

# Retrieval-Enhanced Machine Learning: Synthesis and Opportunities

TO EUN KIM, Carnegie Mellon University, United States

ALIREZA SALEMI, University of Massachusetts Amherst, United States

ANDREW DROZDOV\*, University of Massachusetts Amherst, United States

FERNANDO DIAZ, Carnegie Mellon University, United States

HAMED ZAMANI, University of Massachusetts Amherst, United States

In the field of language modeling, models augmented with retrieval components have emerged as a promising solution to address several challenges faced in the natural language processing (NLP) field, including knowledge grounding, interpretability, and scalability. Despite the primary focus on NLP, we posit that the paradigm of retrieval-enhancement can be extended to a broader spectrum of machine learning (ML) such as computer vision, time series prediction, and computational biology. Therefore, this work introduces a formal framework of this paradigm, Retrieval-Enhanced Machine Learning (REML), by synthesizing the literature in various domains in ML with consistent notations which is missing from the current literature. Also, we found that while a number of studies employ retrieval components to augment their models, there is a lack of integration with foundational Information Retrieval (IR) research. We bridge this gap between the seminal IR research and contemporary REML studies by investigating each component that comprises the REML framework. Ultimately, the goal of this work is to equip researchers across various disciplines with a comprehensive, formally structured framework of retrieval-enhanced models, thereby fostering interdisciplinary future research.

CCS Concepts: • **Information systems** → **Information retrieval**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Machine learning**

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Information Retrieval, Machine Learning

## 1 Introduction

**Background.** In recent years, the research landscape surrounding large language models (LLMs) has witnessed substantial growth, underscored by the profound potential these models hold for various natural language processing (NLP) tasks. One of the significant advancements that has propelled this field forward is the scaling of the number of parameters of LLMs, which has enabled the training of models with unprecedented size and complexity [267]. We witness a similar trend in other fields adjacent to machine learning, for example, large vision foundation models for representing images and videos [5, 40]. Concurrently, the notion of in-context learning (ICL) [39] has emerged as a transformative capability, allowing LLMs to dynamically adapt and incorporate new information during its inference. In parallel, the information retrieval (IR) community has been actively exploring techniques aimed at improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and robustness of accessing information from large-scale collections.

The convergence of these two domains has given rise to a new trend in research, where models are equipped with retrieval capabilities to access external knowledge during both training and inference stages [148, 257]. This integration of retrieval mechanisms into the prediction pipeline started to gain significant traction, as it allows models to ground their predictions in external knowledge without necessitating an increase in model capacity. Methods presented by Hashemi et al. [68] and Lewis et al. [123] are among the earliest work in this space; the former focuses on retrieval-augmented representation learning by extending the transformer network, while the latter studies the paradigm of retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) for knowledge-intensive language tasks. That said, using retrieval results to improve a machine learning systems is not new. Pseudo-relevance feedback methods—methods for representing search queries using the top retrieved documents—are perhaps the first set of methods in this category [10, 30]. The ICL ability inherent in the LLMs has played a pivotal role in facilitating the dissemination and adoption of these retrieval-augmented approaches. By integrating retrieved documents into the prompt of the LLMs, researchers have been able to harness the external knowledge sources without fundamentally altering the underlying model architecture.

**Motivation.** Since improving model performance by increasing the number of parameters is not sustainable, one motivation of retrieval-based models stems from the finding that, while large models tend to memorize training data [17], incorporating retrieval-based methods can effectively transfer the burden of memorization to external storage systems [14, 198]. We advocate for enhancing machine learning (ML) models in general (i.e., beyond generation) with the ability to employ stored information via

\*Now at Databricks.

Notation	Description	Notation	Description
$x$	input instance	$d$	retrieval item
$\mathcal{X}$	input space	$\mathcal{D}$	retrieval space
$y$	output target	$\mathcal{D}_{\text{key}}$	retrieval key space
$\mathcal{Y}$	output space	$C$	stored retrievable items
$L$	labeled data (i.e., $L \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ )	$q$	query
$U$	unlabeled data (i.e., $U \subset \mathcal{X}$ )	$Q$	query space
$\mathcal{L}$	The downstream loss function	$r$	retrieval results
$f_{\theta}$	a predictive machine learning model parameterized by $\theta$	$\mathcal{R}$	retrieval result space
$g_{\omega}$	a retrieval model parameterized by $\omega$	$s$	model feedback
$\mathcal{M}$	a tuple of predictive and retrieval model	$\mathcal{S}$	model feedback space
		$\mu$	evaluation metric

Table 1. Notations used in this paper to synthesize REML research.

information retrieval techniques. IR has already shown its merits in aiding human interaction with vast text databases. We posit that IR’s utility can be broadened to enable machine access to not only extensive text databases but also to knowledge represented in more abstract forms. By integrating ML architectures with direct access to IR systems, we aim to separate the processes of reasoning and memory. Zamani et al. [257] dubbed this approach, *retrieval-enhanced machine learning (REML)*, as a broader concept that extends ML. Extending their work, we further survey the recent advances of REML in the field of ML, including NLP, with consistent mathematical notation. By doing so, we aim to equip researchers with a comprehensive and structured overview of the REML methodologies, enabling them to swiftly embark on research within this domain.

**Applications of REML.** The landscape of REML paradigm encompasses a diverse array of sub-domains, each with its unique set of challenges and applications. This includes seminal work in language modeling [14, 66, 83, 84, 100, 123, 125, 176, 199, 223, 270], machine translation [99], question answering [18, 22, 106, 119, 120, 154, 236, 252, 265], fact verification [20, 123, 164], open domain [111, 202, 211] and task-oriented [45, 155, 175, 213] dialog systems, slot filling [56], state tracking [109], reinforcement learning [26, 49, 57, 79], computer vision [21, 177, 201, 249], multimodal ML [47, 81], commonsense reasoning [254], evidence attribution [53, 54, 80, 146], knowledge-graph augmentation [11, 77, 94, 228, 252, 263], personalization [185, 186], mathematical problem-solving [244], code generation [226, 261, 273], representation learning for audio and speech [128, 192, 272], time series prediction [90, 240, 246], robot navigation and embodiment [3, 237], chip design [26], medical reasoning [85], drug discovery [132], and protein structure prediction [29, 95]. The industry and open source communities have swiftly embraced the adoption of retrieval-based models, recognizing their potential for accelerated adaptation and performance enhancement. Frameworks such as LangChain,<sup>1</sup> LlamaIndex,<sup>2</sup> and DSPy [102] have emerged, streamlining the process of implementing the retrieval-based models. This broad spectrum of domains (not an exhaustive list) underscores the versatility and impact of the REML paradigm across diverse applications.

