
DEXTER: A Benchmark for open-domain Complex Question Answering using LLMs

Venktesh V*, Deepali Prabhu*, Avishek Anand

v.viswanathan-1,d.prabhu,avishek.anand@tudelft.nl
Delft University of Technology
Delft, Netherlands

Abstract

Open-domain complex Question Answering (QA) is a difficult task with challenges in evidence retrieval and reasoning. The complexity of such questions could stem from questions being compositional, hybrid evidence, or ambiguity in questions. While retrieval performance for classical QA tasks is well explored, their capabilities for heterogeneous complex retrieval tasks, especially in an open-domain setting, and the impact on downstream QA performance are relatively unexplored. To address this, in this work, we propose a benchmark composing diverse complex QA tasks and provide a toolkit to evaluate state-of-the-art pre-trained dense and sparse retrieval models in an open-domain setting. We observe that late interaction models and surprisingly lexical models like BM25 perform well compared to other pre-trained dense retrieval models. In addition, since context-based reasoning is critical for solving complex QA tasks, we also evaluate the reasoning capabilities of LLMs and the impact of retrieval performance on their reasoning capabilities. Through experiments, we observe that much progress is to be made in retrieval for complex QA to improve downstream QA performance. Our software and related data can be accessed at <https://github.com/VenkteshV/DEXTER>.

1 Introduction

Addressing complex information needs expressed through complex questions is an active research area with many applications in critical areas such as finance and healthcare [42, 9]. The complexity usually stems from multiple aspects such as complexity due to compositional or ambiguous questions [18, 47, 36, 61], reasoning over heterogeneous evidence sources [67, 32] and complexity due to answer formats [6, 36]. A Question-Answering or QA system built to answer complex questions must have the capability to retrieve fine-grained information from multiple knowledge sources and perform reasoning over these gathered data to address the specific information needs. While several supervised and unsupervised approaches [21, 66, 37, 15, 26, 10] have been proposed for the *complex QA tasks*, a more recent paradigm of employing Large Language Models (LLMs) has emerged. Large Language Models are pre-trained on a large volume of data and are believed to encode world knowledge. They also exhibit abilities like In-Context Learning [55, 56, 2] performing tasks with few examples.

With recent advances made by Large Language Models in several QA tasks [39, 2, 49] they are being increasingly employed in a few-shot setting. This usually involves a closed book setting where the model is prompted to generate answers without access to external knowledge sources, by only relying on knowledge encoded in the model parameters. However, for complex QA tasks, a closed book setting is known to be challenging [58, 49] due to the need for multi-step reasoning, difficulty in question understanding and lack of required world knowledge. To circumvent this, Retrieval

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Dataset	Complexity	Domain	Train	Dev	Test	Corpus Size
Compositional						
MusiqueQA (2-hop only)	Question	multi-domain	14.3k	1.25k	1.2k	569,641
Compositional + Comparative						
WikiMultiHopQA	Question	multi-domain	167.5k	12.6k	12.6k	569,641
StrategyQA	Question	multi-domain	2k	221	490	36.6M
Disambiguation						
AmbigQA	Question, Answer	multi-domain	10k	2k	2k	24.3M
Table+Text						
OTT-QA	Evidence	multi-domain	41.4k	2.2k	2.1k	6.5M
Table+Text + Numerical						
TAT-QA	Question, Evidence	Financial	13.2k	1.6k	1.6k	7000
FinQA	Question, Evidence	Financial	6.2k	883	1147	24.8k

Table 1: Statistics of different datasets in DEXTER benchmark.

Augmented Generation (RAG) methods [31] have been proposed, which augment the LLM with knowledge retrieved from external sources like Wikipedia or domain-specific collections. However, these RAG pipelines usually employ an off-the-shelf retriever [35, 63, 51] to mitigate training cost and generative models without evaluating the possible performance gaps in each of these components. For instance, an off-the-shelf dense retriever model that is pre-trained for passage retrieval might be sub-optimal for retrieving hybrid evidence like structured data encoded in tables. Also, most pre-trained models are trained over a workload of simple questions, making them inadequate for compositional questions. Additionally, these systems have not been evaluated for *complex QA* tasks, as prior works lack a comprehensive analysis of the retrieval performance of diverse models and the impact on downstream QA performance.

In this work, we propose a heterogeneous benchmark DEXTER covering diverse aspects of complexity such as complexity in questions, evidence sources, and answers as shown in Table 1. Existing benchmarks either focus only on complex QA tasks concerning knowledge graphs[54] or are limited to evaluating only answer generation or retrieval components specific to classical QA tasks [53, 46]. Prior works in complexQA are also mostly focus only on limited aspects of complexity [8, 20, 54]. Additionally, individual benchmarks for complex QA assume access to gold standard evidence by evaluating the systems only in a reading comprehension setup [47, 18, 6, 67]. DEXTER casts all datasets to an **open-domain setup** to evaluate retrieval in a more realistic setting. An open-domain setup is much more challenging as the retrieval model has to contend with distractors, and this problem is further exacerbated when dealing with hybrid evidence formats such as table and text.

DEXTER comprises **7 diverse datasets** covering different aspects of complexity and a corresponding multi-domain, large-scale collection to enable open-domain retrieval. DEXTER offers a unified approach to benchmark retrieval and answer generation in an open-domain setting for complex QA tasks. Usually, owing to the cost of training and lack of data, in many cases, pre-trained retrievers are directly employed. Hence, we evaluate **8** different pre-trained retrievers from lexical, sparse, dense, and late-interaction categories for context retrieval. Then, using the best retriever, we evaluate the ability of LLMs to generate answers. We observe that there remains a large gap in retrieval for complex questions, providing scope for further research. Further, we observe that lexical methods like BM25 and late-interaction models like ColBERTv2 perform better than other dense retrieval models. Through extensive experiments, our goal is to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How do off-the-shelf dense retrievers perform on the task of retrieving relevant context for open-domain QA tasks with different aspects of complexity?

RQ2: How well do LLM-based reasoning approaches perform for answering questions from different aspects of complexity in a closed-book setting?

RQ3: How well does augmenting LLM-based reasoning models with retrieved context perform on complex QA tasks in an open-domain setting?




Figure 1: An Overview of DEXTER Benchmark and ToolKit

2 Related Work

Complex Question Answering (CQA) is the task of answering questions requiring diverse abilities such as the ability to deal with hybrid evidence sources, numerical reasoning, common sense abilities, domain knowledge, and multi-step reasoning [9]. DEXTER is an evaluation benchmark for complexQA tasks to evaluate retrieval and its impact on downstream QA performance.

