23 datasets. Our ablation study shows that prompting the LLM to generate a maximum of  $\phi$  queries for all user queries is sub-optimal. Our proposed models can receive a significant improvement over human query rewrite if we can predict the optimal value of  $\phi$  for each user utterance. In this work, we focused on the passage retrieval performance of the proposed models. The efficiency of these models on response generation task, and predicting the efficient number of queries for each user utterance remain as future works.



## 7 Limitations

We present two Generate-then-Retrieve-based methods for improving the retrieval performance. Our proposed methods rely on the answer generated by LLM and try to ground the generated answer to the given collection in different ways. So, the retrieval is biased toward the answer generated by LLM, and any error or limitation in the answer generation would influence the retrieval and re-ranking. For example, if the LLM does not know about a specific topic, it cannot generate a correct and complete answer. The low-quality answer will result in generating low-quality and non-relevant queries which decreases the performance of retrieval. Our main focus in this work is on improving the performance of retrieval and we have not studied the quality of the answer generation using our proposed models for generating the final answer.

## 8 Ethical considerations

Stressing the need to study and measure biases in Language Models (LLMs) when generating data, we think it could cause unexpected ethical issues. Consequently, we need to study the potential biases that exist in the data and formalize their impact on the final output of the model. While in this study we propose to use the answers and queries generated by LLMs for retrieval models, we think these methods should be used carefully in real-world retrieval systems, and designers should consider these biases.

## References

- Mohammad Aliannejadi, Zahra Abbasiantaeb, Shubham Chatterjee, Jeffery Dalton, and Leif Azzopardi. 2024. Trec ikat 2023: The interactive knowledge assistance track overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01330*.
- Avishek Anand, Lawrence Cavedon, Hideo Joho, Mark Sanderson, and Benno Stein. 2020. Conversational search (Dagstuhl Seminar 19461). In *Dagstuhl Reports*, volume 9. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 520–534. Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wen-tau Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. Quac: Question answering in context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.07036*.
- Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2020. Trec cast 2019: The conversational assistance track overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.13624*.
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. In *ICLR (Poster)*. OpenReview.net.
- Ahmed Elgohary, Denis Peskov, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. 2019. Can you unpack that? learning to rewrite questions-in-context. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5918–5924, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Song Feng, Siva Sankalp Patel, Hui Wan, and Sachindra Joshi. 2021. Multidoc2dial: Modeling dialogues grounded in multiple documents. In *EMNLP (1)*, pages 6162–6176. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Thibault Formal, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2021. Splade: Sparse lexical and expansion model for first stage ranking. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2288–2292.
- Luyu Gao, Xueguang Ma, Jimmy Lin, and Jamie Callan. 2023. [Precise zero-shot dense retrieval without relevance labels](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1762–1777, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nam Le Hai, Thomas Gerald, Thibault Formal, Jian-Yun Nie, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Laure Soulier. 2023. Cosplade: Contextualizing SPLADE for conversational information retrieval. In *ECIR (1)*, volume 13980 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 537–552. Springer.
- Zhuoran Jin, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2023. InstructoR: Instructing unsupervised conversational dense retrieval with

