

Learning to Explore and Select for Coverage-Conditioned Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Takyoung Kim^{1,†} Kyungjae Lee² Young Rok Jang²
 Ji Yong Cho^{2,3} Gangwoo Kim^{4,†} Minseok Cho² Moontae Lee^{2,5}

¹University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign ²LG AI Research
³Cornell University ⁴Korea University ⁵University of Illinois Chicago
 tk30@illinois.edu moontae.lee@lgresearch.ai

Abstract

Interactions with billion-scale large language models typically yield long-form responses due to their extensive parametric capacities, along with retrieval-augmented features. While detailed responses provide insightful viewpoint of a specific subject, they frequently generate redundant and less engaging content that does not meet user interests. In this work, we focus on the role of query outlining (*i.e.*, selected sequence of queries) in scenarios that users request a specific range of information, namely **coverage-conditioned** (C^2) scenarios. For simulating C^2 scenarios, we construct **QTREE**, 10K sets of information-seeking queries decomposed with various perspectives on certain topics. By utilizing QTREE, we train **QPLANNER**, a 7B language model generating customized query outlines that follow coverage-conditioned queries. We analyze the effectiveness of generated outlines through automatic and human evaluation, targeting on retrieval-augmented generation (RAG). Moreover, the experimental results demonstrate that QPLANNER with alignment training can further provide outlines satisfying diverse user interests. Our resources are available at <https://github.com/youngerous/qtrees>.

1 Introduction

Curiosity is attributed to perceptual knowledge and sequence of interests (BERLYNE, 1954). The emerging performance of recent large language models (LLMs) enables providing long and detailed responses by utilizing their deep parametric knowledge. Meanwhile, human-machine interaction interface (*e.g.*, chat and acoustic interface) that has been studied for a long time (Levin et al., 2000) allows users to request customized information in the form of instructions. More recent proprietary chat interface services such as ChatGPT (OpenAI,




Figure 1: Unlike the existing RAG systems that simply rewrite or decompose the given query, our QPLANNER, trained with QTREE, first explores possible information coverage. A subset of queries is selected as an outline to retrieve relevant passages and generate long-form response. By leveraging retrieved passages, we prompt LLM to generate the final response tailored to user interests.

2023), Gemini (Google, 2024), and BingChat are accelerating the exploration of human curiosity.

LLMs’ long responses consist of innumerable combinations of relevant topics, as there is no gold standard in long-form text (Krishna et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2022, 2023). However, LLMs often fail to provide tailored responses when users’ queries get complicated. For instance, a user can request LLMs to provide information on a topic, *Generative AI*, especially focusing on historical context *without* describing recent trends (since the user already understands the latest news), but it is too complicated for LLMs to generate meticulously-composed responses. Since humans have their own background knowledge and curiosity level, we define these queries that constrain the information coverage of certain topics as **coverage-conditioned** (C^2) **queries**. Specifically, our scenario conceptualizes “coverage” by assuming that users can request LLMs to include or exclude a specific subtopic within long-form responses.

[†]Work done as a research intern at LG AI Research.

There have been several studies to generate responses following users’ instructions (Ouyang et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022a; Taori et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2023). Among these trends, we focus on **query outlining**, which is a sequence of queries representing intermediate subtopics within a long text, demonstrating its effectiveness in long-form story generation (Fan et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2022, 2023; Wang et al., 2024; Shao et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2024). On top of that, we further raise a question: “*How to generate customized outlines for long-form responses in the retrieval-augmented setup?*” Well-generated outlines should align with user perspectives (Shao et al., 2024) and show improved performance in downstream tasks, such as document retrieval and response generation. In our work, outlines consisting of relevant topics to C^2 queries are expected to be utilized **both** as better search queries and intermediate content drafts, thereby improving the end-to-end retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) performance.

To explore the way to generate customized outlines, we propose **QTREE**, 10K hierarchical sets of information-seeking queries interpreting user queries of existing datasets with diverse perspectives. Hierarchies of QTREE are comprised based on the abstraction level of the main topic. For example, as illustrated in Figure 1, hierarchical topics related to processes after pretraining (*i.e.*, *Finetuning* and *RLHF*) are selected among various viewpoints in LLMs. We assume that the selected subset of QTREE performs a role as an outline for document search and response generation.

To extract a subset of queries following C^2 query from QTREE, we construct **QPLANNER**, an on-premise autoregressive 7B language model generating customized and preferable outlines without human intervention. Specifically, QPLANNER generates outlines to arbitrary C^2 queries by learning the outline-extracting capabilities of LLMs. We evaluate the performance of QPLANNER by measuring whether generated outlines follow C^2 queries, both with automatic and human evaluation. Moreover, we verify that training QPLANNER with preference alignment can further improve the outline quality and end-to-end RAG output. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We explore the effectiveness of query outlining in coverage-conditioned (C^2) scenarios by constructing QTREE, 10K hierarchical sets of

queries containing various perspectives.

- We train QPLANNER, an autoregressive 7B language model that generates outlines for long-form responses customized to C^2 queries.
- By conducting automatic and human evaluation, we verify the effectiveness of alignment training for outlining C^2 queries and analyze how the aligned outlines help generate long-form responses, focusing on the RAG task.

2 Related Work

2.1 Query Modification with LLMs

Integrating retrieval systems with LLMs has become crucial in enhancing retrieval-augmented systems, where query reformulation plays a pivotal role in improving information retrieval outcomes. Recent advancements involve prompting LLMs to supply detailed information, such as expected documents or pseudo-answers, for query expansion (Wang et al., 2023; Jagerman et al., 2023). Additionally, there’s a growing interest in utilizing reward signals to fine-tune the query reformulation model, further optimizing search results based on the ranking of retrieved documents (Ma et al., 2023; Yoon et al., 2024). Recent efforts have also focused on breaking down complex questions into simpler subqueries, leveraging the decomposition for more accurate retrieval and response generation (Khot et al., 2023). Additionally, a line of studies (Yao et al., 2023; Press et al., 2023; Khat-tab et al., 2023) merge the concept of Chain-of-Thoughts (CoT) (Wei et al., 2022b) with interaction through retrieval systems. Furthermore, most recent studies (Oh et al., 2024; Weller et al., 2024) introduce the inclusion of instructional scenarios in the information-seeking process.

While having similar query modification strategies (*e.g.*, query decomposition or instructional scenarios), we consider query outlining as an effective strategy before generating long-form responses. Previously, a hierarchical structure has shown remarkable performance on story generation task (Fan et al., 2018). Yang et al. (2022, 2023) have also emphasized the importance of outline for structured story generation. More recently, Shao et al. (2024) have explored the role of the outline as a medium to present diverse perspectives and constructed outlines by iterative conversational processes. Furthermore, Lee et al. (2024) have improved the quality of free-form writing by outline




Figure 2: The overview of our framework. **[Step 1]** Base query (q_{base}) is decomposed into queries with diverse viewpoints (QTREE), preceded by generating coverage query (q_{cov}). **[Step 2]** After C^2 candidate outlines are extracted, an LLM evaluates each outline and selects the best-scored one. **[Step 3]** Utilizing this dataset, QPLANNER is trained to sequentially generate its own QTREE and preferred outline by taking the C^2 query as an input.

augmentation. Above these studies, we position our work as the automatic exploration of a better outline for retrieval-augmented long-form generation in C^2 scenarios.