**Main Contributions of This Work.** Although many current applications are centered around natural language processing, we believe that ML models that leverage retrieval components are not confined to language models alone, but can be extended to any ML models. To address this broader applicability, we formalize the framework as Retrieval-Enhanced Machine Learning (REML) and synthesize existing studies with consistent mathematical notations which is lacking in the current literature. Throughout this paper, we consistently use the notations described in Table 1. Also, despite the advancements in REML models, there remains a significant underutilization of the rich and extensive body of work from information retrieval research which can offer numerous methodologies and insights that can substantially benefit REML models. This work aims to bridge this gap by integrating IR research into the design of REML models. Ultimately, we hope this work will enable researchers across various fields leveraging ML to easily understand the framework of REML and its extensibility.

## 2 Retrieval-Enhanced Machine Learning

To begin an in-depth exploration of retrieval-enhanced machine learning (REML), we commence with reiterating the generalized formal definition of the task set by Zamani et al. [257]. Like all predictive machine learning frameworks, subsequently referred to

<sup>1</sup><https://www.langchain.com>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.llamaindex.ai>




Fig. 1. Retrieval-enhanced machine learning models should implement three necessary requirements (querying, retrieval, and response utilization) and may implement two optional properties (storing information and providing feedback to the information access model). This results in four categories of REML models presented above. Figure is taken from [257].

as ML models, REML is tasked with learning a functional relationship that maps an input space  $\mathcal{X}$  to an output space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Unlike other ML models, REML predicts outcomes through interactions with one or more information access models, each facilitating access to a database or repository of knowledge. Hence, REML is formally articulated as  $y = f_{\theta}(x; g_{\omega_1}, g_{\omega_2}, \dots, g_{\omega_N})$ , where  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  symbolize the input instance and target output respectively,  $f_{\theta}$  represents an ML model parameterized by  $\theta$ , and  $g_{\omega_i}$  represents an information access model parameterized by  $\omega_i$ . Here,  $N$  signifies the total number of information access models that  $f_{\theta}$  can consult with. Each  $g_{\omega_i}$  is associated with a collection, repository, or memory  $C_i$ , which might consist of natural language texts or alternative indexed representations. Consequently, the collection  $C_i$  serves as a versatile array of parameters available to  $g_{\omega_i}$ , which may be employed *ad hoc*, in the same way as many non-parametric and lazy learning techniques. Zamani et al. [257] outlines three *necessary* (Reqs) and *optional* (Opts) requirements for REML models.

- Req 1 **Querying**. Every  $f_{\theta}$  should possess a capability to generate queries that are dependent on the input, directed towards  $g_{\omega_i}$ s. Refer to §3.
- Req 2 **Retrieval**. Every  $g_{\omega_i}$  must be capable of processing the queries from  $f_{\theta}$ , fetching pertinent information from its corresponding repository  $C_i$ . Refer to §4.
- Req 3 **Response Utilization**. Every  $f_{\theta}$  should utilize the information obtained from  $g_{\omega_i}$ s in its prediction-making process. Refer to §5.
- Opt 1 **Storing**.  $f_{\theta}$  may archive some information in  $C_i$  for later retrieval, applicable during both training and inference. Refer to §6.
- Opt 2 **Feedback**.  $f_{\theta}$  may have the functionality to offer feedback to  $g_{\omega_i}$ , during the training and inference for improvements of either  $f_{\theta}$ ,  $g_{\omega_i}$ , or both. Refer to §7.

The simplest form of REML model is depicted in Figure 1(a) by focusing solely on the essential criteria. The second category, illustrated in Figure 1(b), utilizes the first optional property by storing information in a storage for subsequent retrieval. The third category, presented in Figure 1(c), employs the second optional property, offering feedback to the information access models. The final category incorporates all optional properties, as detailed in Figure 1(d).

Based on the requirements, Zamani et al. [257] proposed a comprehensive framework for REML, as illustrated in Figure 2. This framework is structured around two principal components: the prediction model  $f_{\theta}$  and the information retrieval models  $g_{\omega_i}$ s. For any given input  $x$ , the predictive model  $f_{\theta}$  has the flexibility to initiate multiple retrieval operations. This could involve dispatching multiple queries, engaging with numerous data repositories, offering feedback to the information retrieval components, or employing a mix of these strategies. It's noteworthy that for certain inputs, the number of retrieval processes might be nil, thereby allowing REML to extend the conventional predictive modeling.

### 3 Querying

In REML, the process of acquiring information hinges upon the act of querying a knowledge or information repository. Consequently, the formulation of a query from the input, whether unstructured or structured, stands as the pivotal initiation point for the interplay between predictive and retrieval models within the REML framework. The following sections introduce common operations employed to generate queries based on the task's input.




Fig. 2. A generic framework for REML [257]. The multiplicative nature of the information access process implies that the access to the information can be distributed and/or be done iteratively. Note that each component do not have to be completely separated, e.g., Query Generation or Response Processing module can be dealt within the Predictive Model. In abstract, however, we consider them as one of the components of information access process that can be described separately.

### 3.1 Deciding Where to Query

Before sending a query to an information access system, a REML system can decide where its query should be sent to. Bearing in mind that each  $g_{\omega_i}$  is associated with  $C_i$  (multiplicative nature of information access process depicted in Figure 2), the Query Generation module first decides which tuple(s) of  $g_{\omega_i}$  and  $C_i$  should be selected depending on the context which aligns with the mixture-of-expert-like interpretation described by Pan et al. [160]<sup>3</sup>. This *query decision* problem can be understood by the following sub-problems. 1) *Corpus Selection*: deciding which corpora are needed to be searched over (can be null when no retrieval is needed), and 2) *Retriever Selection*: deciding which retrieval model should be used to search over the chosen corpora.