- large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 6649–6675, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Yu Li, Baolin Peng, Yelong Shen, Yi Mao, Lars Liden, Zhou Yu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2022. Knowledge-grounded dialogue generation with a unified knowledge representation. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 206–218. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jimmy Lin, Xueguang Ma, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Ronak Pradeep, and Rodrigo Nogueira. 2021a. Pyserini: A Python toolkit for reproducible information retrieval research with sparse and dense representations. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR 2021)*, pages 2356–2362.
- Jimmy Lin, Rodrigo Frassetto Nogueira, and Andrew Yates. 2021b. *Pretrained Transformers for Text Ranking: BERT and Beyond*. Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Rodrigo Nogueira, Ming-Feng Tsai, Chuan-Ju Wang, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Conversational question reformulation via sequence-to-sequence architectures and pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01909*.
- Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Rodrigo Nogueira, Ming-Feng Tsai, Chuan-Ju Wang, and Jimmy Lin. 2021c. Multi-stage conversational passage retrieval: An approach to fusing term importance estimation and neural query rewriting. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 39(4):1–29.
- Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2023. Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning. *CoRR*, abs/2301.13379.
- Kelong Mao, Zhicheng Dou, Fengran Mo, Jiewen Hou, Haonan Chen, and Hongjin Qian. 2023a. Large language models know your contextual search intent: A prompting framework for conversational search. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1211–1225, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kelong Mao, Hongjin Qian, Fengran Mo, Zhicheng Dou, Bang Liu, Xiaohua Cheng, and Zhao Cao. 2023b. Learning denoised and interpretable session representation for conversational search. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023, WWW '23*, page 3193–3202, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Fengran Mo, Kelong Mao, Yutao Zhu, Yihong Wu, Kaiyu Huang, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2023. ConvGQR: Generative query reformulation for conversational search. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4998–5012, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongjin Qian and Zhicheng Dou. 2022. Explicit query rewriting for conversational dense retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4725–4737.
- Filip Radlinski and Nick Craswell. 2017. A theoretical framework for conversational search. In *CHIIR*, pages 117–126.
- Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. 2020. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67.
- Sina Semnani, Violet Yao, Heidi Zhang, and Monica Lam. 2023. WikiChat: Stopping the hallucination of large language model chatbots by few-shot grounding on Wikipedia. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2387–2413, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kurt Shuster, Mojtaba Komeili, Leonard Adolphs, Stephen Roller, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2022a. Language models that seek for knowledge: Modular search & generation for dialogue and prompt completion. In *EMNLP (Findings)*, pages 373–393. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kurt Shuster, Jing Xu, Mojtaba Komeili, Da Ju, Eric Michael Smith, Stephen Roller, Megan Ung, Moya Chen, Kushal Arora, Joshua Lane, Morteza Behrooz, William Ngan, Spencer Poff, Naman Goyal, Arthur Szlam, Y-Lan Boureau, Melanie Kambadur, and Jason Weston. 2022b. Blenderbot 3: a deployed conversational agent that continually learns to responsibly engage. *CoRR*, abs/2208.03188.
- Svitlana Vakulenko, Shayne Longpre, Zhucheng Tu, and Raviteja Anantha. 2021. Question rewriting for conversational question answering. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on web search and data mining*, pages 355–363.

- Nikos Voskarides, Dan Li, Andreas Panteli, and Pengjie Ren. 2019. Iips at trec 2019 conversational assistant track. In *TREC*.
- Nikos Voskarides, Dan Li, Pengjie Ren, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Maarten de Rijke. 2020. [Query resolution for conversational search with limited supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. ACM.
- Zeqiu Wu, Yi Luan, Hannah Rashkin, David Reitter, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Mari Ostendorf, and Gaurav Singh Tomar. 2022. CONQRR: Conversational query rewriting for retrieval with reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10000–10014, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fanghua Ye, Meng Fang, Shenghui Li, and Emine Yilmaz. 2023. Enhancing conversational search: Large language model-aided informative query rewriting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5985–6006, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shi Yu, Jiahua Liu, Jingqin Yang, Chenyan Xiong, Paul Bennett, Jianfeng Gao, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2020. Few-shot generative conversational query rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1933–1936.
- Shi Yu, Zhenghao Liu, Chenyan Xiong, Tao Feng, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2021. Few-shot conversational dense retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 829–838.
- Wenhao Yu, Dan Iter, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Mingxuan Ju, Soumya Sanyal, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Generate rather than retrieve: Large language models are strong context generators. In *ICLR*. OpenReview.net.
- Hamed Zamani, Johanne R Trippas, Jeff Dalton, and Filip Radlinski. 2022. Conversational information seeking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08808*.

Dataset	N. Conv	N. Turns	Conv Length
CAsT 20	25	216	8.6
CAsT 22	18	205	11.39
iKAT 23	25	133	13.04

Table 6: Statistics of the datasets.

## Appendix

### A Experimental Setup

**Hyper-parameters.** For the first-stage retrieval we employ the BM25 model from Pyserini (Lin et al., 2021a) using the default values for the parameters. For the re-ranker, we use the pre-trained Cross-Encoder model `ms-marco-MiniLM-L-6-v2` from the `sentence-transformers` library with a maximum length of 512. We use LLaMA-chat 2 (13B) with the following parameters: `top_k=10`, `top_p=0.9`, `temperature=0.75`. We conduct our experiments on a single A6000 GPU with 32 GB RAM. We use the GPT-4 model as a zero-shot learner using the default values of parameters for all approaches. In our experiments, we prompt the LLM to generate a maximum of 5 queries ( $\phi = 5$ ). This number is selected based on our preliminary experiments because we do not have a validation set to find the best number. However, we provide a detailed ablation study on the impact of  $\phi$  parameter in the test set. For Oracle models we change the value of  $\phi$  between 1-5 and repeat the experiments.