2.2 Evaluation of Long-form Responses

Evaluating long-form responses of LLMs presents a significant challenge due to the subjective and complex nature of such assessments. Recent research (Krishna et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2022, 2023) highlight the limitations of current automated metrics in accurately assessing long-form texts, underscoring the necessity for detailed, fine-grained evaluation methods. Some holistic approaches consider a wide array of model capabilities, introducing multi-metric evaluation settings (Liang et al., 2023; Gehrmann et al., 2023; Shevlane et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2024). Additionally, the push towards fine-grained atomic evaluation settings for tasks like fact verification and summarization indicates a growing interest in detailed assessments (Min et al., 2023; Krishna et al., 2023). Recent research has also explored model-based evaluation, where learned models determine automated scores (Yuan et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024). While these studies consider long-form responses themselves as the target to evaluate, we evaluate

both outlines and responses by following insights from Kellogg (1988) where outlines alleviate the cognitive overload of reading long text (*i.e.*, serving as an effective content draft) while representing the core structure of long-form writing.

3 Framework

3.1 Definition

Throughout our work, we call QTREE as a hierarchical set of queries derived from a single user query. Formally, QTREE consists of a hierarchical query sequence $\{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{11}, \dots, q_{ijk}\}$, where the length of each query annotation denotes the hierarchical level within QTREE. For example, q_{213} refers to the query located at the third position at depth-3, following the path from the second position at depth-1 to the first position at depth-2. We set the depth and the width of QTREE as three, respectively (*i.e.*, $3+9+27=39$ queries exist in each QTREE). Additionally, as exemplified in Figure 1, we define C^2 query as the concatenation of user’s original query (base query; q_{base}) and additional query constraining information coverage (coverage query; q_{cov}), formalized as $C^2 = [q_{base}; q_{cov}]$.

| Dataset | Source | Train | Test |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--------|------|
| ASQA (Stelmakh et al., 2022) | Wikipedia | 4,353 | 100 |
| Longform (Köksal et al., 2024) | Wikipedia | 4,483 | 100 |
| ExpertQA (Malaviya et al., 2023) | Expert | 1,741 | 100 |
| Total | - | 10,577 | 300 |

Table 1: Basic statistics of our seed datasets. We specify the number of questions in each split. We obtain q_{base} from these datasets constructed from various corpus.

3.2 Overview

Figure 2 illustrates the overall pipeline of our framework. Followed by q_{base} collection (Section 3.3.1), we construct QTREE (Section 3.3.2) and generate q_{cov} (Section 3.3.3). Since we intend to generate C^2 queries dealing with users’ various requests, QTREE has to interpret q_{base} with diverse perspectives. For example, a q_{base} "What is Generative AI?" can be answered through various viewpoints, including its latest trend, historical context, and application across different fields. By utilizing generated q_{cov} , candidate outlines for each C^2 query can be parsed (Section 3.4.1), preceded by the evaluation of each outline for selecting the best one (Section 3.4.2). The following subsections detail the construction procedure, and all used prompts are provided in Appendix E.

3.3 Preparing C^2 Queries (Step 1)

3.3.1 Base Query (q_{base}) Collection

We first collect q_{base} that requires long-form content composition to respond. Specifically, we utilize two Wikipedia-based long-form question answering datasets – ASQA (Stelmakh et al., 2022) and Longform (Köksal et al., 2024), and one from expert domain – ExpertQA (Malaviya et al., 2023), as demonstrated in Table 1. For the test set, we sample 100 test queries for each dataset. By leveraging LLMs¹, we construct C^2 queries by combining these 10K q_{base} with corresponding q_{cov} (see Section 3.3.3). Since there are a few noisy queries, we slightly modify and filter existing queries. We describe the detailed preprocessing in Appendix A.

3.3.2 QTREE Construction

Prior to generating q_{cov} , we decompose q_{base} into diverse queries as a tree structure (*i.e.*, QTREE). The purpose of constructing QTREE for each q_{base}

is to unfold the scope of information within parametric knowledge of LLMs. This structured graph also enables effective instruction generation (will be detailed in the next subsection) according to the hierarchy of abstractiveness. We assume queries in deeper depth present more concrete subtopics. In other words, queries in leaf nodes contain the most detailed queries of a specific subject. Table 6 in Appendix C illustrates an example of QTREE.

Quality Check Checking the quality of QTREE is relatively easier than unformatted text sequence. In the query decomposition stage, we ensure that QTREE contains a predefined number of nodes in each depth and width and does not overlap each other. This can be simply done by heuristically inspecting the structured output. We also prompt the LLM to generate queries as question-format².

3.3.3 Coverage Query (q_{cov}) Generation

To remind, q_{cov} constrain coverage within the wide range of information. Therefore, generating q_{cov} from QTREE requires selecting specific viewpoint to cover. However, solely relying on LLMs’ parametric knowledge does not guarantee the diversity of realistic situations. We therefore adopt the following two concepts to assist q_{cov} generation.

- **Background Query:** Understandably, users’ interests attribute to their background knowledge. With this in consideration, we randomly select a single query from QTREE, which will be a starting point for simulating users’ curiosity. We define this query as **background query**. The specificity of the background query also differs according to the depth of the selected query. In other words, it can be inferred that users who are seeking information of deeper queries possess a more detailed recognition of the relevant subjects.

¹We fix the LLM with the gpt-4-0125-preview of OpenAI (OpenAI, 2023), with a temperature of 1.0, throughout this work.

²We intend every query contains question mark, but we do not explicitly filter queries with non-question format as questions can be expressed in various forms.

| Intent Operation | q_{cov} Examples |
|------------------|--|
| INCLUSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Considering my eagerness to learn about educational analysis, include any thematic discussions by experts on the qualifications or contributions of the newly appointed UPSC member to the commission. ▶ Since I'm curious about the roots of the name, please explain where the name Jibril originated from. ▶ Given my interest in agriculture, include details about how different seasons can enhance or diminish the quality and quantity of tea produced in various regions. |
| EXCLUSION | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Ensure you omit any irrelevant details about Mary Poppins itself; I'm only interested in the birth date of the actress who played the bird lady. ▶ Since I already understand the elements required to prove theft, ensure to focus on the different classifications of theft in various legal systems without delving into the proof elements. ▶ Avoid diving into the biographies of other directors from the series; I'm only interested in the one who directed the initial movie. |

Table 2: Example of generated q_{cov} according to intent operations (randomly sampled from the training set).

| |
|---|
| <p>C² Query: Describe the film The Woman Hunt. Since I'm already familiar with how audiences and critics received The Woman Hunt, please avoid discussing reviews or reception in your explanation.</p> |
| <p>Parsed Outline:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the plot of The Woman Hunt? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. What are the main events in The Woman Hunt? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1. What initiates the conflict in The Woman Hunt? 1.1.2. What is the climax of The Woman Hunt? |

Table 3: Example of parsed outline. Example of corresponding QTREE is available at Table 6.