**3.1.1 Corpus Selection.** Selecting  $C_i$  is not only regarded with deciding what kind of external information should be provided to the  $f_{\theta}$  [160] but also encompasses the question of *when to query* (no corpus selection when no retrieval is beneficial to  $f_{\theta}$ ). This can be a critical question as retrieval augmentation can hurt the performance for certain input types [9, 138, 141]. It also can save computational resources by reducing the number of searching [114]. There can be several criteria on whether external information can be beneficial to the predictive model. It can be based on term popularity [141], input complexity [86], or a trained model [9].

**3.1.2 Retriever Selection.** Once one or more  $C_i$  is selected, a REML system can further benefit itself by choosing the optimal retriever specialized in searching the selected corpora. This is a relatively challenging and new task, and we refer readers to Khramtsova et al. [104, 105] for deeper understanding.

### 3.2 Reformulating the Input

For many cases, raw user input cannot be directly leveraged as a query to the retrieval model, underscoring the critical need for input reformulation into a different representation. This reformulation occurs through a process, where the input is transformed using a separate component or the same predictive model based on the specific requirements of the system. The general equation for transformation is

$$q = \text{transform}_q(x, \text{context}) \quad (1)$$

where  $x$  is the input that the transformation should be applied on (i.e., the original input to the task, the previous search query, the output of another transformation, etc.) and  $\text{context}$  is side information that this function can use in performing the transformation. For example, one of the use cases of  $\text{context}$  can be a user profile, which can help personalize this transformation for a user [186]. Common motivations for transforming the input into an alternative format encompass a range of factors, including but not limited to truncation, expansion, and conversion.

**3.2.1 Compression.** In certain scenarios, not all words or components of the input prove relevant for the search objective. Consequently, the common practice of omitting specific segments of the input has been employed in numerous prior studies. In the majority of cases, sequence-to-sequence models are trained to identify and mark the segments that require reduction [101, 153, 157, 242]. At times, a straightforward approach such as segmenting the input into distinct chunks and utilizing these

<sup>3</sup>In KiC [160], a router selects an expert predictive model (not a retriever) with specific knowledge source. However, this helps the understanding of the first step of the Query Generation module.

segments as queries can be highly effective [14]. In multi-modal search scenarios, omitting a specific modality from the input and conducting searches across a corpus from different modalities has proven to be valuable [61].

**3.2.2 Expansion.** In certain scenarios, the input alone may lack essential information required by the search system to yield desired results. In such situations, augmenting the input with additional pertinent data can be done. This process of expansion broadens the context and enhances the search system’s capability to retrieve relevant and meaningful results, thereby improving overall system performance. Typically, expansion is achieved by concatenating the input with previously retrieved results [238, 274] or generated text that is conditioned on the input [27, 131, 142, 220].

**3.2.3 Conversion.** For some situations, reshaping the input into a new query based on its inherent structure, instead of mere expansion, is proved to be advantageous. This approach is particularly valuable when crafting structured queries for database [4, 41] and API access [89, 159, 170, 195].

The conversion operation may results in a transformation of the input space  $\mathcal{X}$  into the query space  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Consequently, it is essential to note that  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $\mathcal{X}$  are not necessarily equivalent, signifying that the transformed queries might operate in a distinct space compared to the original input. In complex multi-modal search scenarios, employing the input directly might not be viable. Consequently, transforming the input into a different modality form becomes imperative, ensuring seamless and efficient communication between the predictive model and the search system [52, 129, 130, 184, 232].

Moreover, transforming the input from the original input space into the latent space of a language model and retrieving information from the model’s prior interactions with data, like what happens in kNN-LM [100], represent additional transformations that alter the query space [23, 70, 98, 99, 250]. Indeed, Neural Turing Machines [59, 63, 173] and Memory Transformers [217, 234, 270] employ a similar conversion process to translate input into a latent variable. This transformation is essential for enabling effective retrieval from the memory/storage component of these models.

### 3.3 Decomposing the Input

This category involves breaking down a complex input into simpler parts, often to better understand the content and retrieve more accurate results. This technique is particularly useful when dealing with long and complex inputs that cover multiple topics or concepts [150, 163, 271]. The general equation for decomposition is

$$Q = \text{decompose}(x, \text{context}) \quad (2)$$

where  $x$  is the input that should be decomposed (i.e., the original input to the task, the output of a transformation, etc.),  $\text{context}$  is side information that this function can use in performing the decomposition, and  $Q$  is the set of decomposed queries. Note that decomposition returns a set of queries in contrast with the transformation operation which only returns a single query.

### 3.4 Unified Equation for Query Generation

The unified equation for query generation is therefore

$$Q = \text{decompose}(\text{transform}_q(x, \text{context}), \text{context}) \quad (3)$$

Any of these function can be replaced with the identity function [6, 66, 83, 96, 123, 123, 212, 243] disregarding modality [172, 187]. Furthermore, it is conceivable to apply these functions multiple times and in various order. Particularly in the realm of multi-hop question answering and fact verification, prior research extensively employs multiple transformations and decompositions to fulfill the task requirements [33, 88, 169, 214, 241]. Given the intricacies of these tasks, leveraging a combination of various transforms and decompositions becomes essential.

## 4 Searching

Depending on the nature of the documents, the queries, and the tasks, different search functionalities are required and expected. For instance, in some task-oriented dialogue systems,  $f_\theta$  (conversational agent) requires access to relational databases. Therefore, in such scenarios, structured queries like SQL is used for searching. That being said, retrieval items in most applications are in the form of semi-structured or unstructured text or involve multi-modal aspects. In the following, we review different retrieval models for the various situations.