2.1 Benchmarks

To the best of our knowledge, DEXTER is the first complexQA benchmark to evaluate pre-trained retrieval models in an *open-domain setting* and downstream LLM-powered answer generation for diverse complex QA tasks. Prior benchmarks either focus on open-domain QA evaluation for classical QA tasks [23, 53, 46] or only concern with a narrow definition of complexity, such as reasoning over knowledge graphs [54]. BEIR[46] is a heterogeneous benchmark that only focuses on information retrieval performance for classical QA tasks and not its downstream impact on QA performance. The benchmark also does not cover diverse aspects of complexity. While they contain three datasets for Question Answering, namely NQ[29], HotpotQA[61], and FiQA-2018[33], these datasets mostly contain corpus consisting of text passages and do not consider the complexity of retrieving hybrid evidence formats. Similarly, KILT[38] is also an evaluation framework for knowledge intensive tasks which focuses on covering various tasks and domains and is not specific to Question Answering. Additionally, the QA tasks in KILT are primarily based on Wikipedia and do not consider the complexity of open-domain retrieval from sources with hybrid evidence such as table and text data. In contrast to the above two benchmarks, MultiReQA[17] is an evaluation benchmark specifically for Question Answering, however, they are limited to simple sentence-level retrieval tasks given a question. Additionally, this work has a limited focus on information retrieval, covering only two neural (BERT[11], USE-QA[60]) and one term-based retriever (BM25[40]) and also only comprises *small corpora* sizes with a maximum of 100K sentences. In our work, we aim to curate an evaluation benchmark that focuses on open-domain complex Question Answering covering diverse aspects of complexity over large corpus collections.

2.2 Retrieval and Generative Components Evaluation for Complex Question Answering

Question Answering usually entails retrieval of contexts from a knowledge source, followed by extractive or generative components to generate the final answer [24]. Existing solutions for complex QA primarily employ supervised and unsupervised approaches [21, 66, 37, 15, 26, 10, 59]. More recently, with the advances in Large Language Models [2, 55, 56], a new paradigm of prompting LLMs to perform reasoning for addressing complex information needs has emerged. To steer the model’s reasoning process, augmenting the LLM with external context has recently garnered interest with advances in retrieval augmented generation [31]. However, many of the complex QA tasks do not have a realistic retrieval setup and tackle the task in a reading-comprehension setting

[47, 18, 67, 6, 62]. Hence, in our work, we primarily cast all the datasets to an open-domain setting, which makes retrieval more challenging due to the presence of distractors. We also observe that existing works on some complex QA tasks usually employ an off-the-shelf retriever [35, 63, 51] to directly prompt generative models [27, 39, 4] without evaluating the possible performance gaps in each of these components. Hence, existing works lack a comprehensive analysis of different retrieval methods across different complex QA tasks and their impact on downstream QA performance.

3 The DEXTER Benchmark and Toolkit

The DEXTER benchmark is designed to enable research in Complex Question Answering (CQA), encompassing different aspects of complexity. The toolkit accompanying the benchmark is designed in a modular manner to reduce the entry barrier for researchers while also enabling extension to new complex QA tasks and methods. Figure 1 depicts the core modules and features in the DEXTER toolkit for benchmarking retrieval and answer generation components. One of our main contributions is also evaluating the retrieval models for complex QA tasks in an **open-domain** setting. More details on the open-domain setting is provided in Section 3.1. DEXTER offers a unified benchmark to evaluate pre-trained retrieval models and answer generation models in a principled manner.

3.1 Datasets

The prior benchmarks, primarily focus on limited aspects of complexity such as reasoning over knowledge graphs or multi-hop QA [8, 30, 34]. However, DEXTER covers diverse dimensions of complexity such as (i) Complexity due to *Compositional and Comparative* reasoning (MusiqueQA [47], 2WikiMultiHopQA [18]), (ii) Complexity due to *implicit and common-sense reasoning* based questions (StrategyQA [16]) (iii) Complexity due to *ambiguity* in questions (AmbigQA [36]) and (iv) complexity due to reasoning over *different modalities / heterogeneous sources* such as table and text (TAT-QA [67], OTT-QA [32]) and (v) complexity due to *numerical reasoning* over heterogeneous sources (FinQA [6]).

MusiqueQA and 2WikiMultihopQA require multihop-reasoning for retrieval around different aspects of the question, followed by reasoning over the retrieved contexts. StrategyQA requires deciphering implicit aspects in the question for retrieval and commonsense reasoning around these aspects. AmbigQA contains ambiguous questions that can have multiple interpretations and hence multiple plausible answers. TAT-QA, FinQA, and OTT-QA require retrieval over heterogeneous evidence sources such as tables and text followed by compositional or numerical reasoning.

Hence, it is evident that the discussed aspects of complexity require retrieval from knowledge sources followed by reasoning over the contexts. However, we observe that the majority of the baselines to these datasets are designed in a reading comprehension setup [6, 4, 47, 67] which assumes access to gold contexts for a given question or relies on prompting generative models for knowledge [39, 27, 62] without comprehensively evaluating retrieval. However, in the real world, the QA pipelines for complex QA would have to contend with retrieval from large corpus collections with *distractors*. For a more realistic evaluation, we cast the retrieval task for these datasets to an open-domain setup.

Open Domain Setup: The compositional and comparative reasoning datasets 2WikimultihopQA (WQA) and MusiqueQA (MQA) have a reading comprehension setup where each question is paired with 10 to 20 paragraphs. To convert them to an open-domain setup, we combine the paragraphs from all questions. This results in 430,225 paragraphs for 2WikiMultihopQA and 139,416 for MusiqueQA. We combine these together to enable a realistic open-domain setting with distractors resulting in 569,641 paragraphs. For query relevance judgments also known as *qrels* which indicate relevant contexts for a question to evaluate retrieval, we use the contexts given for each question.

For strategyQA we use the Wikipedia dump with 36.6 million passages used to collect the dataset. For *qrels*, we use the title information of Wikipedia passages that annotators looked up when annotating supporting facts for each question and use this to extract corresponding passages from the Wikipedia dump. The matching passages are graded as 1 indicating their relevance to the query. The resulting *qrels* are used to evaluate the retrieval setup.

While AmbigQA was also constructed using Wikipedia, the original dataset does not come with annotated passages for each question. We use the Wikipedia dump used for annotation as a corpus

comprising 24.3M passages. For constructing qrels we use the semi-oracle information provided by authors of AmbigQA [36]. This information points to the Wikipedia articles clicked and viewed by annotators when annotating answers to a question. Due to multiple interpretations of the question, this list comprises multiple passages. We use those passages that were viewed by the annotators and contain valid answers to the question as positive and relevant passages to the questions in the qrels. The rest are considered as negative passages as they do not contain a valid answer, though may be lexically related to the question.

For FinQA, we use the financial transcripts used to generate the questions as the evidence collection. FinQA was originally intended to be a reading comprehension dataset paired with a table and a text passage for each question. We leverage this to form the qrels for retrieval evaluation. We use a similar process for TAT-QA. The original work of OTT-QA had already released an open-domain set up with a corpus collection of Wikipedia passages paired with corresponding Wikipedia tables. While the original work [32] does not perform an extensive evaluation of the retrieval step, DEXTER evaluates the ability of diverse models to retrieve from heterogeneous sources with different modalities of evidence. For all datasets with hybrid evidence, we serialize the table by separating **columns** using the "|" symbol and **rows** are separated by a newline to enable encoding by transformer-based models.

3.2 DEXTER Software Framework

The DEXTER software¹ is available as a python package (pip install dexter-cqa) to enable ease of use. Our setup doubles as a toolkit to benchmark retrieval models and LLM-based reasoning for complex QA tasks. We provide customizable data loaders for different data modalities (table+text), typed model classes, pre-processing scripts for corpus formation, and wrappers for customizable retrieval models and LLMs for inference as shown in Figure 1. We also provide an implementation of standard metrics for evaluating retrieval and answer generation. We adhere to SOLID principles of software development to enable the extension of the benchmark to new datasets, retrieval, and generative models. DEXTER implements a generic data loader that is customizable by class extension. Our environment is driven by configuration files where the user can specify the dataset, corpus, and model names to use for an experiment. The *Orchestrator* module invokes the corresponding classes to create instances and helps in running retrieval and answer generation in a sequential manner. All our data is stored in JSON format. We also support the caching of retrieval results in JSON format. This enables using retrieval outputs from non-open-source retrieval models, where the user can input the JSON of retrieval results as input to the answer generation model. Overall, DEXTER is a modular, unified toolkit enabling benchmarking of pre-trained retrieval models and answer generation through generative models for complex QA tasks.