• **Intent Operation:** While users consider a particular subject to ask, they may choose whether the content should be addressed within the responses. We conceptualize user intent through a binary operation (*i.e.*, INCLUSION, EXCLUSION), thereby facilitating the generation of q_{cov} that explicitly request the inclusion/exclusion of the subtopic on the background query.

In practice, we prompt LLM to generate q_{cov} by combining randomly selected background query from QTREE with intent operation. As shown in Table 2, combinations of background query and intent operation yield diverse q_{cov} for each q_{base} . Especially, in EXCLUSION operation, we find that relatively harder requirements (*e.g.*, avoiding one topic but focusing on another topic) are given. Therefore, it can be assumed that q_{cov} with EXCLUSION operation requires harder scenarios (we analyze this in Appendix D). In addition, we generate five q_{cov} per each q_{base} and choose one if corresponding outlines are correctly parsed (will be further described in Section 3.4.1).

3.4 Exploring Candidate Outlines & Evaluation (Step 2)

3.4.1 Parsing Outlines

In this stage, LLM sequentially extracts candidate outlines from QTREE that satisfies instructions of C² queries³. Table 3 illustrates the example of the candidate outline, providing a hierarchical subset of queries (*i.e.*, plot - main event - conflict & climax) about The Woman Hunt. We set the number of candidate outlines to three per each C² query.

Quality Check We fix the number of queries within each outline to four, guaranteeing that all queries are directly connected or neighboring within QTREE, as illustrated in Table 3. Additionally, we verify the JSON parsability of each outline and ensure that all queries do not overlap each other. For the efficient usage of API calls, we heuristically remove queries in leaf nodes if an outline contains more than four queries and include the outline as a candidate.

³Our preliminary verification identifies that sequentially generating candidate outlines shows more diversity than temperature-based sampling. Refer to Appendix B for case studies.

3.4.2 Evaluating Outline Quality

In order to evaluate the quality of candidate outlines, we leverage LLM (gpt-4-0125-preview) to serve as a judge deciding whether the content on each candidate outline follows C^2 query. More precisely, we prompt the model to assign scores, measuring how faithfully the outline aligns with the C^2 query. The scoring mechanism employs a five-point Likert scale, along with a corresponding rationale generation for the evaluation. Since outlines have significantly shorter context than long-form text while containing core contents (Kellogg, 1988), it is expected that the evaluation of the LLM shows better alignment with human intuition than directly evaluating long context.

3.5 Training QPLANNER (Step 3)

To deal with arbitrary C^2 queries and generate corresponding outlines, we train a language model named QPLANNER. We instruct QPLANNER to sequentially generate QTREE and selected outline, as we intend that QTREE serves like an intermediate Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al., 2022b) reasoning process.

In the training phase, we employ supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and alignment tuning for the training QPLANNER. First, we train the Llama-2-7B-Chat model (Touvron et al., 2023) using 10K C^2 queries mapped with 31K candidate outline pairs, which are constructed through Section 3.4.1. This training phase allows the model to generate formatted outlines following C^2 queries. Then we further align the preferred outline by adopting a variant of direct preference optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023). Following Tunstall et al. (2023) that show the possibility of distilling the preference of large teacher models into the targeted model, we utilize LLM evaluation previously acquired in Section 3.4.2 as a reward signal for aligning QPLANNER. We regard the chosen sample as the highest-scored and the rejected sample as the lowest-scored outline. We do not use samples whose highest and lowest scores are the same in the alignment stage. The amount of the final training sample is 31,488 in SFT and 8,568 in DPO, respectively. Refer to Appendix F for further details, such as hyperparameters.

| | Mean (\uparrow) | SD (\downarrow) |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| Random Baseline | 2.57 | 1.44 |
| SFT-QPLANNER (31K) | 2.79 | 1.40 |
| DPO-SYNNEG (31K + 8K align) | 2.98 | 1.39 |
| DPO-COMBINED (31K + 16K align) | 3.01 | 1.36 |
| DPO-QPLANNER (Ours; 31K + 8K align) | 3.16 | 1.33 |

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation (SD) for automatic outline evaluation (five-point Likert scale). Our DPO-QPLANNER scores the highest mean score and the lowest SD, indicating robust improvement.

4 Experiments

4.1 Automatic Evaluation

We let LLM (gpt-4-0125-preview) conduct automatic scoring for outlines on our test set. For long-form response evaluation, we do not automatically measure due to the lack of reliability in long-form text evaluation (Xu et al., 2023).

4.1.1 Mean Score Comparison

Table 4 shows our test result with a five-point Likert scale. We score outlines generated by each trained model⁴, focusing on whether the content of outlines follows given C^2 queries (as mentioned in Section 3.4.2).

DPO-QPLANNER (Ours) While our SFT model shows a higher score than the random baseline, we find that **preference alignment based on the SFT model using our candidate outlines**, which are ranked in Section 3.5, **significantly improves the evaluation score**. It should be noted that our reward signal is based on the language model’s generation whose subjectivity is similar to human’s, different from Ma et al. (2023); Yoon et al. (2024) whose reward signals are more likely to be an explicit and gold criterion (e.g., retrieved ranking of the target document). Since there is no proper baseline to verify the effectiveness of our outlining framework, we construct the following baselines as an initial point to estimate performance.

Random Baseline Since the output of QPLANNER includes QTREE, we can extract arbitrary out-

⁴A few cases return outline with 3 or 5 queries, which is not an ideal number of the output (*i.e.*, 4), but we do not filter them in our evaluation.

line regardless of the C^2 queries. Specifically, we select a random background query from QTREE generated by our SFT-QPLANNER, then extend the branch to randomized directions (*i.e.*, upper depth, neighbor, or lower depth) until four queries are connected as a single outline⁵. We find that the random baseline shows the lowest mean score (2.57) with the highest standard deviation (1.44) on our test set.

DPO-SYNNeg To further explore the effectiveness of selected negative samples in DPO-QPLANNER, we prepare another DPO model trained with different types of negative samples. While negative samples of DPO-QPLANNER are generated by LLM, as described in Section 3.5, it is also possible to heuristically synthesize negative samples using QTREE, background query, and intent operation. This procedure is similar to generating random baseline, except for (1) setting the starting point as the background query and (2) ensuring synthesized outlines have the *opposite* intent operation to the original intent. That is, the intent of synthetic negative (SYNNeg) outlines explicitly conflicts with that of the positive (chosen) outlines, while the intent of negative outlines of DPO-QPLANNER are aligned with that of positive outlines. On the 8K DPO-QPLANNER training set, we maintain the chosen (*i.e.*, highest-scored) outlines and replace rejected outlines with synthetically generated negative outlines.