#### 4.1 Retrieval Models with Sparse Representations

Many text-based retrieval models use sparse representations for representing queries and documents. For instance, term-matching (lexical) retrieval models, such as TF-IDF [190], BM25 [178], and query likelihood [166], represent each query and document using a  $V$ -dimensional sparse vector, where  $V$  denotes the vocabulary size. In these models, the dimensions associated with the terms that appear in the given text carry non-zero values and the rest are zero. Most of these models are based on the term independent, or the bag-of-words assumption. That being said, models that consider term position and ordering exist, such as higher-order language models [204], positional language models [134], and sequential dependency models [147].

The sparsity nature of data in these retrieval models enable them to use an inverted index data structure for scalable and efficient retrieval. Note that these models often suffer from a vocabulary mismatch problem, meaning that using different vocabulary for representing the same concept in the query and document does not contribute to the estimated relevance score. This can significantly impact the performance of  $g_{\omega}$ , especially from the recall perspective. Query expansion and document expansion approaches exist to address the vocabulary mismatch problem, including the pseudo-relevance feedback models [118, 179, 260]. Neural network solutions for expanding the documents, such as SPLADE [50], has shown promising results when sufficiently large-scale training data is available.

An alternative to lexical representation is using latent vectors. For instance, SNRM [256] learns high-dimensional sparse latent vectors produced by deep learning models for representing queries and documents.

#### 4.2 Retrieval Models with Dense Representations

Queries and documents can be represented using low-dimensional (compared to the vocabulary size) dense vectors. Such dense vectors are often obtained using pre-trained language models, such as BERT [37], that are fine-tuned for retrieval tasks [96]. Dense retrieval models are commonly based on bi-encoder architectures – one encoder for representing the query and another for the document. These encoders could share parameters. Some dense retrieval methods, such as DPR [96], represent each query or document by a single dense vector. While others, such as ColBERT [103], use one vector per token, resulting in multiple vectors for each query and document. Approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) algorithms, such as HNSW [140], are used for efficient retrieval when dealing with dense representations. Dense retrieval approaches are also commonly used when dealing with multi-media and multi-modal data [172, 184].

#### 4.3 Reranking Models

Modern search engines are mainly designed based on a multi-stage cascaded architecture—a stack of ranking models where the first model efficiently retrieves a list of documents and the following models rerank the results from the previous stage. A common scenario is a two-stage process: retrieval and reranking. Reranking models are often optimized using explicit or implicit relevance labels. These models are called learning-to-rank models. Early learning-to-rank models rely on manually-extracted and engineered features sets, while the most recent ones rely on deep learning models for representation learning and reranking. A common strategy for reranking using deep learning models is called cross encoding [158], meaning that a query and a candidate document are concatenated and fed to a network like BERT [37], which is trained (or fine-tuned) to produce a relevance score. Learning-to-rank models can be optimized using pointwise, pairwise, or listwise loss functions. For more information, refer to the learning-to-rank survey by Liu [133] and the neural ranking model surveys by Mitra and Craswell [152] and Guo et al. [64].

#### 4.4 Generative Retrieval Models

Generative retrieval models, or differentiable search indexes, adopt an encoder-decoder or a decoder-only neural network architecture with the goal of generating document identifiers given the query. Even though earlier attempts to developing these models [209] fail at performing effectively at scale [168], recent research by Zeng et al. [259] developed prefix-oriented optimization approaches that let generative retrieval models to effectively scale up to large collections. These models often assign a semantic document identifier to each document in the collection and are optimized to generate the identifiers of relevant documents using sequential decoding algorithms, such as beam search.

#### 4.5 Unified Equation for Searching

The current literature of searching can be generalized by equations of *addressing* and *reading* borrowed from the paradigm of Neural Turing Machines (NTM) [59, 60, 173]. Before reading from the collection  $C_t$ , the model should decide which part of the collection it should attend to by addressing. The addressing can be done by comparing the query  $q_t \in Q$  (from 3) with the keys in the collection and/or by finding the location in the collection. The addressing is also used when constructing the collection which will be discussed in Section 6.

4.5.1 *Content-based addressing.* At  $t$ 'th iteration, with a slight simplification of the notation (simplifying  $C_t^i$  to  $C_t$ ), given a query  $q_t$  and a collection  $C_t$ , content-based addressing can be defined as:

$$w_t^{\text{content}} = \text{address}_{\text{content}}(q_t, C_t) = \text{topK}(\text{sort}(\text{score}(q_t, \text{transform}_s(C_t))), k) \quad (4)$$

where  $k$  is the number of relevant addresses to be selected based on the query, *score* is a scoring function, such as BM25 [178] or cosine similarity [66, 139]. The content-based address vector  $w_t^{\text{content}}$  can be exhaustively computed by pairwise comparisons of query and all elements of the collection [24, 59, 60, 193, 206, 229], accelerated [115, 229], or approximated by ANN, selecting the top  $k$  items  $d_i \in C$ , resulting in  $w_t^{\text{content}}$  with  $k$  non-zero elements [2, 100, 112, 139, 173, 235, 270]. The function  $\text{transform}_s$  may be needed when the contents in the collection cannot be readily compared with the  $q_t$ , e.g., mapping to a feature space [14, 66, 199, 229] and lexical transformation [136]. This function can be an identity function when transformation is not needed [58].

4.5.2 *Location-based addressing.* Location-based addressing lets the searching system access the corpus purely by storage location such as index without any lexical or contextual comparison between a query and the corpus. Therefore, this is often used for storing (Section 6) or recency-based retrieval. Thus,

$$w_t^{\text{location}} = \text{address}_{\text{location}}(q_t, \text{context}) \quad (5)$$

where *context* is the side information that this function can use in generating the location based address (e.g., previous generated addresses by this function). For some applications, both content- and location-based addressing can be used together. To this end, the final address can be defined as:

$$w_t = \text{combine}(w_t^{\text{location}}, w_t^{\text{content}}) \quad (6)$$

where *combine* is a function that generates an address based on the location-based and content-based addresses. For example, most previous work relies on either purely content-based addressing [66, 100, 173, 193] or purely location-based addressing [200, 229]. However, it is also possible to combine both content-based and location-based addressing [59, 60].