3.3 Evaluation Metrics

We implement the Metrics module as shown in Figure 1.

Retrieval: While DEXTER provides several evaluation metrics for retrieval, we choose Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (nDCG@k) as the primary metric for our results. This is because nDCG is a rank-aware metric that is well-suited for binary and graded relevance judgments. Precision and recall metrics are rank-unaware and hence not well suited to comparison across diverse complex QA tasks. It also has nice theoretical advantages, as discussed in the work [52]. In our benchmark, we provide a wrapper over the Python interface of the TREC eval tool [50].

Answer generation: For evaluating the generative models used for answer generation in DEXTER, we employ several metrics based on the complex QA task. We use *Cover-EM* (*c-EM*) [39, 41] for MusiqueQA, 2WikiMultiHopQA, TAT-QA, OTT-QA and StrategyQA following the prior works. Cover-EM checks if the gold answer is a substring of the generated answer. Since LLMs may generate additional text such as explanation/reasoning in addition to the exact answer, this metric is more suited for complex QA tasks that comprise free-form answers of different types. For instance, for a question "What position was held by Warren Hastings?" while a ground truth answer could be "Governor-general", a generated answer could be "Governor-general of Bengal". For FinQA, we follow the work POT [5] and implement a metric *EM-tol* which performs a match between predicted and ground truth answers by using *math.isclose* with a relative tolerance of 0.02. This is a relaxation of strict Exact Match for numerical answers, as LLMs cannot generate high-precision floats and large numbers, which is a characteristic of FinQA.

¹<https://github.com/VenkteshV/DEXTER>

4 Experimental Setup

We use DEXTER to benchmark diverse state-of-the-art retrieval approaches for context retrieval in an open-domain setup and state-of-the-art generative LLMs for answer generation. Our experiments are carried out on a server with two GeForce RTX 3090 GPUs with a combined GPU memory of 48 GB.

4.1 Retrievers

We focus primarily on transformer based architectures and leverage publicly available checkpoints as shown in Table 5 in Appendix A.1. We evaluate retrieval models from several categories. However, DEXTER is model agnostic, and new models can be easily added because of the modular framework. For all datasets except FinQA we evaluate on dev set due to lack of publicly available test sets with gold labels. For FinQA we evaluate on test set.

Lexical retrieval: BM25 [40] computes token-matching between sparse representations using TF-IDF weights. We employ Elasticsearch’s BM25 implementation due to its enhanced query speed and maintainability over other implementations[12].

Sparse retrieval: For sparse retrieval we employ SPLADE [14, 13] which is a neural model employing query and document sparse expansions.

Dense retrieval: DPR[24] trains a dual encoder model with large datasets to maximize similarity between related queries and documents. We found the open source model trained on multiple datasets *facebook-dpr-question-encoder-multiset-base* to work better than the model trained on individual datasets like the bi-encoder trained on Natural Questions. We also include ANCE[57] in our evaluation which is a bi-encoder model that samples hard negatives through an Approximate Nearest Neighbour search over an index of the corpus which is also updated yielding better negatives. We employ the checkpoint *msmarco-roberta-base-ance-firstp* trained on MS-MARCO [1]. Tas-b [19] is a bi-encoder model trained using supervision from a cross-encoder and ColBERT.

Late-Interaction Models: We implement the late-interaction model ColBERTv2 [25, 43] in DEXTER. It is a multi-vector late-interaction model that employs a cross-attention-based MaxSim operation to capture fine-grained interactions between query and document token representations.

Method	WQA	MQA	AmbigQA	StrategyQA	Tat-QA	FinQA	OTT-QA
Lexical							
BM25 [40]	0.327	0.191	0.316	0.101	0.432	0.155	0.149
Sparse							
SPLADEV2 [13]	0.251	0.155	0.268	0.087	0.355	0.118	0.107
Dense							
DPR [24]	0.126	0.109	0.135	0.042	0.212	0.052	0.058
ANCE [57]	0.212	0.140	0.272	0.091	0.287	0.086	0.062
tas-b [19]	0.277	0.176	0.275	0.126	0.349	0.099	0.096
MPNet [45]	0.222	0.163	0.193	0.127	0.323	0.103	0.129
Contriever [22]	0.216	0.155	0.149	0.053	0.164	0.059	0.062
COIBERTV2 [43]	0.294	0.199	0.297	0.127	0.433	0.155	0.196

Table 2: Retrieval results on DEXTER, nDCG@10 across datasets.

4.2 Generative Models

We support various open generative models such as LLama2, Mistral, and FLANT5-XL. We also support OpenAI models. In our experiments, we primarily employ gpt-3.5-turbo among the OpenAI models. For our main experiments, during LLM inference, we set the maximum number of output tokens to 512, and temperature to 0.3 to mitigate randomness, with frequency and presence penalty set to 0.8 and 0.6 to avoid repetition. The prompts employed can be found in Appendix D.

5 Results

The retrieval results across complex QA datasets are shown in Table 2. We also report Recall@100 in Appendix E, Table 7. The answer generation results are shown in Table 8.

5.1 Comparison of Retrieval Models on Diverse Complex QA Tasks

To Answer **RQ1**, we evaluate lexical, late-interaction, and diverse dense-retrieval models on the curated datasets in an open-domain setup. From Table 2, we observe that the lexical model BM25 is a strong baseline across all complex QA tasks, including reasoning over hybrid sources. We observe that DPR has the lowest performance, indicating that while this model is suited for simpler open-domain QA tasks, it falls short on complex QA tasks. We observe that though DPR was trained on Natural Questions it falls short on AmbigQA which is a derivative of natural questions. We posit that this is because the bi-encoder model was not trained to handle ambiguity, indicating that complex QA requires further care compared to traditional questions. They fall short on tasks that require multistep reasoning during retrieval or when retrieving hybrid evidence like tables and text from multiple sources. Surprisingly, we also observe that models like *contriever* that are pre-trained for retrieval underperform compared to lexical models like BM25 and other dense retrieval models like tas-b and MPNet. We also observe that neural sparse models like SPLADE are competitive or even outperform dense retrieval models and prove to be strong baselines following BM25.

Late-Interaction model ColBERT (v2) [43] outperforms other methods on 5/7 datasets. We posit that cross-attention-based operation on tokenwise representations helps capture intricate relationships between query and context and also between different modalities of evidence such as table and text. This aids in higher retrieval performance on datasets like StrategyQA that require implicit reasoning and also on all table and text-based QA datasets compared to other dense retrieval models. We also find similar observations in individual works like [65] which employs cross-attention fusion between table and text evidence and [59] which employs cross-attention for multi-hop reasoning.