On the comparison with DPO-QPLANNER and DPO-SYNNeg, we find that **negative samples of DPO-QPLANNER are notably effective** than the other one. We conjecture that constructing “hard” negatives⁶ (*i.e.*, less scored subtrees with the “same” intent) is an important factor to align with C^2 queries, as discussed in previous studies (Rosset et al., 2023; Scarlatos et al., 2024).

DPO-COMBINED We also measure the performance of combining negative samples in DPO-QPLANNER and DPO-SYNNeg. While the test score slightly increases compared to DPO-SYNNeg, performance becomes worse than DPO-QPLANNER despite the doubled amount of training samples.

⁵Intent operation is also not considered in the random baseline.

⁶We define LLM-generated negative samples as “hard” when compared to synthetic negative samples whose intent operations are explicitly opposite to positive outlines.




Figure 3: Pairwise score comparison per each C^2 query in automatic outline evaluation. Outlines of our DPO-QPLANNER are judged as the best among all other baselines.

4.1.2 Pairwise Score Comparison

We also measure pairwise comparison between models in Figure 3. **Our DPO-QPLANNER gets the highest score on the same C^2 query**, which is intuitively aligned with the result in Table 4. Given the fact that exhaustively devising preferred outline for C^2 queries is labor-intensive, our QPLANNER is an effective solution for exploring and providing preferred outlines for composing long-form responses.

4.2 Human Evaluation

We also conduct a human study to identify the effectiveness of QPLANNER. We describe detailed information in Appendix G such as demographics and payment.

4.2.1 Outline Evaluation

Recruited evaluators read and rate two outlines (SFT- and DPO-QPLANNER) for randomly selected 100 C^2 queries from the test set using the same five-point Likert scale criteria as the automatic evaluation. Each evaluator rates from 4 to 10 outlines in random order, and each outline has at least 6 evaluators (Average: 6.55, Max: 15). We intend to have as many evaluators as possible to rate individual outline to gather a collective rating for each set. This is because even with simple outlines, judging if outlines with unfamiliar subjects successfully follow C^2 queries is highly intellectual and unavoidably subjective task.

As expected for this type of subjective task, evaluators do not reach a high inter-rater reliability (Krippendorff’s $\alpha=0.22$ for SFT ratings 0.23 for DPO-QPLANNER ratings between human raters). However, more importantly, we


find **significant positive correlations between human-rated scores and LLM-rated scores** – both for SFT (Pearson’s $r = 0.51$, p -value < 0.001) and DPO-QPLANNER (Pearson’s $r = 0.39$, p -value < 0.001), which indicates positive relationships with large and medium strength, respectively. Moreover, DPO-QPLANNER receives higher scores (Mean= 3.29, Std=0.81) than SFT (Mean= 3.03, Std=0.78). This trend is supported even when we regress scores on model version (SFT or DPO-QPLANNER) and the total length of outlines in characters, with outline id as a fixed effect (Model: $b=0.27$, p -value=0.01; Outline length: $b=0.01$, p -value=0.30). That is, the length of outlines is not predictive of scores.

4.2.2 Response Evaluation


In addition to outline evaluation, we recruit another participants to evaluate 100 randomly sampled RAG responses. Ten evaluators are assigned for each response. According to Kim et al. (2023), the writing format of model responses affects human preferences. Therefore, we fix the format with Markdown to compare responses by focusing only on their content. In addition, we prompt LLM to generate responses by strictly relying on given evidence to prevent LLM from arbitrarily responding with its parametric knowledge. We provide a description of the document retrieval procedure in Appendix G.2.1.

Regarding evaluation criteria, we first instruct participants to judge whether generated responses follow requirements within C^2 queries or not (Query Satisfaction in Figure 4). We guide to annotate "Yes" if responses at least partially handle topics within C^2 queries. For response pairs annotated as "Yes" in both models, participants select their preferred response from the two models (Response Preference in Figure 4).

QPLANNER as Better Search Query We verify whether queries within outlines can help search relevant documents. We compare responses of vanilla RAG with those of QPLANNER-DPO using the exactly same prompt. In other words, outline queries of QPLANNER-DPO only affect search results. As illustrated in Figure 4a, we find that conventional RAG pipeline does not properly handle C^2 queries, whose requirements are far more complicated than normal queries. Furthermore, among responses that satisfy the requirements of C^2 queries, responses of QPLANNER-DPO are mostly preferred.



(a) QPLANNER as Search Query



(b) QPLANNER as Content Draft

Figure 4: Human evaluation results

QPLANNER as Better Content Draft We further explore whether better outlines lead to better responses. In this setup, we compare responses of QPLANNER-SFT with those of QPLANNER-DPO. Likewise, the exactly same prompt is used for the comparison and queries within outlines are included to compose responses, along with document searching. Results in Figure 4b indicate that QPLANNER aligned with preference outlines tends to provide preferred outlines, although QPLANNER-SFT also shows a similar tendency with QPLANNER-DPO, which is different from that of Vanilla-RAG.

For both studies, we conduct two McNemar’s tests (McNemar, 1947) to examine whether the differences we found are statistically significant. We choose to run McNemar’s tests because they are suited for our experiment settings, where the outcome is binary (*i.e.*, satisfactory or not), and each human evaluator judges both responses for the same query (within-subjects design). The contingency tables used for the tests can be found in Table 10. The results confirm that QPLANNER-DPO outperforms Vanilla RAG (test-statistics=60, p -value <0.001), and QPLANNER-DPO outperforms QPLANNER-SFT (test-statistics=207, p -value=0.004).

5 Conclusion

Customizing information coverage within C^2 queries requires complex selection of subtopics to

compose long-form responses. We investigate the role of query outline in terms of assistive search queries and intermediate content draft for RAG task. To simulate C^2 scenarios, we construct QTREE, hierarchical sets of queries representing diverse perspectives of the original query. Subsequently, we train QPLANNER which extracts customized outlines from QTREE for C^2 queries. Our findings based on automatic and human evaluation show that (1) preference-aligned QPLANNER can provide better outlines, (2) outlines enable searching more relevant documents, and (3) well-generated outlines lead to preferred responses. We believe our work shows the possibility of QTREE as a testbed for exploring effective pre-writing strategy to deal with complicated queries.

Limitation

We fix the number of queries in each outline to four, but it can be adjusted (*i.e.*, composing more or less queries) according to the topic. We plan to adapt outlines in a flexible manner in our future work.

It should be noted that retrieved documents in our RAG setup can also affect final responses. Although we set the same searching configuration among all methodologies, additional fact verification is still needed for practical applications.

In addition, despite demonstrating significant performance gain both in automatic and human evaluation, we find that state-of-the-art LLM still has difficulty in generating long-form responses that handle detailed coverage of C^2 query. This is presumably due to the complexness of C^2 queries, but it arises the importance of constructing meticulous benchmark evaluating long-form responses of complicated queries. This will be another direction of our future work.