4.5.3 *Unified Equation for Searching.* With the final address vector  $w_t$ , the retrieval results  $r_t$  from  $g_\omega$  is defined as:

$$r_t = \text{read}(w_t, \text{transform}_s(C_t)), \quad (7)$$

where *read* simply selects the content from corpus in location  $w_t$  that that is transformed by the  $\text{transform}_s$ .

## 5 Presentation & Consumption

In this section we will cover two key parts of REML. **Presentation** involves not only how we define the result space  $\mathcal{R}$ , but also how the results from retrieval are prepared for the next step of consumption. Based on the application, the presentation stage can range from simple copying of the results to more complex pipelines with intermediate preprocessing and model-based transformations. **Consumption** is the process through which the predictive model ( $f_\theta$ ) incorporates the retrieved information. There are many considerations when designing effective methods for presentation and consumption. One typically wants to incorporate as much information as possible while balancing the tradeoffs between efficiency and accuracy.

### 5.1 Presentation

When presenting search results to a human reader the interface is designed to make the findings easily consumed such as through sorting items by relevance or highlighting salient snippets [230]. In REML, we follow a similar principle except the target consumer

of the retrieved data is a machine, which has a different set of limitations and capabilities. Table 2 summarizes the research related to presentation.

**5.1.1 Transforming the data.** Dependent on the task and source of data, the result data will be incomplete prior to consumption. The transformation of data is a general and powerful process that converts data through a separate model depending on the needs of the system. Common reasons requiring further data transformation include decontextualization, translation, and summarization among others, thus  $r$  can be transformed by the following equation:

$$r' = \text{transform}_p(r) \quad (8)$$

*Decontextualization.* When the retrieved item is only a few sentences of a much larger document, then it may require *decontextualization* to resolve anaphora or previously defined abbreviation [156].

*Translation.* It may be the case that search operates in a cross-lingual representation space, and there will be a mismatch in language between the retrieved items and desired output language [117]. A multilingual language model may be robust to code switching in the retrieved context, but it will likely be more reliable to translate any retrieved documents before processing them for prediction [87, 162]. Translation can be applied to other modalities, such as regenerating an image to match an expected style.

*Summarization.* Due to possible context limits of predictive model, it is desirable to condense document data so that more documents can fit into the context. This can be achieved through automatic summarization, converting the original data into a shortened form through an extractive or abstractive process [54, 107, 124, 239]. Furthermore, data can be summarized in the context of the input, providing clarity and explaining why the document is relevant.

**5.1.2 Combining result items.** To further optimize the presentation of the result items for size or clarity, multiple items can be combined, e.g., summarizing all items jointly [194, 233]. Not all REML systems will combine items, as operating over individual items can be efficient and effective. Furthermore, combining items may lead to complications such as miscalibration between the individual scores and scores of a combined result, which is represented by *compose*:

$$r' = \text{compose}(r) \quad (9)$$

**5.1.3 Truncate results list.** If not all documents fit into the context for consumption, we discard or truncate documents based on these limits, optimizing for length and potentially other properties such as diversity [12, 73, 145], which is represented by *truncate*:

$$r' = \text{truncate}(r) \quad (10)$$

**5.1.4 Unified Equation for Presentation.** The full equation for presentation:

$$r' = \text{truncate}(\text{compose}(\text{transform}_p(r))) \quad (11)$$

where any of these functions can be replaced with simple forms such as an identity function [82, 83, 123]. Additionally, we can imagine these functions being applied multiple times in any order. We include this ordering as the one that seems most natural when taking into account context length limits.  $\text{transform}_p$  is on individual items, and  $\text{compose}$  is similar to  $\text{transform}_p$  but on groups of items. Not shown is *loading* of retrieved items. Unlike traditional ML systems, where data is typically used only for training, REML systems have unique requirements associated with data loading. Since the amount of external data required for an input is dynamic and considerable [14], efficient load and manage of data is essential [42, 65]. We assume loading is handled implicitly by the retrieval module.

## 5.2 Consumption

In REML, the predictive model is presented with one or more documents. The effectiveness of  $f_\theta$  is influenced by the *consumption* of the presented documents. Ideally,  $f_\theta$  would consume all the documents simultaneously, yet our systems are computationally limited; hence, the *granularity* of consumption is typically limited to a subset of the presented documents. Depending on the task, different *consumption algorithms* may prove varying in utility—some algorithms are used for extraction and others for on-the-fly updates of the predictive model parameters. In contrast, *decoding algorithms*, such as beam search [51] or nucleus sampling [75], provide ways to decode effective outputs given the presented documents and can incorporate verification for improved



Transform (§5.1.1)	
ALCE [54], SuRe [107] & RECOMP [239]	Explore summarization of retrieved items for compression.
Teach LLMs to Personalize [124]	Context independent and dependent summarization to emphasize key retrieved aspects.
QADecontext [156] †	Decontextualization as a downstream task when presenting passages from scientific documents.
Compose (§5.1.2)	
Fixed Chunking [233]	Recursively summarizes adjacent chunks in books.
RAPTOR [194]	First clusters then summarizes related chunks of text.
Truncate (§5.1.3)	
FiD-Light [73]	Extracts vector subsets to speed up attention bottlenecks in FiD-like model decoding.
Choppy [12] †	A supervised approach to ranked list truncation.

Table 2. Instances of Presentation-related research. †: Relevant for future REML research.

effectiveness. There are additional concerns during consumption, such as efficiency [35, 73] and attribution [9, 54, 146, 196], that provide further utility. Table 3 summarizes the research related to consumption.