Method	MQA c-EM	WQA c-EM	AmbigQA $F1_{Ans}$	StrategyQA c-EM	Tat-QA c-EM	FinQA EM-Tol	OTT-QA c-EM
Closed-book QA							
FEW-SHOT [2]	11.66	28.41	14.28	62.88	-	-	-
FEW-SHOT-COT [56]	20.85	34.08	14.55	66.38	-	-	-
ZERO-SHOT-COT [28]	12.22	19.25	13.00	25.33	-	-	-
SELF-ASK [39]	23.64	32.58	-	68.99	-	-	-
Open-domain QA							
RAG-Oracle							
FEW-SHOT	41.53	58.17	32.24	72.93	50.75	42.55	40.53
FEW-SHOT-COT							
- gpt-3.5-turbo	44.28	65.55	35.57	73.36	54.05	52.22	46.23
- Mistral-7b	22.54	25.00	09.93	62.55	42.99	12.55	18.39
ZERO-SHOT-COT	33.87	60.75	27.09	35.37	34.25	47.51	42.21
RAG							
FEW-SHOT	20.93	38.58	20.08	62.01	24.04	16.83	8.72
FEW-SHOT-COT	25.80	47.33	27.37	63.32	25.78	17.44	10.61
ZERO-SHOT-COT	20.93	32.58	12.60	51.09	20.44	16.48	10.07
supervised baseline	37.60	50.59	42.30	65.2	55.2	58.86	33.20

Table 3: QA Performance on DEXTER. The model used is gpt-3.5-turbo, unless otherwise specified.

Insight 1: *Pre-trained dense retrieval models fall short on retrieval performance for compositional questions and when retrieving from hybrid knowledge sources. In contrast, lexical models serve as strong baselines and late-interaction models demonstrate significant potential.*

5.2 LLM Reasoning Performance on Complex QA Tasks in Closed Book Setting

To answer **RQ2**, we evaluate the performance of Large Language Models on diverse complex QA tasks in a closed-book setting where the models are expected to answer questions without access to the context. Since TAT-QA, OTT-QA, and FinQA have questions that are tightly coupled to context, they are incomprehensible and unanswerable without context and hence cannot be evaluated

in a closed-book setting. We evaluate various state-of-the-art prompting strategies such as chain-of-thought [56] and self-ask [39] which have shown improvements for complex reasoning tasks. We observe that though models like gpt-3.5-turbo are believed to encode world knowledge, they overall underperform on compositional reasoning tasks when not provided with relevant context. While chain-of-thought and self-ask improve compositional and comparative reasoning performance over few-shot prompting by eliciting reasoning chains from LLMs, they are still limited without access to context. However, we observe that in StrategyQA which requires commonsense reasoning and reasoning over implicit aspects, gpt-3.5-turbo achieves impressive gains. This can be ascribed to the factual knowledge encoded in the model parameters due to pre-training on Wikipedia passages. These passages serve as a common source for annotators to construct supporting facts answering the questions. We also observe that emergent capabilities like chain-of-thought are more pronounced in large-scale models like gpt-3.5-turbo leading to significant performance improvements than smaller models like Mistral-7b (In Table 8) or LLama2-7b (In Appendix F).

Insight 2: *The retrieval plays an important role in complex QA tasks. LLMs do not encode sufficient parametric knowledge to solve complex QA tasks in a closed-book setting.*

5.3 LLM Reasoning Performance in Retrieval Augmented Open-Domain Setting

To answer **RQ3**, we carry out experiments in two different setups. To obtain an upper bound on LLM reasoning performance, we carry out an answer generation task in an Oracle setup. In an Oracle setup, the LLMs are fed with gold contexts as input. We observe that in compositional and comparative reasoning tasks, the performance of the model increases significantly compared to the closed-book setting and even supervised state-of-the-art methods. We observe that for commonsense reasoning, providing relevant context to LLM in ZERO-SHOT-COT prompting setting further improves results compared to the closed-book setting. This reinforces the need for augmenting relevant context for addressing complex information needs, even for LLMs that are believed to encode world knowledge in model parameters.

We observe that for reasoning hybrid contexts such as table and text data, Large Language Models still fall short compared to state-of-the-art supervised approaches even when provided with gold contexts in the Oracle setting. While some existing results have shown the capabilities of LLMs to be tabular reasoners [3], our results highlight the gaps and need for further enhancements to support hybrid data modalities in large generative models.

Insight 3: *Retrieving relevant context for complex QA tasks has significant performance gaps. Large Language Models have significant performance gaps when reasoning over hybrid evidence sources and cannot sufficiently model ambiguity in questions even in the presence of gold contexts.*




Figure 2: Effect of # of retrieved docs. using ColBERTv2 on QA perf. (few-shot-cot,gpt-3.5-turbo)

5.4 Impact of Number of Retrieved Contexts on Answer Generation performance

To analyze the effect of the number of retrieved contexts on downstream QA performance, we perform experiments using top-1, top-3, top-5, and top-10 retrieved contexts (Figure 2). We employ

ColBERTv2 as the retrieval model and gpt-3.5-turbo as the generative model. The plot shows the perils of choosing an insufficient number of documents. For instance, on WQA with top-1 context, the performance drops by 17.36% compared to reasoning with top-10 contexts, and on OTT-QA performance drops from 10.61 to 5.68 (by about 83%). Usually, retrieving more contexts increases the chance of retrieving distractors, which might impact performance. However, since complex QA tasks require multi-step reasoning over multiple contexts, we posit that retrieving more contexts helps the LLM to reason around different aspects of the question with respect to diverse contexts. Additionally, it has been observed that distractors in retrieved contexts also aid the LLM in contrastive reasoning by contrasting information from relevant and distractor contexts [64]. We also observe that retrieving excessive contexts also deteriorates performance, as observed on TAT-QA where performance drops by 5.81% for top-10 contexts. We observe that this is primarily because TAT-QA and FinQA requires extracting precise numerical information from financial documents, and distractors would result in incorrect reasoning.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we presented DEXTER, a benchmark for complex QA with a coverage of diverse aspects of complexity and data in easy-to-use formats with a modular toolkit to evaluate retrieval and generative models over hybrid evidence sources in an *open-domain* setting. We observe that lexical models like BM25 and sparse retrievers serve as strong baselines. However, overall we observe that retrieval has immense scope for improvement in the presence of ambiguous or compositional questions and when retrieving hybrid evidence such as table and text. We also observe that while Large Language models are believed to encode world knowledge, they grossly underperform on complex QA tasks in a closed-book setting. Large Language Models also lack at modeling ambiguity and demonstrate gaps in parsing information from hybrid evidence formats such as table and text, even when provided with gold evidence. We hope DEXTER will help further research in complex Question Answering to address these gaps.