References

- Akari Asai, Timo Schick, Patrick Lewis, Xilun Chen, Gautier Izacard, Sebastian Riedel, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. [Task-aware retrieval with instructions](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 3650–3675, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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. 2018. [Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1611.09268.
- D. E. BERLYNE. 1954. [A theory of human curiosity](#). *British Journal of Psychology. General Section*, 45(3):180–191.
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Yunxuan Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Alex Castro-Ros, Marie Pellat, Kevin Robinson, Dasha Valter, Sharan Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2024. [Scaling instruction-finetuned language models](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(70):1–53.
- Pradeep Dasigi, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Arman Cohan, Noah A. Smith, and Matt Gardner. 2021. [A dataset of information-seeking questions and answers anchored in research papers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4599–4610, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. [ELI5: Long form question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3558–3567, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angela Fan, Mike Lewis, and Yann Dauphin. 2018. [Hierarchical neural story generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 889–898, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sebastian Gehrmann, Elizabeth Clark, and Thibault Selam. 2023. [Repairing the cracked foundation: A survey of obstacles in evaluation practices for generated text](#). *J. Artif. Int. Res.*, 77.
- Google. 2024. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.11805.
- Rolf Jagerman, Honglei Zhuang, Zhen Qin, Xuanhui Wang, and Michael Bendersky. 2023. [Query expansion by prompting large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.03653.
- Ronald T. Kellogg. 1988. [Attentional overload and writing performance: effects of rough draft and outline strategies](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 14:355–365.
- Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Xiang Lisa Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, Christopher Potts,

- and Matei Zaharia. 2023. [Demonstrate-search-predict: Composing retrieval and language models for knowledge-intensive nlp](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.14024.
- Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. [Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Seungone Kim, Jamin Shin, Yejin Cho, Joel Jang, Shayne Longpre, Hwaran Lee, Sangdoon Yun, Seongjin Shin, Sungdong Kim, James Thorne, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. [Prometheus: Inducing fine-grained evaluation capability in language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Yoonsu Kim, Jueon Lee, Seoyoung Kim, Jaehyuk Park, and Juho Kim. 2023. [Understanding users’ dissatisfaction with chatgpt responses: Types, resolving tactics, and the effect of knowledge level](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.07434.
- Kalpesh Krishna, Erin Bransom, Bailey Kuehl, Mohit Iyyer, Pradeep Dasigi, Arman Cohan, and Kyle Lo. 2023. [LongEval: Guidelines for human evaluation of faithfulness in long-form summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1650–1669, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kalpesh Krishna, Aurko Roy, and Mohit Iyyer. 2021. [Hurdles to progress in long-form question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4940–4957, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abdullatif Köksal, Timo Schick, Anna Korhonen, and Hinrich Schütze. 2024. [Longform: Effective instruction tuning with reverse instructions](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2304.08460.
- Yoonjoo Lee, Kyungjae Lee, Sunghyun Park, Dasol Hwang, Jaehyeon Kim, Hong-In Lee, and Moontae Lee. 2023. [QASA: Advanced question answering on scientific articles](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 19036–19052. PMLR.
- Yukyung Lee, Soonwon Ka, Bokyoung Son, Pilsung Kang, and Jaewook Kang. 2024. [Navigating the path of writing: Outline-guided text generation with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.13919.
- E. Levin, R. Pieraccini, and W. Eckert. 2000. [A stochastic model of human-machine interaction for learning dialog strategies](#). *IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing*, 8(1):11–23.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Alexander Cosgrove, Christopher D Manning, Christopher Re, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew Arad Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue WANG, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekogul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Andrew Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. 2023. [Holistic evaluation of language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Featured Certification, Expert Certification.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruo Chen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023. [G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2511–2522, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. [Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5303–5315, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chaitanya Malaviya, Subin Lee, Sihao Chen, Elizabeth Sieber, Mark Yatskar, and Dan Roth. 2023. [Expertqa: Expert-curated questions and attributed answers](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.07852.
- Quinn McNemar. 1947. [Note on the sampling error of the difference between correlated proportions or percentages](#). *Psychometrika*, 12(2):153–157.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxin Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [FActScore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 12076–12100, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hanseok Oh, Hyunji Lee, Seonghyeon Ye, Haebin Shin, Hansol Jang, Changwook Jun, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. [Instructir: A benchmark for instruction following of information retrieval models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.14334.
- OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2303.08774.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John

- Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2023. [Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5687–5711, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Corby Rosset, Guoqing Zheng, Victor Dibia, Ahmed Awadallah, and Paul Bennett. 2023. [Axiomatic preference modeling for longform question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11445–11475, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Scarlatos, Digory Smith, Simon Woodhead, and Andrew Lan. 2024. [Improving the validity of automatically generated feedback via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.01304.
- Yijia Shao, Yucheng Jiang, Theodore A. Kanell, Peter Xu, Omar Khattab, and Monica S. Lam. 2024. [Assisting in writing wikipedia-like articles from scratch with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.14207.
- Toby Shevlane, Sebastian Farquhar, Ben Garfinkel, Mary Phuong, Jess Whittlestone, Jade Leung, Daniel Kokotajlo, Nahema Marchal, Markus Anderljung, Noam Kolt, Lewis Ho, Divya Siddarth, Shahar Avin, Will Hawkins, Been Kim, Iason Gabriel, Vijay Bolina, Jack Clark, Yoshua Bengio, Paul Christiano, and Allan Dafoe. 2023. [Model evaluation for extreme risks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.15324.
- Ivan Stelmakh, Yi Luan, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. [ASQA: Factoid questions meet long-form answers](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8273–8288, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiaofei Sun, Zijun Sun, Yuxian Meng, Jiwei Li, and Chun Fan. 2022. [Summarize, outline, and elaborate: Long-text generation via hierarchical supervision from extractive summaries](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6392–6402, Gyeongju, Republic of Korea. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. [Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model](#). https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.09288.
- Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro von Werra, Cl  mentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Nathan Sarrazin, Omar Sanseviero, Alexander M. Rush, and Thomas Wolf. 2023. [Zephyr: Direct distillation of lm alignment](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.16944.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, and Furu Wei. 2023. [Query2doc: Query expansion with large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9414–9423, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tiannan Wang, Jiamin Chen, Qingrui Jia, Shuai Wang, Ruoyu Fang, Huilin Wang, Zhaowei Gao, Chunzhao Xie, Chuou Xu, Jihong Dai, Yibin Liu, Jialong Wu, Shengwei Ding, Long Li, Zhiwei Huang, Xinle Deng, Teng Yu, Gangan Ma, Han Xiao, Zixin Chen, Danjun Xiang, Yunxia Wang, Yuanyuan Zhu, Yi Xiao, Jing Wang, Yiru Wang, Siran Ding, Jiayang Huang, Jiayi Xu, Yilihamu Tayier, Zhenyu Hu, Yuan Gao, Chengfeng Zheng, Yueshu Ye, Yihang Li, Lei Wan, Xinyue Jiang, Yujie Wang, Siyu Cheng, Zhule Song, Xiangru Tang, Xiaohua Xu, Ningyu Zhang, Hua-jun Chen, Yuchen Eleanor Jiang, and Wangchunshu Zhou. 2024. [Weaver: Foundation models for creative writing](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.17268.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Atharva Naik, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Anjana Arunkumar, David Stap, Eshaan Pathak,