**5.2.1 Consumption at different granularities of retrieval items.** Typically, multiple items are retrieved and it is a design choice whether to process retrieved items separately or together. The followings are the main paradigms for consuming retrieval items:

- **Single:** Only a single item is incorporated in the prediction. This may be sufficient for simple queries, but often information will need to be combined across multiple retrieved items.
- **Ensemble:** Predictions are made for multiple retrieval items in the *single*-fashion, then aggregated [100, 199].
- **Joint:** When the prediction has a sufficiently flexible context representation, then multiple retrieval items can be passed simultaneously in a single inference procedure [83, 123]. This is potentially richer than the ensemble approach since each retrieved item is *aware* of the others. Due to computational limits, only a few retrieval items are able to be processed this way and the *ensemble*-approach is relatively more scalable.
- **Multi-round:** A hybrid approach where a subset of retrieved items are processed at a time, and the next subset incorporates information about the retrieved items processed thus far [88]. Although more scalable than the *joint*-approach, this may be slower. That being said, some applications (e.g. dialogue) naturally conform to the *multi-round* framework.

These paradigms are atomic functions that can be composed to form more complex operations. For instance, given lists of retrieved items, denoted as  $r_0, r_1, r_2, r_3$ , the atomic functions with different granularities can be composed as:

$$y = \text{ensemble}(\text{multiround}(\text{joint}(r_0), \text{joint}(r_1)), \text{multiround}(\text{joint}(r_2), \text{joint}(r_3))), \quad (12)$$

**5.2.2 Consumption algorithms.** Independent of the choice of granularity, there are algorithms applicable for consumption. Broadly, they fall into the following categories:

- **Extractive:** The predictive model is limited to extracting exact information from the retrieved item, e.g., a span of text from a retrieve passage to answer a question [100, 116, 225]. This can be achieved through pointer networks [215], constrained decoding [74, 76, 167], and other similar techniques [106].
- **Analogical:** Learning by example, case based reasoning, and retrieve-and-edit approaches all fall under the category of analogical reasoning. Each of these involves different underlying mechanisms, but essentially the predictive model will be extrapolating from one or more demonstrative examples to make its prediction and not necessarily extracting factual knowledge from the retrieved items [32].
- **Contextual:** The predictive model incorporates the retrieved items in its context, but the decoding of the output is not constrained in any way [199].
- **Latent:** A hybrid approach where retrieved items are not incorporated directly into the context, but are instead incorporated in other ways, e.g., by merging hidden states [250]. Similar to the *contextual*-approach, decoding is not constrained.

**5.2.3 Decoding algorithms.** Independent of the *consumption algorithm*, there are different *decoding algorithms* that can be used for producing outputs in REML. The decoding algorithms explored thus far fall into the following categories:

Consumption Granularities (§5.2.1)		
kNN-LM [100]	Single + Ensemble	Probabilities are computed for each retrieved item independently then combined.
RePLUG [199]	Single + Ensemble	Probabilities are computed for each retrieved item independently then combined.
RAG [123]	Joint	Retrieved items are concatenated before consumption.
FiD [83]	Joint	Retrieved items are concatenated in the decoder during consumption.
FLARE [88]	Multi-round	Potentially retrieves new items as generation progresses.
Consumption Algorithms (§5.2.2)		
kNN-LM [100]	Extractive	A single word is selected from the retrieved context.
CoG [116]	Extractive	An extension of kNN-LM that can output both words and phrases.
FilCo [225]	Extractive	Filters out irrelevant texts from retrieved documents.
CBR [32]	Analogical	Incorporate knowledge graphs into neural models in spirit of case based reasoning.
Dynamic L2M [43]	Analogical	Retrieves demonstrations for few-shot prompting.
RePLUG [199]	Contextual	Uses retrieved items in the context.
SPALM [250]	Latent	Incorporates retrieved items into the hidden state.
Decoding Algorithms (§5.2.3)		
kNN-LM [100]	Text-only	Retrieval probability is ignored for next word prediction.
RAG [123]	Retrieval-enhanced	Retrieval probability is incorporated in beam search.
Self-RAG [9]	Retrieval-enhanced	Critic probability is incorporated in beam search.
FLARE [88]	Verification-based	Discards low confidence continuations, triggering retrieval.
Consumption Efficiency (§5.2.4)		
LUMEN [35]	Precompute	Partially computes passage representations offline.
Attribution and Extensions (§5.2.5)		
ALCE [54]	Attribution	End of sentence. Multi-source.
SemQA [196]	Attribution	Mid-sentence. Multi-source.
Self-RAG [9]	Attribution	End of sentence. Single source.
Self-RAG [9]	Verification	Outputs a special token indicating whether to use document.

Table 3. Instances of consumption research.

- Output-only: Search algorithms like beam search [51] will only consider the model output when scoring candidate predictions [100].
- Retrieval-enhanced: Search algorithms like beam search will consider both the model output and the retrieved items when scoring candidate predictions [9, 123]. This should penalize spurious associations between query and retrieved item.
- Verification-based: The initial output of the predictive model will be scrutinized by a verification module and potentially rejected if a condition is a met, e.g., the output does not entail the retrieved item [88].

5.2.4 *Consumption efficiency.* Steps can be taken in *presentation* to speed up inference, such as by compressing passages through summarization or truncating the list of retrieved items [35, 73]. There are other approaches to improve efficiency that are more tightly integrated with consumption, e.g., partially precomputing passage embeddings.

5.2.5 *Attribution and other extensions.* Advanced applications of REML will augment the predictive model output space to incorporate REML-specific information. The most common instance of this is probably to support attribution, so that each part of the output can be traced back to the relevant retrieved item [9, 54, 146, 196]. Other cases involve in-line verification or calls to external tools that would not be easily possible without incorporating retrieved items [9].

## 6 Storing

Storing is one of the optional yet crucial properties of REML models and refers to how retrievable items are saved, represented, and indexed. The storage components can be categorized into coupled and decoupled storage. If at least one external memory is optimized jointly with the predictive model, we call the architecture has *coupled storage*. In the coupled storage architecture, contents can be populated to the storage *online*, updated alongside a predictive model, e.g., Neural Turing Machines (NTM) [59, 60]

and REALM [66]. On the other hand, if all external storage are from off-the-shelf system, and the contents are populated *offline*, we call the architecture has *decoupled storage*, e.g., kNN-LM [100] and ED2LM [78].