References

- [1] Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Alina Stoica, Saurabh Tiwary, and Tong Wang. Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset, 2018.
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [3] Wenhui Chen. Large language models are few(1)-shot table reasoners. In Andreas Vlachos and Isabelle Augenstein, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2023*, pages 1120–1130, Dubrovnik, Croatia, May 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [4] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks, 2022.
- [5] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [6] Zhiyu Chen, Wenhui Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan Routledge, and William Yang Wang. FinQA: A dataset of numerical reasoning over financial data. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia, and Scott Wen-tau Yih, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3697–3711, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [7] Zhiyu Chen, Wenhua Chen, Charese Smiley, Sameena Shah, Iana Borova, Dylan Langdon, Reema Moussa, Matt Beane, Ting-Hao Huang, Bryan Routledge, and William Yang Wang. Finqa: A dataset of numerical reasoning over financial data, 2022.
- [8] Philipp Christmann, Rishiraj Saha Roy, and Gerhard Weikum. Compmix: A benchmark for heterogeneous question answering, 2023.
- [9] Xavier Daull, Patrice Bellot, Emmanuel Bruno, Vincent Martin, and Elisabeth Murisasco. Complex qa and language models hybrid architectures, survey, 2023.
- [10] Zhenyun Deng, Yonghua Zhu, Yang Chen, Michael Witbrock, and Patricia Riddle. Interpretable amr-based question decomposition for multi-hop question answering, 2022.
- [11] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Thamar Solorio, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [12] Anton Fogelberg and Jonas Nygren. Search engine evaluation, 2023.
- [13] Thibault Formal, Carlos Lassance, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. Splade v2: Sparse lexical and expansion model for information retrieval, 2021.
- [14] Thibault Formal, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 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, SIGIR '21*, page 2288–2292, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [15] Ruiliu Fu, Han Wang, Xuejun Zhang, Jun Zhou, and Yonghong Yan. Decomposing complex questions makes multi-hop QA easier and more interpretable. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 169–180, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, November 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [16] Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies, 2021.
- [17] Mandy Guo, Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Qinlan Shen, and Noah Constant. MultiReQA: A cross-domain evaluation for Retrieval question answering models. In Eyal Ben-David, Shay Cohen, Ryan McDonald, Barbara Plank, Roi Reichart, Guy Rotman, and Yftah Ziser, editors, *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Domain Adaptation for NLP*, pages 94–104, Kyiv, Ukraine, April 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [18] Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. Constructing a multi-hop QA dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6609–6625, Barcelona, Spain (Online), December 2020. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- [19] Sebastian Hofstätter, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Allan Hanbury. Efficiently teaching an effective dense retriever with balanced topic aware sampling. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '21*, page 113–122, New York, NY, USA, 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [20] Pranab Islam, Anand Kannappan, Douwe Kiela, Rebecca Qian, Nino Scherrer, and Bertie Vidgen. Financebench: A new benchmark for financial question answering, 2023.
- [21] Mohit Iyyer, Wen-tau Yih, and Ming-Wei Chang. Search-based neural structured learning for sequential question answering. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1821–1831, Vancouver, Canada, July 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [22] Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning, 2022.
- [23] Ehsan Kamalloo, Nouha Dziri, Charles Clarke, and Davood Rafiei. Evaluating open-domain question answering in the era of large language models. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for*

- Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5591–5606, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [24] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [25] Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert, 2020.
- [26] Tushar Khot, Daniel Khashabi, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Text modular networks: Learning to decompose tasks in the language of existing models, 2021.
- [27] Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks, 2023.
- [28] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners, 2023.
- [29] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466, 2019.
- [30] Yunshi Lan, Gaole He, Jinhao Jiang, Jing Jiang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on complex knowledge base question answering: Methods, challenges and solutions, 2021.
- [31] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks, 2021.
- [32] Kaixin Ma, Hao Cheng, Xiaodong Liu, Eric Nyberg, and Jianfeng Gao. Open-domain question answering via chain of reasoning over heterogeneous knowledge. In Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 5360–5374, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [33] Macedo Maia, Siegfried Handschuh, André Freitas, Brian Davis, Ross McDermott, Manel Zarrouk, and Alexandra Balahur. Www’18 open challenge: Financial opinion mining and question answering. In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018, WWW ’18*, page 1941–1942, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 2018. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- [34] Vaibhav Mavi, Anubhav Jangra, and Adam Jatowt. A survey on multi-hop question answering and generation, 2022.
- [35] Dehai Min, Nan Hu, Rihui Jin, Nuo Lin, Jiaoyan Chen, Yongrui Chen, Yu Li, Guilin Qi, Yun Li, Nijun Li, and Qianren Wang. Exploring the impact of table-to-text methods on augmenting llm-based question answering with domain hybrid data, 2024.
- [36] Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions. In Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu, editors, *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 5783–5797, Online, November 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [37] Sewon Min, Victor Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Multi-hop reading comprehension through question decomposition and rescoring. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6097–6109, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [38] Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vladimir Karpukhin, Jean Maillard, Vassilis Plachouras, Tim Rocktäschel, and Sebastian Riedel. KILT: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks. In Kristina Toutanova, Anna Rumshisky, Luke Zettlemoyer, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Iz Beltagy,

- Steven Bethard, Ryan Cotterell, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Yichao Zhou, editors, *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2523–2544, Online, June 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [39] Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models, 2023.
- [40] Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389, 2009.
- [41] Corby Rosset, Chenyan Xiong, Minh Phan, Xia Song, Paul Bennett, and Saurabh Tiwary. Knowledge-aware language model pretraining, 2021.
- [42] Rishiraj Saha Roy and Avishek Anand. Question answering for the curated web: Tasks and methods in qa over knowledge bases and text collections, 2022.
- [43] Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. ColBERTv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction. In Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and Ivan Vladimir Meza Ruiz, editors, *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3715–3734, Seattle, United States, July 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [44] Priyanka Sen, Alham Fikri Aji, and Amir Saffari. Mintaka: A complex, natural, and multilingual dataset for end-to-end question answering. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Chu-Ren Huang, Hansaem Kim, James Pustejovsky, Leo Wanner, Key-Sun Choi, Pum-Mo Ryu, Hsin-Hsi Chen, Lucia Donatelli, Heng Ji, Sadao Kurohashi, Patrizia Paggio, Nianwen Xue, Seokhwan Kim, Younggyun Hahm, Zhong He, Tony Kyungil Lee, Enrico Santus, Francis Bond, and Seung-Hoon Na, editors, *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1604–1619, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea, October 2022. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- [45] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. MpNet: masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS '20*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2020. Curran Associates Inc.
- [46] Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. Beir: A heterogeneous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. In J. Vanschoren and S. Yeung, editors, *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, volume 1. Curran, 2021.
- [47] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. MuSiQue: Multihop questions via single-hop question composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:539–554, 2022.
- [48] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. MuSiQue: Multihop questions via single-hop question composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:539–554, 2022.
- [49] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive multi-step questions. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10014–10037, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [50] Christophe Van Gysel and Maarten de Rijke. Pytrec_eval: An extremely fast python interface to trec_eval. In *SIGIR*. ACM, 2018.
- [51] Jinyuan Wang, Junlong Li, and Hai Zhao. Self-prompted chain-of-thought on large language models for open-domain multi-hop reasoning. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2717–2731, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [52] Yining Wang, Liwei Wang, Yuanzhi Li, Di He, Tie-Yan Liu, and Wei Chen. A theoretical analysis of ndcg type ranking measures, 2013.
- [53] Zhen Wang. Modern question answering datasets and benchmarks: A survey, 2022.