**Dataset.** We report the results on the TREC iKAT 23, TREC CAsT 20 and 22 datasets. The statistics of these datasets are shown in Table 6. The TREC iKAT 23 dataset is one of the few datasets that features complex dialogues where single-query rewriting is not effective. The average length of conversations in iKAT is 13.04 which makes the context modeling task more challenging.

**Metric.** We evaluate passage retrieval performance using the official metrics used in the literature, namely, `nDCG@3`, `nDCG`, `Recall@10`, `Recall@100`, and `MRR`. `nDCG@3` evaluates the scenarios where the top passages are intended to be presented to the user. We calculate these metrics using the `trec_eval` tool.

We do the statistical significance tests using paired t-tests at  $p < 0.05$  level and compare the best model with other models and baselines.

**Compared methods.** We compare our proposed models to five strong query rewriting (QR) baselines including (1) ConvGQR (Mo et al., 2023) a pre-trained model for expanding the query rewrite with the potential answer, (2) T5QR (Lin et al., 2020) a T5-based query rewriting model which is trained on CANARD dataset (3) LlamaQR, using LLaMA model as a zero-shot learner for query rewriting, (4) GPT4QR, using GPT-4 model as a zero-shot learner for query rewriting, and (5) HumanQR, using the resolved-utterance by human. We use the same retrieval and re-ranking pipeline for these baselines and our proposed methods. The prompt designed for LlamaQR and GPT4QR models is shown in Table 11. For the ConvGQR model we use the code released by authors in GitHub to fine-tune the model on the QReCC dataset (Anantha et al., 2021). We use the T5QR model (which is based on the T5-base model and is trained on the CANARD dataset) released by huggingface<sup>1</sup> in our experiments. The results of the LLM4CS model on CAsT 20 dataset are reported from the original paper and we did not run their baseline on our retrieval pipeline. For the iKAT 23 dataset, we append the persona of the user to the context of the conversation in the baseline models. We include the result of (6) LLM4CS (Mao et al., 2023a) model on CAsT 20 dataset based on the results reported in their paper.

### B Experiments on proposed models using different values of $\phi$

We report the performance of our proposed models including MQA, MQA<sub>A</sub>, and MQ using different values for  $\phi$  parameter in Tables 9, 8, and 7. In these experiments, we keep the  $\phi$  value consistent for all conversational turns (i.e., user utterance).

### C Prompts

The prompt used for MQA and AQ approach using GPT-4 is shown in Table 10. We use

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/castorini/t5-base-canard>

Table 7: Passage retrieval results of our proposed models on iKAT 23 using different values of  $\phi$  and GPT-4 model as LLM.

Approach	$\phi$	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR
MQA	1	25.1	26.3	6.6	21.6	47.0
	2	24.9	30.0	8.0	24.6	50.1
	3	24.8	31.7	7.2	24.9	51.8
	4	23.6	31.1	7.2	24.3	49.8
	5	23.0	29.9	6.8	22.5	50.3
MQA <sub>A</sub>	1	16.1	20.6	5.3	20.8	37.1
	2	18.6	24.9	6.2	23.3	43.4
	3	18.4	26.9	5.9	23.4	39.8
	4	17.3	27.4	5.5	22.8	36.2
	5	18.1	26.8	4.9	21.2	42.9
MQ	1	28.2	28.8	6.9	22.8	52.0
	2	25.3	29.4	6.7	22.7	52.7
	3	22.0	28.9	6.6	22.6	50.2
	4	24.2	30.1	6.8	23.3	53.0
	5	22.6	31.1	6.4	25.1	52.8

Table 8: Passage retrieval results of our proposed models on CAsT 22 using different values of  $\phi$  and GPT-4 model as LLM.

Approach	$\phi$	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR
MQA	1	39.2	37.1	8.2	29.8	68.5
	2	38.0	40.2	7.5	30.2	68.5
	3	36.1	42.1	7.9	31.3	69.2
	4	35.1	42.6	7.3	31.6	67.4
	5	33.2	42.3	7.0	31.1	68.7
MQA <sub>A</sub>	1	35.6	35.5	7.6	27.2	66.6
	2	32.3	39.5	7.4	29.1	61.5
	3	32.8	41.6	7.6	29.3	61.3
	4	32.7	43.4	7.5	29.7	62.6
	5	32.5	41.8	7.4	31.1	60.5
MQ	1	41.0	38.0	8.5	30.6	71.1
	2	40.4	42.3	8.2	32.3	75.0
	3	35.9	43.2	7.7	32.4	70.6
	4	34.9	43.7	7.8	32.4	67.2
	5	35.0	45.1	8.0	32.5	71.8

the same prompt for MQA<sub>A</sub> approach. The prompt used for zero-shot MQ using GPT-4 model is shown in Table 12. The term *ctx* in the prompts designed for GPT-4 includes all of the previous user utterances and system responses.