In its simplest form, REML systems will operate with *decoupled* storage where the retrieval model is implemented independent of the predictive model. Since entries in the storage are populated offline and many off-the-shelf retrieval models are readily available, it is relatively convenient to construct the decoupled storage. On the other hand, many advanced REML systems operate with *coupled* storage where the retrieval model is directly influenced by the predictive model. Here, the entries in the storage are populated online and updated alongside the predictive models. In this section, we describe storage operations and challenges associated with the coupled and decoupled storage.

## 6.1 Primary Storage Operations

In general, there are three types of operations that each storage system must support to be effectively utilized in REML systems: *Address Generation*, *Read*, and *write*. The storage operations will typically be used in three scenarios: 1)  $f_\theta$  needs to incorporate historical context in its prediction, e.g., long context language models [13]; 2)  $f_\theta$  conducts various types of online learning using recent/past interactions, e.g., experience replay in reinforcement learning and language agents [200]; and 3)  $f_\theta$  is a memory network-like architecture [229] where retrieval is an abstract process and everything written to or read from the storage is controlled by the network which is the service of the objective being optimized.

**6.1.1 Address Generation.** An important aspect of utilizing storage in REML systems is the ability to store and retrieve specific pieces of information. Therefore, the storage system must be capable of generating a specific address for reading from or writing to the storage. Storage location can be divided into abstract location (slots in the storage space) and physical location (where in hardware the storage sits). For abstract location, it boils down to the role of  $address_{location}$ , as introduced in Section 4.5. In most cases, it will be a simple rotational function [59, 60] which allows an iteration through a sequence of slots. For better efficiency, the function can store entries into clusters by content [229] or layers [115], reducing the computation during searching. For physical location, entries that do not need to be in RAM or VRAM can be moved to a disk with memory mapping, while entries that must be in the RAM, such as embedding index to be searched, can be compressed without notable performance degradation [84].

**6.1.2 Read.** Reading from the storage is an essential part of REML models and closely tied with the search operations. However in Section 6, we focus on how retrievable items are represented in the storage. How they are read are discussed in Section 4.

**6.1.3 Write.** At time  $t$ , after the address vector  $w_t$  is obtained, storage operation can be done by a *write* function that updates the datastore  $C_t$  as follows:

$$C_{t+1} = write(w_t, C_t, payload_t) \quad (13)$$

where *payload* can be a form of vector or raw representation, which can be preprocessed by some functions, similar to the functions defined in Section 5, before being stored in the storage [78].

With the view of addressing mechanism mentioned in Section 4.5, it can be understood that location-based addressing is used before the write operation, following the framework of Neural Turing Machine (NTM) [59, 60]. In most cases, the write operation will simply append the latest entry to the end of a storage (address vector pointing to the next available slot), executed after every new input in sequential order, following the work of neural cache model [58]. On the other hand, some architectures, such as Memory Neural Network (MemNN) [229] or large memory layers [115] operate differently, and will generate an address specifying where in memory to write the new entry, potentially overwriting any entry that was there before. Regularization can be applied in memory networks to ensure that a substantial portion of the memory is used. These decisions can be made by concerted effort with the storage management component.

## 6.2 Phases of Storage Operation

In REML systems, storage operates through two distinct phases. The initial phase, called *Storage Construction*, involves the system setting up the storage infrastructure with the necessary information to facilitate its operations. Following this setup, the system transitions to the *Storage Management* phase, where it determines the appropriate strategies for storing information, including the selection of what data to retain, the optimal storage locations, and the methods for organizing the information for future retrieval.

**6.2.1 Storage Construction.** REML systems mostly initialize its storage by processing an entire retrieval corpus. This can be done offline before training, after training before inference, and throughout training as needed. Storage construction is well documented and studied, and the initial storage construction is essentially a series of write and address generation operations. Storage can be constructed as a key-value structure where retrieval space  $\mathcal{D}$  can be defined as:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(k_i, v_i) \mid d \in \mathcal{C}, k_i = \text{transform}_k(d), v_i = \text{transform}_v(d)\} \quad (14)$$

where  $\text{transform}_k$  is a key representation function that can take each entry in the corpus or an input instance  $x$ . Similarly,  $\text{transform}_v$  is a value representation function that can take each entry in the corpus or an input instance  $x$  to generate a value in the storage. Note that the  $\text{transform}_k$  and  $\text{transform}_v$  function can simply be the identity function, meaning it does not change the key and value at all. Table 4 describes how each paper constructed its storage offline and/or online. For example, in EMAT [236], where the collection is pairs of questions and answers, the  $\text{transform}_k$  function utilizes only the question in each pair to generate the key representation, and  $\text{transform}_v$  function uses only the answer from each pair to generate the value representation.

**6.2.2 Storage Management.** Once the storage is initialized, both for optimal task completion and efficiency, there is a need to schedule the storage operations, and we dub this phase as storage management. Efficient usage of storage can be understood in terms of space and speed which come down to: when, what, and how to store.

*When to store.* In many scenarios,  $g_\omega$  will pull information from the storage built at an initial phase based on the need of  $f_\theta$ . However, this setup can introduce *storage staleness* problem when  $\omega$  changes during  $g_\omega$  is being sequentially or jointly trained with  $f_\theta$ . Since  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{key}}$  (retrieval space of keys in  $\mathcal{C}$ ) is constructed by  $\omega$  during the training, it is necessary to refresh the storage as  $\omega$  is updated; this was even mentioned from MemNN [229]. This comes down to asking two questions: 1) *how often to update*, and 2) *what portion of storage to update*. For the first question, one can either synchronously (every training step) or asynchronously (every  $T$  training step) update the storage [7]. For the second question, one can choose to update the entire storage, a subset of the storage, or refrain from updating the storage at all.

*What to store.* Continued from when to store, if the storage are being periodically updated, it may be beneficial to selectively store. For the synchronous update, updating a subset of storage either by in-batch approximation or reranking is preferred due to large computational overhead, while full storage update is often performed when update is done asynchronously [7, 66, 84, 270]. Another way to selectively store is to erase some of the entries stored in the past along with the periodic update as storage can become full. One simple approach is to set a window size of a storage and manage it like a queue [31, 174, 200, 231], similar to discarding the oldest entry in the storage [58]. Weston et al. [229] devised a separate erasure module that scores the utility of each entry to discard the least useful entries.