- Giannis Karamanolakis, Haizhi Lai, Ishan Purohit, Ishani Mondal, Jacob Anderson, Kirby Kuznia, Krima Doshi, Kuntal Kumar Pal, Maitreya Patel, Mehrad Moradshahi, Mihir Parmar, Mirali Purohit, Neeraj Varshney, Phani Rohitha Kaza, Pulkit Verma, Ravsehaj Singh Puri, Rushang Karia, Savan Doshi, Shailaja Keyur Sampat, Siddhartha Mishra, Sujan Reddy A, Sumanta Patro, Tanay Dixit, and Xudong Shen. 2022. [Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ NLP tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5085–5109, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022b. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Orion Weller, Benjamin Chang, Sean MacAvaney, Kyle Lo, Arman Cohan, Benjamin Van Durme, Dawn Lawrie, and Luca Soldaini. 2024. [Followir: Evaluating and teaching information retrieval models to follow instructions](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.15246.
- Fangyuan Xu, Junyi Jessy Li, and Eunsol Choi. 2022. [How do we answer complex questions: Discourse structure of long-form answers](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3556–3572, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fangyuan Xu, Yixiao Song, Mohit Iyyer, and Eunsol Choi. 2023. [A critical evaluation of evaluations for long-form question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3225–3245, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Yang, Dan Klein, Nanyun Peng, and Yuandong Tian. 2023. [DOC: Improving long story coherence with detailed outline control](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3378–3465, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kevin Yang, Yuandong Tian, Nanyun Peng, and Dan Klein. 2022. [Re3: Generating longer stories with recursive reprompting and revision](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4393–4479, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. [React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Seonghyeon Ye, Doyoung Kim, Sungdong Kim, Hyeonbin Hwang, Seungone Kim, Yongrae Jo, James Thorne, Juho Kim, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. [FLASK: Fine-grained language model evaluation based on alignment skill sets](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Chanwoong Yoon, Gangwoo Kim, Byeongguk Jeon, Sungdong Kim, Yohan Jo, and Jaewoo Kang. 2024. [Ask optimal questions: Aligning large language models with retriever’s preference in conversational search](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.11827.
- Weizhe Yuan, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2021. [BARTScore: Evaluating generated text as text generation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

A Base Query Modification

For the ASQA⁷ (Stelmakh et al., 2022) and ExpertQA⁸ (Malaviya et al., 2023) dataset, we do not modify the base query. For the Longform⁹ (Köksal et al., 2024) dataset, as there are additional format-related instructions concatenated with the base query (*e.g.*, *Respond in 3 sentences.*), we eliminate them by using regular expressions. Moreover, we find that Longform dataset contains noisy queries (*e.g.*, *This does not provide enough information for an answer to be provided.*), which are unfiltered artifacts generated by large language models. In this case, we manually filter similar expressions.

B Outline Sampling Comparison

To identify the effectiveness of sequentially generating candidate outlines at once, we generate candidate outlines using temperature sampling. As shown in Table 5, sequential generation meaningfully diversifies candidate outlines than temperature sampling. Similar results are obtained when we increase the sampling temperature.

⁷Apache 2.0 License

⁸MIT License

⁹MIT License

C² Query:

When was the museum of islamic art built? Since I'm already familiar with who the lead architect of the Museum of Islamic Art was and their design vision, focus on providing the construction date without delving into architectural design specifics.

Parsed Outline (Sampling Temperature 1.0):

- 3.2. Which construction company undertook the building of the Museum of Islamic Art, and in which year did they commence work?
 - 3.2.1. What firm was responsible for the construction of the Museum of Islamic Art, and when did they start ?
 - 3.2.2. Can you identify the construction firm that built the Museum of Islamic Art and the year construction began?
 - 3.2.3. Who constructed the Museum of Islamic Art, and in what year did construction efforts begin?
 - 3.3. What were the financial and logistical challenges in constructing the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 3.3.1. What budgetary constraints affected the construction of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 3.3.2. What logistical hurdles were encountered during the building of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 3.3.3. In constructing the Museum of Islamic Art, what were the major financial and logistical issues
 3. Who contributed to the design and construction of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 3.2. Which construction company undertook the building of the Museum of Islamic Art, and in which year did they commence work?
 - 3.2.1. What firm was responsible for the construction of the Museum of Islamic Art, and when did they start ?
 - 3.2.2. Can you identify the construction firm that built the Museum of Islamic Art and the year construction began?
-

Candidate Outlines (Sequential Generation):

2. When did the Museum of Islamic Art open to the public?
 - 2.1. What is the official opening date of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 2.1.1. On which date was the Museum of Islamic Art inaugurated?
 - 2.1.2. When was the grand opening of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 1. What is the construction date of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 1.2. Who was the architect behind the Museum of Islamic Art design, and in what year did the construction take place under their guidance?
 - 1.2.1. What is the name of the architect who designed the Museum of Islamic Art, and during which year was their design realized ?
 - 1.2.3. In what year did construction of the Museum of Islamic Art occur under the designated architect 's design?
 3. Who contributed to the design and construction of the Museum of Islamic Art?
 - 3.2. Which construction company undertook the building of the Museum of Islamic Art, and in which year did they commence work?
 - 3.2.1. What firm was responsible for the construction of the Museum of Islamic Art, and when did they start ?
 - 3.2.3. Who constructed the Museum of Islamic Art, and in what year did construction efforts begin?
-

Table 5: Comparison of temperature sampling and sequential generation of candidate outlines.

C Example of QTREE

C² Query:

Describe the film The Woman Hunt. Since I'm already familiar with how audiences and critics received The Woman Hunt, please avoid discussing reviews or reception in your explanation.