For QR model the prompt shown in Table 11 is designed. This prompt is used for both LLaMA and GPT-4 models. We pass all the previous user and system interactions as *ctx* in this prompt.

The two-shot prompt designed for LLaMAMQA approach is shown in Table 13. In this prompt, the answer generated by LLaMA itself is passed as the *response*. For the prompts of LLaMA model, all the previous user utterances with the last system response

Table 9: Passage retrieval results of our proposed models on CAsT 20 using different values of  $\phi$  and GPT-4 model as LLM.

Approach	$\phi$	nDCG@3	nDCG	R@10	R@100	MRR
MQA <sub>A</sub>	1	45.9	52.4	18.6	50.4	74.0
	2	44.4	54.9	17.7	51.3	71.4
	3	42.3	55.3	17.9	50.6	71.8
	4	42.8	56.3	18.0	50.6	67.6
	5	45.0	57.6	18.2	54.5	73.3
MQA	1	45.9	53.8	19.1	55.7	72.2
	2	47.6	58.0	20.0	58.4	76.8
	3	43.6	58.5	19.7	59.5	75.3
	4	42.0	58.2	19.3	60.0	72.4
	5	44.8	59.6	19.5	60.9	77.4
MQ	1	47.5	57.2	20.8	60.9	75.8
	2	47.0	59.9	21.1	63.5	77.4
	3	45.0	60.2	20.6	63.1	76.5
	4	43.3	59.1	19.3	62.7	76.8
	5	44.8	60.5	20.6	62.5	77.7

are passed as context to the model.

The one-shot prompt designed for LLaMAMQA approach is shown in Table 14.

Table 10: The prompt designed for MQA and AQ approaches using GPT-4 as a zero-shot learner.

### (1) Initial Answer Generation and (2) Query Generation in MQA approach.

(1) # Instruction:

*I will give you a conversation between a user and a system. Also, I will give you some background information about the user. You should answer the last question of the user. Please remember that your answer to the last question of the user shouldn't be more than 200 words.*

# Background knowledge: {*ptkb*}  
 # Context: {*ctx*}  
 # User question: {*user utterance*}  
 # Response:

(2) # Can you generate the unique queries that can be used for retrieving your previous answer to the user? (Please write each query in one line and don't generate more than  $\phi$  queries)

# Generated queries:

Table 11: The prompt designed for QR using GPT-4 and LLaMA models as a zero-shot learner.

---

**Query re-writing (QR).**

---

# Instruction:

*I will give you a conversation between a user and a system. Also, I will give you some background information about the user. You should rewrite the last question of the user into a self-contained query.*

# Background knowledge: {*ptkb*}

# Context: {*ctx*}

# Please rewrite the following user question: {*user utterance*}

# Re-written query:

---

Table 12: The prompt designed for MQ approach using GPT-4 as a zero-shot learner.

---

**Query Generation in MQ approach.**

---

# Instruction:

*I will give you a conversation between a user and a system and some background information about the user. Imagine you want to find the answer to the last user question by searching Google. You should generate the search queries that you need to search in Google. Please don't generate more than  $\phi$  queries and write each query in one line.*

# Background knowledge: {*ptkb*}

# Context: {*ctx*}

# User question: {*user utterance*}

# Generated queries:

---

Table 13: The prompt designed for two-shot MQA using LLaMA model.

---

**The two-shot prompt for query generation in MQA.**

---

# Instruction:

*Generate the unique queries to search them in a search engine to retrieving the last response of the system to the user. (Please write each query in one line and don't generate more than  $\phi$  queries)*

# Example 1

# Background knowledge: 1: My sister is following the 'West Worl', but I don't like it, 2: Johnny Depp made the Pirates of the Caribbean excellent, 3: My friend suggested to me the 'Now you see me' movie, ...

# Context:

user: Can you tell me what the Golden Globe Awards is?

user: What is it?

user: Is it different from the Oscars?

user: What is the difference between them?

user: No, I mean Academy Awards and Golden Globe Awards.

user: What else?

system: The Hollywood Foreign Press Association, a group of 93 journalists from around 55 countries, ....