- [54] Zihao Wang, Hang Yin, and Yangqiu Song. Benchmarking the combinatorial generalizability of complex query answering on knowledge graphs, 2021.
- [55] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. Emergent abilities of large language models, 2022.
- [56] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, 2023.
- [57] Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval, 2020.
- [58] Wenhan Xiong, Xiang Lorraine Li, Srini Iyer, Jingfei Du, Patrick Lewis, William Yang Wang, Yashar Mehdad, Wen tau Yih, Sebastian Riedel, Douwe Kiela, and Barlas Oğuz. Answering complex open-domain questions with multi-hop dense retrieval, 2021.
- [59] Wenhan Xiong, Xiang Lorraine Li, Srini Iyer, Jingfei Du, Patrick Lewis, William Yang Wang, Yashar Mehdad, Wen tau Yih, Sebastian Riedel, Douwe Kiela, and Barlas Oğuz. Answering complex open-domain questions with multi-hop dense retrieval, 2021.
- [60] Yinfei Yang, Daniel Cer, Amin Ahmad, Mandy Guo, Jax Law, Noah Constant, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Steve Yuan, Chris Tar, Yun-hsuan Sung, Brian Strope, and Ray Kurzweil. Multilingual universal sentence encoder for semantic retrieval. In Asli Celikyilmaz and Tsung-Hsien Wen, editors, *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 87–94, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [61] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In Ellen Riloff, David Chiang, Julia Hockenmaier, and Jun’ichi Tsujii, editors, *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380, Brussels, Belgium, October–November 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [62] Xi Ye and Greg Durrett. The unreliability of explanations in few-shot prompting for textual reasoning, 2022.
- [63] Bowen Yu, Cheng Fu, Haiyang Yu, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. Unified language representation for question answering over text, tables, and images. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 4756–4765, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [64] Zheng Zhao, Emilio Monti, Jens Lehmann, and Haytham Assem. Enhancing contextual understanding in large language models through contrastive decoding, 2024.
- [65] Wanjun Zhong, Junjie Huang, Qian Liu, Ming Zhou, Jiahai Wang, Jian Yin, and Nan Duan. Reasoning over hybrid chain for table-and-text open domain qa, 2022.
- [66] Ben Zhou, Kyle Richardson, Xiaodong Yu, and Dan Roth. Learning to decompose: Hypothetical question decomposition based on comparable texts. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2223–2235, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [67] Fengbin Zhu, Wenqiang Lei, Youcheng Huang, Chao Wang, Shuo Zhang, Jiancheng Lv, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. TAT-QA: A question answering benchmark on a hybrid of tabular and textual content in finance. In Chengqing Zong, Fei Xia, Wenjie Li, and Roberto Navigli, editors, *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3277–3287, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Checklist

1. For all authors...

- (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope? [Yes] . Please see Abstract and Introduction.
 - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes] We discuss limitations of DEXTER benchmark in Appendix B.
 - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [No] We focus on benchmarking retrieval and QA performance for complex QA tasks.
 - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes]
2. If you are including theoretical results...
- (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
- (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes] . URL is mentioned in Abstract and Section 3.2. Further details are provided in Section A.1.
 - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [Yes] All results are reproducible using the source code in the GitHub repository mentioned in the abstract. We also explicitly mention hyperparameters and inference settings in Section 4, in Appendix D, Appendix C.
 - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [No] . We perform inference for diverse pre-trained models, which often do not come with pre-training code. Re-training all these models is not feasible. Additionally, LLM training is computationally expensive.
 - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [Yes] These details are provided in Section 4
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
- (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes] . We cite papers of all 7 datasets used in this work and also related models. Please see Section 3.1.
 - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes] . See Appendix A.1 for details and Table 4 in Appendix.
 - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes]
 - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you’re using/curating? [N/A] . We use publicly available datasets and strictly follow their provided license.
 - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [N/A] . We primarily use publicly available datasets. Most datasets are from less sensitive sources like Wikipedia and public financial transcripts, where we don’t expect personally identifiable information or offensive content due to strict guidelines at source https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Offensive_material.
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
- (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]
 - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [N/A]

We provide an overview of datasets employed, Limitation of the DEXTER benchmark (Section B), prompts (Section D) and additional results in this Appendix.

Dataset Name	Homepage	Liscense
MusiqueQA	https://github.com/StonyBrookNLP/musique	CC BY 4.0 License
WikiMultiHopQA	https://github.com/Alab-NII/2wikimultihop	CC BY 4.0 License
StrategyQA	https://allenai.org/data/strategyqa	Provided under "MIT License" for non-commercial research purposes.
AmbigQA	https://nlp.cs.washington.edu/ambigqa/	Creative Commons Attribution Share Alike 3.0
OTT-QA	https://ott-qa.github.io/	Provided under "MIT License" for non-commercial research purposes.
TAT-QA	https://nextplusplus.github.io/TAT-QA/	CC BY 4.0 License
FinQA	https://github.com/czyssrs/FinQA	Provided under "MIT License" for non-commercial research purposes.

Table 4: Characteristics of datasets included in DEXTER

Name	Component	Checkpoints
BM25	Retrieval	-
SPLADE	Retrieval	https://huggingface.co/naver/splade_v2_max
DPR	Retrieval	Question: https://huggingface.co/facebook/dpr-question_encoder-multiset-base Context: https://huggingface.co/facebook/dpr-ctx_encoder-multiset-base
ANCE	Retrieval	https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/msmarco-roberta-base-ance-firstp
Tas-b	Retrieval	https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/msmarco-distilbert-base-tas-b
MPNet	Retrieval	https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/multi-qa-mpnet-base-cos-v1
Contriever	Retrieval	https://huggingface.co/facebook/contriever
ColBERTv2	Retrieval	https://github.com/VenkteshV/ColBERT?tab=readme-ov-file#overview
Flan-T5	LLM	https://huggingface.co/google/flan-t5-xl
Llama	LLM	https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-2-7b-hf

Table 5: Characteristics of models used in DEXTER

A Data Card

Summary. Section 3.1 and Table 1 in the main paper provide an overview of datasets in DEXTER benchmark. We further provide example questions from each of the datasets in Table 6.

Languages. English

Domain. DEXTER is an Complex QA benchmark with retrieval being evaluated in open-domain setup. the questions contained in the MusiqueQA (MQA), 2WikiMultiHopqa (WQA), AmbigQA, OTT-QA and StrategyQA are from multiple domains. TAT-QA and FinQA questions focus on financial domain.

Additional Details. The benchmark is a curation of 7 datasets relevant to the domain of complex question answering. Table.4 details each of these datasets with their homepage, licenses and characteristics. Section A.2 shows the structure of a sample with question, evidence and answer formed by our dataloader in DEXTER toolkit. The Section also covers the json structure of raw data files. All the **data** can be found in form of zip files in the repository https://gitlab.tudelft.nl/venkteshviswan/bcqa_data. The corpus for all datasets except for AmbigQA, StrategyQA and OTT-QA are packaged along with dev, train and test questions in the zip files in the repo. The corpus files for AmbigQA, StartegyQA and OTT-QA are large and hence uploaded to a Google Drive and linked in readme of the repo https://gitlab.tudelft.nl/venkteshviswan/bcqa_data. A copy of our datasets would also be available in huggingface <https://huggingface.co/DEXTER-CQA>. We plan to continuously maintain the two data sources to ensure continuous development of the benchmark and to encourage open source contributions.

Reproducibility: For reproducibility developers can download the data files, install DEXTER from source and run the inference scripts in evaluation folder from DEXTER repo <https://github.com/VenkteshV/DEXTER>. Alternatively, we also provide a python package (pip install dexter-cqa) and an example jupyter notebook https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1U0Z_JuDeWgKvvcPs4ygCEoGCUUGC1PUs?usp=sharing to enable ease of access and reproducibility of results

A.1 Meta Information

Benchmark Curators. The benchmark was created by Venktesh Viswanathan, Deepali Prabhu, and Avishek Anand.