QTREE:

1. What is the plot of The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.1. What are the main events in The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.1.1. What initiates the conflict in The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.1.2. What is the climax of The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.1.3. How does The Woman Hunt end?
 - 1.2. Who are the main characters in The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.2.1. Who is the protagonist of The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.2.2. Who is the antagonist in The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.2.3. What supporting characters play crucial roles in The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.3. What themes are explored in The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.3.1. What is the primary theme of The Woman Hunt?
 - 1.3.2. How does The Woman Hunt explore gender dynamics?
 - 1.3.3. What messages does The Woman Hunt convey about survival?
 2. Who directed The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.1. What is the directorial style of The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.1.1. How does the director use camera angles in The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.1.2. What unique directorial choices are made in The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.1.3. How does the pace affect the narrative in The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.2. What other films has the director of The Woman Hunt made?
 - 2.2.1. What are the most popular films by The Woman Hunt's director?
 - 2.2.2. How do other films by the director compare to The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.2.3. What recurring themes appear in the director's filmography?
 - 2.3. How has the director's background influenced The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.3.1. What aspects of the director's personal life reflect in The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.3.2. How does the director's cultural background inform The Woman Hunt?
 - 2.3.3. What previous experiences of the director shaped The Woman Hunt?
 3. How was The Woman Hunt received by audiences and critics?
 - 3.1. What are the critical reviews of The Woman Hunt?
 - 3.1.1. How do film critics analyze The Woman Hunt?
 - 3.1.2. What are the predominant critiques of The Woman Hunt?
 - 3.1.3. Are there any notable defenses of The Woman Hunt's thematic choices?
 - 3.2. What is the audience's reaction to The Woman Hunt?
 - 3.2.1. How do audience perspectives on The Woman Hunt vary?
 - 3.2.2. What aspects of The Woman Hunt resonate most with audiences?
 - 3.2.3. What fan opinions of The Woman Hunt diverge from critical reviews?
 - 3.3. Has The Woman Hunt won any awards or recognition?
 - 3.3.1. What awards or nominations has The Woman Hunt received?
 - 3.3.2. How does The Woman Hunt rank among other films of its genre?
 - 3.3.3. Are there any film festivals where The Woman Hunt was highlighted?
-

Table 6: Example of QTREE generated by the process described in Section 3.3.2.

D Analysis on Intent Operations

| | SFT | | DPO-QPLANNER | |
|------|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| | INCLUSION | EXCLUSION | INCLUSION | EXCLUSION |
| Mean | 2.85 | 2.74 | 3.22 | 3.10 |
| SD | 1.23 | 1.55 | 1.15 | 1.47 |

Table 7: Mean and standard deviation (SD) according to the intent operation in automatic outline evaluation.

We decompose the result of Table 4 according to intent operations in Table 7, focusing on SFT and DPO-QPLANNER scores. We discover that C^2 queries based on EXCLUSION score lower than those on the intent of INCLUSION. This result aligns with our assumption in Section 3.3.3, where q_{cov} with EXCLUSION operation require more complicated selection of desirable outline.

E Used Prompts

We use the following prompts in our work.

| Decomposing Base Query into QTree |
|---|
| <p>You are a subquery graph generator. Generate a numbered tree graph of given question with three-depth hierarchies. You also need to follow the instructions below:</p> <p>All keys and values should be in the form of question. Each node in the first depth should provide unique viewpoint interpreting the question. The number of siblings and leaves should be three. Output format should be a dictionary format. For example, the output should be expressed as `` `json {1. node: {1.1. node: [1.1.1. node, 1.1.2. node, 1.1.3. node], 1.2. node: ...}, 2. node: {...}, ... ```</p> <p>All subqueries should be concise, independent and self-contained from other context so that it can be used as a search query. All subqueries (keys and values, and each other) should not be overlapped.</p> <p>Question: {{base_query}} Subquery Graph:</p> |

Generating Coverage Queries Using Background Query and Intent Operation

You are an instruction generator.
Your role is to generate five self-contained instructions that relate subquestion with question.

The following is guidelines you must follow:

{{The user wants to know about the answer specifically related to the given subquestion. Therefore, generated instructions MUST ask to include topics of the subquestion.}} OR {{The user already knows about the answer to the given subquestion. Therefore, generated instructions MUST require to exclude topics of the subquestion.}}

Each instruction should be clear and concise. Moreover, please use various expressions for including/excluding specific topics. Each instruction should not contract with Question. Make sure to generate instructions that can be naturally connected after Question. Instructions should be written from a first person's viewpoint. For example, the instruction can start as 'Since I know/do not know about ..., you need to ...' Five instructions should be easily separated by "&&", without any numbering or bullet points.

Question: {{base_query}}

Subquestion: {{background_query}}

Instructions:

Parsing Outlines from QTree

You are a subtree parser.

Your role is to extract three json-formatted subtrees based on a full question tree, which is generated based on the root question "{{base_query}}"

Here is guidelines you must follow:

You should parse subtrees maintaining the original tree structure. Keys sharing the same parent node are allowed to parse, but completely separated keys are not allowed.

The first subtree should follow both 'Rule' and 'Instruction'. On the other hand, the second and the third subtree should follow 'Rule', but not necessarily 'Instruction'. The total number of nodes in each subtree should be 4. Subtrees should be separated with '&&' for easy parsing.

Tree: {{qtree}}

Rule: {{Include/Exclude the node ### in the subtree.}}

Instruction: {{coverage_query}}

Subtree:

Scoring Candidate Outlines Using Large Language Model

Your role is to evaluate the quality of subqueries generated from given query.

Query: {{coverage_conditioned_query}}

Subqueries:

{{list_of_search_queries}}

* Evaluation aspects

Instruction following: How accurately do the subqueries adhere to and execute the specific instructions provided?

* Scale

You should evaluate each aspect as a five-scale score metrics. Score 5 means that subqueries are highly following the evaluation aspects.

* Answer format

You should return a JSON-formatted response as demonstrated in the example.

Example: ``json {"rationale": "YOUR_RATIONALE_STRING", "score": YOUR_SCORE_INTEGER}```

Lastly, do not generate any other statements except for requested format.

QPlanner Input

Create a three-level deep query graph that expands on the knowledge related to the provided question. Next, identify and extract a subsection of this graph that most effectively answers the question, ensuring this subsection retains a tree-like structure and includes four distinct nodes.
Question: {{coverage_conditioned_query}}

Generating Response with Retrieved Documents (QPlanner for Search Query)

As an experienced writing assistant, your task is to generate an answer to the given query. Structure your answer in Markdown, employing elements like headings, subheadings, bullet points, and bold text for clarity and organization. Your response should strictly rely on the given evidence, so do not respond with information that is not given. In that case, just mention there is no evidence for that query.

QUERY: {{coverage_conditioned_query}}

EVIDENCE:

TITLE: {{title_1}}

CONTENT: {{content_1}}

...

RESPONSE:

Generating Response with Retrieved Documents (Qplanner for Search Query & Content Draft)

As an experienced writing assistant, your task is to generate an answer to the given query. Structure your answer in Markdown, employing elements like headings, subheadings, bullet points, and bold text for clarity and organization. Your response should strictly rely on the given evidence, so do not respond with information that is not given. In that case, just mention there is no evidence for that query. Also, there are subqueries that help answer the main query. You can use subtopics of subqueries as headers and the corresponding evidence as contents if they are useful to answer the main query.

QUERIES:

- Main Query: {{coverage_conditioned_query}}

- Subquery 1: {{query_1}}

- Subquery 2: {{query_2}}

- Subquery 3: {{query_3}}

- Subquery 4: {{query_4}}

EVIDENCE:

TITLE: {{title_1}}

CONTENT: {{content_1}}

SOURCE: {{query_used_to_search_this_document}}

...