# User question: Did any of my favorite actresses win any of them?

# System response: Yes, both Jennifer Aniston and Lisa Kudrow, who you enjoyed in the Friends series, have won Golden Globe Awards. Jennifer Aniston won the Golden Globe in 2003 for Best Actress in a Television Series – Musical or Comedy for Friends. Lisa Kudrow also won this category in 1998 for the same series. Aniston's performance in The Morning Show also earned her another nomination in 2020. On the other hand, neither of the actresses have won an Academy Award as of yet.

# Generated queries:

1. Has Jennifer Aniston ever won a Golden Globe or an Academy Award?

2. Has Lisa Kudrow ever won a Golden Globe or an Academy Award?

3. List of Golden Globe winners in Best Actress in a Television Series – Musical or Comedy category for 1998 and 2003.

4. Did Jennifer Aniston win any awards for 'The Morning Show'?

-----

# Example 2

# Background knowledge: 1: I am diagnosed with diabetes type 2, 2: My husband is a light drinker, 3: We have pasta twice a week! It is my favorite dish,....

# Context:

user: Can you tell me about different types of alcoholic drinks?

user: What is the difference between them?

user: No, the other category.

user: Ok. Can you compare base liquors and the third one?

user: Interesting, but I was mainly looking for ingredients and flavor! FYI, I don't drink myself.

user: How is it different from Liqueurs?

user: Why are their names so similar?

user: How about the percentage of alcohol?

system: Liquor is hard (the hardest) alcohol product made by distillation, often clocking ....

# User question: Which types are suitable for my husband?

# System response: Considering your husband is a light drinker, he might enjoy lower-alcohol content beverages such as wine, beer, or certain liqueurs. Specifically, since he enjoys seafood like salmon, white wine such as chardonnay, pinot grigio, or a light-bodied beer might be a good match. However, always remember to consume alcohol in moderation, and if there are any health concerns, consult with a physician.

# Generated queries:

1. Which alcoholic beverages are suitable for a light drinker who likes salmon?

2. What types of alcohol go well with seafood?

3. What types of alcohol are preferred for people who drink lightly?

4. What alcoholic drinks have lower alcohol content?

5. Recommendations for alcoholic beverages for light drinkers.

-----

# Example 3

# Background knowledge: {*ptkb*}

# Context: {*ctx*}

# User question: {*user utterance*}

# System response: {*response*}

# Generated queries:

---

Table 14: The prompt designed for one-shot MQ using LLaMA model.

---

**The one-shot prompt designed for MQ.**

---

# Instruction:

*Please generate self-contained questions that should be searched in a search engine to answer the user's LAST utterance. (Please write each query in one line and don't generate more than  $\phi$  queries)*

# Example 1

# Background knowledge: 1: My sister is following the 'West Worl', but I don't like it, 2: Johnny Depp made the Pirates of the Caribbean excellent, 3: My friend suggested to me the 'Now you see me' movie, it was fantastic, 4: I went on a biking trip last year, 5: I usually like to drink coffee in the morning, 6: I watched the proposal and enjoyed it. Ryan Reynolds is my favorite!, 7: The 'Friends' series was terrific, Jennifer Aniston and Lisa Kudrow were the best stars!

# Context:

user: Can you tell me what the Golden Globe Awards is?

user: What is it?

user: Is it different from the Oscars?

user: What is the difference between them?

user: No, I mean Academy Awards and Golden Globe Awards.

user: What else?

system: The Hollywood Foreign Press Association, a group of 93 journalists from around 55 countries, are the committee for the Globes. On the contrary, the voting body of the Academy Awards; the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences (AMPAS) consists of 6,000 voting members. The Golden Globes Award recognizes the excellence of artists in both the film and television industry in the United States as well as in other countries. However, Academy Awards only recognize the excellence of artists in their cinematic achievements, primarily in Hollywood or the American film industry. There are 25 categories for Golden Globes; 14 in motion pictures and 11 in television. At present, the Academy Awards has 24 categories. Usually, the Golden Globes ceremony is held in January of each year while the Academy Awards ceremony is held in February of each year.

# User question: Did any of my favorite actresses win any of them?

# Generated queries:

1. Has Jennifer Aniston ever won a Golden Globe or an Academy Award?
2. Has Lisa Kudrow ever won a Golden Globe or an Academy Award?
3. Did Jennifer Aniston win any awards for 'The Morning Show'?
4. List of Golden Globe winners in Best Actress in a Television Series – Musical or Comedy category for 1998 and 2003.

---

# Example 2

# Background knowledge: {*ptkb*}

# Context: {*ctx*}

# User question: {*user utterance*}

# Generated queries:

---