Licensing Information. The licensing information of each of the underlying datasets included in the benchmark is provided in Table.4. For dexter toolkit, we release the software with Apache 2.0 license.

Leader board/Benchmarks. The benchmark is aimed to be used by researchers wanting to test various components of the RAG pipeline for the task of complex question answering. Currently, we have evaluated a range of retrievers and language models, as shown in the Results Section in

Dataset	Example Question	Description	Ability
StrategyQA [16]	Does Andrew Johnson’s presidential number exceed Elagabalus’s Emperor number?	comparison and implicit questions	Reasoning over implicit aspects and commonsense reasoning
WQA [18]	Who was born later, Gideon Johnson or Holm Jølsen?	comparison and compositional questions	Compositional and Comparative Reasoning
MQA [48]	What did the actress in My Fair Lady win a Tony for ?	compositional questions	Compositional Reasoning
AmbigQA [36]	Who plays the doctor in dexter season 1?	Ambiguous QA	Detecting and reasoning under ambiguity
TAT-QA [67]	What is the year on year percentage change in domestic discount rate between 2018 and 2019?	Table based numerical reasoning	Table Parsing, Text understanding, numerical reasoning
OTT-QA [32]	What is the full birth name of the Bradford A.F.C player that only played for the team in 2011 ?	Table and Text based reasoning	Table Parsing, Text understanding
FinQA [7]	In 2010 and 2009 , what was the total fair value in billions of assets segregated for the benefit of securities and futures brokerage customers?	Table and Text based numerical reasoning	Table Parsing, Text understanding, numerical reasoning

Table 6: Overview of the Complex QA datasets used in this study. Abilities refers to skills required to solve the dataset.

the main paper. Our benchmark is also open to evaluation, and it is easy to add new retrieval and generative models. We have made the models and code used in our main experiments available on our GitHub repository. This allows others to reproduce our empirical results, develop their own models or datasets, extend our framework, and conduct meaningful evaluations. Users can easily access the available datasets by downloading the corresponding data files from our repository https://gitlab.tudelft.nl/venkateshviswan/bcqa_data and utilizing the data loaders in DEXTER. Retrievers can be loaded using our retriever classes and the publicly available checkpoints. For LLM engines, users can either use their own API keys or the publicly available checkpoints. A summary of publicly used checkpoints for models is provided in Table.5. The users of DEXTER can easily extend any of its components to load custom datasets, retrievers or LLMs. We aim to ensure that the benchmark is not limited to our components or datasets alone, allowing for flexible and broad usage.

A.2 Dataset Structure

For benchmarking purposes, we have chosen to convert each of the base datasets into two types of files. The first file includes questions, their answers, context mappings, and metadata. The second file contains the documents that contain the relevant contexts with their metadata. The projection to an open domain setting is further explained in Section 3.5 of the main paper. We use the train, test, and validation split configuration from the base dataset. The first file containing question-answer pairs has a free structure, with most of them following the original structure of the dataset. Listing.2 shows a single sample formed by the data loaders in DEXTER. The file with the corpus has a fixed structure as shown in Listing.1. All the code to convert raw files from the base dataset to the standard format used in DEXTER is made on our GitHub repository.

Listing 1: Example block showing standard structure used to form the corpus file.

```

1 [
2   {
3     "id": "idx",
4     "title": "title of the context item",
5     "text": "Main text of the context items",
6     "type": "Type of the context item, currently table or text"
7   },
8   ...
9 ]

```

Listing 2: Example block showing standard structure of data formed by our data loaders

```

1 {
2   "idx": "V/2008/page_17.pdf-1-0",
3   "question": {
4     "idx": "V/2008/page_17.pdf-1",
5     "text": "what is the average payment volume per transaction
6             for american express?"
7   },
8   "answer": {
9     "idx": "V/2008/page_17.pdf-1",
10    "text": "127.40"
11  },
12  "evidence": {
13    "table": [
14      [
15        "visa inc. ( 1 )",
16        "$ 2457",
17        "$ 3822",
18        "50.3",
19        "1592"
20      ],
21      [
22        "mastercard",
23        "1697",
24        "2276",
25        "27.0",
26        "916"
27      ]
28    ],
29    "columns": [
30      "company",
31      "payments volume ( billions )"
32    ],
33    "idx": "V/2008/page_17.pdf-1.table"
34  }
35 }

```

B Limitations

While DEXTER covers diverse aspects of complex QA tasks, it still has some limitations. Here we identify some limitations to aid in further enhancements to the benchmark and toolkit in the future. The enhancements would be continually handled and maintained by the core development team and would also be open to contributions.

Multilingual Datasets While currently DEXTER covers diverse aspects of complexity and is a multi-domain benchmark, it is primarily composed of questions and documents in English. This is primarily due to lack of diverse multi-lingual complex QA datasets. In future, we plan to curate complex questions from diverse languages starting with integration of Mintaka [44] dataset in DEXTER.

Evaluation on more open models: Currently DEXTER supports OpenAI models and open-source models like Mistral, Llama2-7b and FlanT5. In our results, we have demonstrated the importance of

scale of LLMs employed for reasoning. While we carry out the main experiments with gpt-3.5-turbo due to its superior performance, we also plan to support more open source models in the future. While it is difficult to catch up with rapid release of open models every week, we plan to add new models with considerable improvements on diverse benchmarks. We also plan to open our project for contributions to encourage evaluation of new models and methods.

Toolkit enhancements and training support: Our initial goals for DEXTER was to comprehensively evaluate off-the-shelf retrieval models on complex QA tasks in open-domain setup. This was followed by evaluation of the impact of retrieval on LLM reasoning in a Retrieval Augmented Generation setup (RAG). Hence, the current toolkit does not support training of custom retrieval models. In future, we plan to incorporate this, in addition to exploring transformer based architectures that can extend to long context.

C Further Experimental Details

C.1 Retriever

We evaluate diverse retrieval models with publicly available checkpoints, shown in Table 5. Due to the length limit of transformer based models, we restrict the document length to first 512 word pieces, as done in prior work [46]. We select diverse retrieval models based on their unique characteristics. BM25 and SPLADE serve as strong lexical and sparse retrievers respectively. DPR is a well known off-the-shelf retrieval model employed for opne-domain QA. Tas-b is chosen due to the strong training objective that uses dual supervision. ANCE employs better sampling of negatives during training and MPNET is chosen due to different pre-training objective compared to BERT based language models. ColBERTv2 is a well known late-interaction model that mitigates the cost of cross-encoder by employing late interaction based attention mechanism while providing superior performance to bi-encoder based dense retrieval models.

C.2 Generative models

We employ temperature of 0.3 to reduce randomness in generated outputs. We employ 5 few-shot samples to account for context length limitations in LLMs and to accommodate retrieved documents in RAG setup. The frequency and brevity penalty are set to 0.8 and 0.6 respectively. For all datasets except FinQA we evaluate on dev set due to lack of publicly available test sets with gold labels. For FinQA we evaluate on test set. While the original MusiqueQA dataset contains a large number of question in validations et filtering out unanswerable questions yields a validation set of 1252 questions [39]. For 2WikiMultiHopQA we perform retrieval and LLM inference for the first 1200 2-hop questions to mitigate cost of LLM inference as done in prior work [49, 39].