RESPONSE:

F Training Details

| Hyperparameter | SFT | DPO |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|
| Epoch | 1 | 1 |
| Batch Size Per Device | 14 | 8 |
| Learning Rate (LR) | 2e-5 | 5e-7 |
| LR Schedule | Cosine | Cosine |
| Warmup Ratio | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Gradient Accumulation Step | 1 | 2 |
| Beta | - | 0.01 |
| # of Samples | 31,488 | 8,568 |

Table 8: Hyperparameters for training QPLANNER. A few noisy samples are filtered in advance at SFT stage.

We utilize publicly available software¹⁰ in our finetuning and alignment stage. We train each stage one epoch using 16 NVIDIA A100 GPUs (40GB of memory). Table 8 describes detailed hyperparameters for each stage.

G Additional Information on Human Evaluation

We conduct two human evaluation studies separately. For both studies, crowd workers are recruited from Prolific¹¹. At the beginning of the evaluation, workers are informed what task they are expected to do, there are no foreseeable benefits and risks, their participation is voluntary, and they can leave if they want (see Figure 5).

G.1 Outline Evaluation

| Score Rubric |
|--|
| 1: The sub-questions/responses entirely disregards the instructions , providing content unrelated to the instruction . |
| 2: The sub-questions/responses show a superficial attempt to follow instructions but significantly strays from the intended task , missing key objectives . |
| 3: The sub-questions/responses generally adheres to the instructions but overlooks certain details or nuances, achieving only a partial match with the instruction . |
| 4: The sub-questions/responses is closely aligned with the instructions , exhibiting minor deviations that slightly affect the completeness of the execution . |
| 5: The sub-questions/responses exhibits impeccable adherence to the instructions , capturing all nuances and completing the task as specified . |

Table 9: Score rubric for evaluating subqueries and responses in human evaluation.

A total of 127 crowd workers participate in the evaluation (Gender: 68 men, 57 women, and 2 non-binary; Age: Mean=28.6 yrs, SD=7.9 yrs, Min=18 yrs, Max=63 yrs; Ethnicity: White: 69, Black: 44, Mixed: 11, and Asian:2; Country of residence: South Africa: 52 (41.27%), Portugal: 20 (15.87%), Poland: 10 (7.94%), United Kingdom: 5 (3.97%), Mexico: 5 (3.97%), and 19 other countries; Highest education level completed: A majority of the evaluators hold at least a Bachelor’s degree (n=83, 65.87%).

¹⁰<https://github.com/huggingface/alignment-handbook>

¹¹<https://www.prolific.com/>

Individual crowd workers evaluate different numbers of instances depending on their availability. They are compensated 9 GBP/hour for their work. We paid 606.41 GBP in total.

They score each sample by following the rubric in Table 9. We engage evaluators by asking them to write at least 30 characters to describe their rationale for preference, which also helps evaluators take the rating more seriously and derive more rational and accurate ratings. We also provide an evaluation session with no more than evaluating 5 outlines considering the human attention span. If evaluators want to continue participating, they have to sign up for another evaluation session, which ensures they have a break for recharging themselves. Lastly, we utilize Prolific’s offering that automatically rejects work that takes too long or too short, above or below two standard deviations of the average completion time.

G.2 Response Evaluation

| Search Query Evaluation | | | Content Draft Evaluation | | |
|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Vanilla RAG | QPLANNER-DPO | | QPLANNER-SFT | QPLANNER-DPO | |
| | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory |
| Unsatisfactory | 179 | 606 | Unsatisfactory | 130 | 271 |
| Satisfactory | 60 | 155 | Satisfactory | 207 | 392 |

Note: The sum of the counts in the contingency tables is 1000 (100 queries evaluated by 10 workers) for each evaluation, respectively.

Table 10: Contingency tables for human study in response evaluation

A total of 63 crowd workers participate in the evaluation (Gender: 33 men and 30 women; Age: Mean=28.08 yrs, SD=9.01 yrs, Min=19 yrs, Max=68 yrs; Ethnicity: White: 26, Black: 22, Mixed: 10, and Asian: 5; Country of residence: South Africa: 20 (15.87%), Portugal: 10 (7.94%), Mexico: 8 (6.35%), Poland: 6 (4.76%), Canada: 4 (3.17%), and 11 other countries; Highest education level completed: A majority of the evaluators hold at least a Bachelor’s degree (n=49, 77.78%). Individual crowd workers evaluate different numbers of instances depending on their availability. They are compensated 9 GBP/hour for their work. We pay 878.58 GBP in total.

We offer ten single sessions for evaluation (5 sessions for Vanilla RAG vs. QPLANNER-DPO and 5 sessions for QPLANNER-SFT vs. QPLANNER-DPO). Each session has ten evaluators. If wanted, evaluators can participate in more than one session; thirteen out of 63 evaluated multiple sessions. A session takes 20 to 40 minutes. In a session, evaluators are first provided with a short tutorial with evaluation guidelines and examples. Then, they evaluate a pair of responses that answer the same query for twenty queries. They are told that all of the queries are formatted as [question] (q_{base}) + [instruction] (q_{cov}) and asked to mark a response “Satisfactory” if the response satisfies any of the two evaluation items: (1) the response indeed answers the question [question] with evidence or partial evidence, which includes “there is no evidence but here is useful information,” and (2) the response follows the instruction, [instruction], and mark it “Unsatisfactory” otherwise. If all of the two responses to the same query are rated “Satisfactory,” they were asked to choose which one was a better answer (155 cases in Search Query Evaluation and 392 cases in Response Outline Evaluation; refer to Table 10). We describe a better answer would have more items described above satisfied, or it would be better at following the instruction.

G.2.1 Document Retrieval

For simulating RAG pipeline, we utilize DuckDuckgo¹² to search relevant documents. To balance the number of documents, top-10 documents are retrieved in Vanilla RAG, and top-2 documents are retrieved for queries (*i.e.*, $2 * 5 = 10$ documents including C² query) in QPLANNER-SFT and QPLANNER-DPO. Additionally, we follow the *associative selection* process, suggested in Lee et al. (2023), to extract relevant evidence paragraph from retrieved documents. Specifically, we construct FLAN-T5-Large (Chung et al., 2024) trained with Wikipedia-based datasets such as MS-MARCO (Bajaj et al., 2018), ELI5 (Fan et al.,

¹²<https://serpapi.com/duckduckgo-search-api>

2019), ASQA (Stelmakh et al., 2022), and Qasper (Dasigi et al., 2021). The trained language model matches passages in each document with given queries and returns answerability score deciding whether the paired query and passage are relevant. We select top-1 passage for each document as an evidence for generating RAG response.

You are invited to participate in a research study that aims to understand and develop user-preferred answering options for common-sense questions.

TIME: Your participation will take approximately 40 minutes.

PAYMENT: You will receive your compensation for study completion.

TASK: You will judge how satisfactory a large language model's answer is, and choose a better answer out of two answers.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no foreseeable risks or benefits to you associated with this study.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this study, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time. The alternative is not to participate. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Protocol Director, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Figure 5: Initial information provided to participants in our human study.