Method	WQA	MQA	AmbigQA	StrategyQA	Tat-QA	FinQA	OTT-QA
Lexical							
BM25	0.416	0.259	0.637	0.337	0.794	0.429	<u>0.123</u>
Sparse							
SPLADE	0.323	0.181	0.620	0.272	<u>0.749</u>	0.361	0.106
Dense							
DPR	0.179	0.107	0.560	0.124	0.508	0.176	0.066
ANCE	0.223	0.115	0.594	0.247	0.666	0.294	0.055
tas-b	0.303	0.172	0.620	0.342	0.712	0.326	0.101
MPNet	0.253	0.149	0.603	0.355	0.683	0.326	0.129
Contriever	0.294	0.169	0.576	0.254	0.328	0.229	0.072
COIBERTV2	<u>0.333</u>	<u>0.211</u>	<u>0.621</u>	<u>0.339</u>	0.729	<u>0.411</u>	0.124

Table 7: Dense retrieval results Recall@100 across complex QA benchmarks. The best results are highlighted in bold and second best results are underlined

Method	MQA c-EM	WQA c-EM	AmbigQA $F1_{Ans}$	StrategyQA c-EM	Tat-QA c-EM	FinQA EM-Tol	OTT-QA c-EM
RAG-Oracle (FEW-SHOT-COT)							
- gpt-3.5-turbo	44.28	65.55	35.57	73.36	54.05	52.22	46.23
- Mistral-7b	<u>22.54</u>	25.00	<u>09.93</u>	<u>62.55</u>	<u>42.99</u>	<u>12.55</u>	<u>18.39</u>
- Llama2-7b	<u>22.12</u>	<u>47.33</u>	9.09	<u>56.77</u>	30.46	06.62	15.89
supervised baseline	37.60	50.59	42.30	65.2	55.2	58.86	33.20

Table 8: QA Performance on DEXTER. The model used is gpt-3.5-turbo, unless otherwise specified. The best results are highlighted in bold. And second best results are underlined.

MusiqueQA Prompt

Instruction: Follow the given examples and Given the question and context output final answer for the question using information in the context and give answer in form of [Final Answer]: .

Exemplars :

[Question]: What is the current official currency in the country where Ineabelle Diaz is a citizen?

[Answer]: Ineabelle Diaz is from Peurto Rico, which is in the United States of America. The current official currency in the United States is the United States dollar.

[Final Answer]: United States dollar.

[Question]: Where was the person who founded the American Institute of Public Opinion in 1935 born?

[Answer]: The person who founded the American Institute of Public Opinion in 1935 is George Gallup. George Gallup was born in Jefferson, Iowa.

[Final Answer]: Jefferson.

[Question]: What language is used by the director of Tiffany Memorandum?

[Answer]: The director of Tiffany Memorandum is Sergio Grieco. Sergio Grieco speaks Italian.

[Final Answer]: Italian.

[Question]: What is the sports team the person played for who scored the first touchdown in Superbowl 1?

[Answer]: The player that scored the first touchdown in Superbowl 1 is Max McGee. Max McGee played for the Green Bay Packers.

[...]

Test Input : Read the following context, and then answer the question: Context: { } Question: { }
Explanation: [INS] Answer: [INS]

Figure 3: Example of In-context learning for MusiqueQA through manual FEW-SHOT-COT based prompting of LLMs (limited examples shown)

D Prompts

We show some of the manual FEW-SHOT-COT prompts used for RAG experiments for few datasets (Figures 5,3,4) and also an example of self-ask style prompting (Figure 6). The few-shot samples used are applicable for closed-book, RAG top-k and RAG Oracle setups. The prompts comprise demonstration samples with rationales to elicit chain of thought reasoning in LLMs. All prompts employed for different OpenAI and open models on different datasets can be found in DEXTER github

```

2WikiMultiHopQA Prompt

Instruction:Follow the given examples and Given the question and context output
final answer for the question using information in the context and give
answer in form of [Final Answer]: .

Exemplars :
[Question]: Who lived longer, Theodor Haecker or Harry Vaughan Watkins??

[Answer]: ITheodor Haecker was 65 years old when he died. Harry Vaughan Watkins was 69 years old
when he died.

[Final Answer]: Harry Vaughan Watkins.

[Question]: Why did the founder of Versus die?

[Answer]: The founder of Versus was Gianni Versace. Gianni Versace was shot and killed on the steps
of his Miami Beach mansion on July 15, 1997.

[Final Answer]: Shot.

[Question]: Who is the grandchild of Dambar Shah?

[Answer]: TDambar Shah (? - 1645) was the king of the Gorkha Kingdom. He was the father of
Krishna Shah. Krishna Shah (? - 1661) was the king of the Gorkha Kingdom. He was the father of
Rudra Shah.

[Final Answer]: Rudra Shah.

[Question]: Are both director of film FAQ: Frequently Asked Questions and director of film The Big
Money from the same country?

[Answer]: The director of the film FAQ: Frequently Asked Questions is Carlos Atanes. The director of
the film The Big Money is John Paddy Carstairs. The nationality of Carlos Atanes is Spanish. The
nationality of John Paddy Carstairs is British

[...]

Test Input : Read the following context, think step by step and then answer the question: Context:
{} Question: {}
Explanation: [INS] Answer: [INS]

```

Figure 4: Example of In-context learning for 2WikiMultiHopQA through manual FEW-SHOT-COT based prompting of LLMs (limited examples shown)

repo <https://github.com/VenkteshV/DEXTER/tree/main/evaluation> in evaluation folder. The inference scripts for each datasets are housed under the "llm" sub-folder. For instance, for RAG FEW-SHOT-COT inference using gpt-3.5-turbo the prompt can be found at https://github.com/VenkteshV/DEXTER/blob/main/evaluation/musique/llms/run_gpt3_rag_few_SHOT.py.

E Retrieval Results (Recall@100)

We report the Recall@100 for retrieval in Table 7. We observe that BM25 achieves high recall in 5/7 datasets. We also observe that ColBERTv2 provides the second-best recall results and is not far behind BM25 on most datasets. This demonstrates that pre-trained late-interaction based methods are more suited compared to other dense retrieval methods for complex QA tasks when used in an off-the-shelf manner. We also observe that sparse retrieval models like SPLADEv2 are also competitive and serve as a strong baseline.




Figure 5: Prompt for FinQA




Figure 6: Prompt for StrategyQA

F Generative Model Results (Open Models)

We show the results for Llama2-7b in Table 8. We observe that scale plays a major role when employing Large Language models for reasoning, as gpt-3.5-turbo vastly outperforms smaller models like Mistral and Lalam2 even when all models are provided with gold evidence. This demonstrates that scale of the LLM plays a major role in pronounced emergent capabilities like Chain of though and In-Context Learning. However, we observe immense potential for open source models to close this gap with stronger pre-training objectives, as their current performance on certain tasks like StrategyQA and TAT-QA are impressive .

Among open source models we observe that mistral offers superior performance on 6/7 datasets in DEXTER benchmark, outperforming Llama2 by upto **12 points** in TAT-QA. However, we observe that Llama2 has superior comparative reasoning capabilities, as it outperforms Mistral by 22 points.

We observe that open source smaller models fall behind LLMs like gpt-3.5-turbo even in presence of gold evidence. Hence, our main experiments primarily employ gpt-3.5-turbo for diverse experimental setups. However, we observe there is immense potential for open source small LLMs in complex QA and hope DEXTER would help contribute to further progress in this direction.