*How to store.* This encompasses entry representation, e.g., index compression [144, 174, 231] and quantization [84] and architectural choice of the storage, e.g., key-value structure [2, 14, 58, 78, 100, 149, 235, 250, 270], where the compression and representation computations can happen incrementally by batch [257].

### 6.3 Storage Types

In the literature, two types of storage architectures are identified in REML systems: *Coupled Storage* and *Decoupled Storage*. The following sections and Table 4 will elaborate on these architectures.

**6.3.1 Coupled Storage.** Coupled storage is defined as a storage that can be updated online during training and inference of the predictive model and can be jointly optimized. Initial developments of the coupled storage enhancements were primarily led by Neural Turing Machine (NTM) [59, 60] and Memory Network (MemNN) [229]. They showed abstract operations, such as copying, recall, and sorting, to language reasoning tasks by leveraging external addressable storage, where contents in the storage of these architectures are dense vectors which can be readily used by  $f_\theta$ . We refer the readers to the original papers of the two models for deeper understanding of primary shape of REML models with coupled storage. There are a few notable characteristics about REML with coupled memory, including but not limited to the following.

*Staleness of Coupled Storage.* One of the primary concerns of the coupled storage arises when  $g_\omega$  is being trained, making the storage stale. It is still an ongoing challenge in the community, but as mentioned in Section 6.2, there have been several techniques

Coupled Storage (§6.3.1)		
	Key	Value
NTM [59, 60]	transformed output of $f_\theta$	(the same as the Key)
MemNN [229], MemN2N [206] & DMN [112]	input feature embedding	(the same as the Key)
Neural Cache Model [58]	hidden representation of RNN	next word
RUM [24]	user-item embedding	(the same as the Key)
Transformer-XL [31]	hidden representation of Transformer	(the same as the Key)
LongMem [222] & Memorizing Transformer [235]	attention-key	attention-value
MemTransformer [15]	sequence of tokens	tokens
RPT [181] & Unlimiformer [13]	token chunk embedding	(the same as the Key)
MeMViT [231] & PFMN [121]	image frame embedding	(the same as the Key)
REALM [66], REPLUG LSR [199] & ATLAS [84]	document embedding	(the same as the Key)
EMAT [236]	question embedding	answer embedding
QAMAT [22]	question embedding	question-answer embedding
TRIME [270]	context (sequence of tokens)	next token
NPM [149]	token embedding	token
Reflexion [200], CLIN [139] & ExpeL [266]	self-reflection in NL	(the same as the Key)
Generative Agent [161]	stream of experience in NL	(the same as the Key)
Voyager [219]	program description embedding	program code
MemPrompt [136]	NL question	NL human feedback
Synapse [268]	task metadata embedding	state and trajectories in NL
Decoupled Storage (§6.3.2)		
kNN-LM [100] & SPALM [250]	context embedding	next token
RAG [123]	document embedding	(the same as the Key)
RETOMATON [2]	context embedding	next token, pointer
KIF [47]	evidence embedding (multimodal)	(the same as the Key)
RETRO [14]	token chunk embedding	token chunk
ED2LM [78]	document embedding	document
REPLUG [199]	document embedding	(the same as the Key)
Embodied-RAG [237]	node of a topological map in NL	position and path to the location

Table 4. Instances of REML models with external storage. NL is an abbreviation of natural language.

devised to circumvent this issue by answering *how often to update* (synchronous or asynchronous) and *what portion of the storage to update* (full or partial). Therefore, there are five different strategies including an avoidance of update. **Synchronous full update** is the simplistic approach to solve the staleness problem by updating the storage at every training step. It is attempted in a few research [13, 181], but its large computational overhead prevents it from being used in a practical setting [84]. **Synchronous partial update** can be done by selecting a batch of entries to update [84]. Depending on the applications, there can be various batch selection strategies, such as lexical similarity [270] or in-document sampling [149]. **Asynchronous full update** is done by updating the full storage every  $T$  training steps [66, 84, 199, 236]. This allows staleness in the index before it is updated again. For example, Wu et al. [236] freeze the storage at the beginning of each training epoch and only updates at the end of each epoch. As far as we know, there is little attempt on **asynchronous partial update** as it may degrade the training performance in larger margin. Alternatively, since index recreation is highly expensive, it is possible to **ignore the staleness** and avoid re-indexing with adequate strategies without compromising a performance in a large margin [66, 84, 123, 173, 222, 235].

*Cold Start Problem in Coupled Storage.* Another characteristic of the models equipped with coupled storage is that they can have a cold start problem, where the performance of  $f_\theta$  is suboptimal before the storage is filled up with enough information. Most of the architectures that start with an empty storage such as language agents (LA) or long-context language models that process a long document in multiple training steps have this issue [139, 161, 200, 219, 235, 266, 270]. However, the cold start problem can be alleviated when the model can be adapted to a new task and the storage/experience built during the previous tasks is transferable to the new task [139].

*Versatility of Coupled Storage.* Despite its disadvantages, coupled storage has seen significant development both theoretically and in various applications. It includes making REML systems with coupled storage end-to-end trainable [206], capturing the

position and temporality of language using episodic storage [112], and scaling the storage through sparse access [173, 258] and strategic storage management [58, 115]. These have led to applications in various domains, such as meta-learning [193], sequential recommendation [24], video summarization and recognition [121, 231]. In long context language modeling [13, 270], there have been approaches to solve the task through attention recurrence [31, 222, 235, 250] and compression of hidden states [144, 174, 231]. Recently, research on language agents focus on agents’ ability to use language models for perceiving, reasoning, planning, and managing memory while interacting with external environments [207]. These agents, which learn independently from their observations and adapt their knowledge, are equipped with external storage for long-term memory, allowing them to store past reasoning [139, 161, 200, 219, 266] or user feedback [136] for future use and self-reflection [137].

**6.3.2 Decoupled Storage.** Decoupled storage is defined as a storage method in REML systems where  $g_\omega$  operates independent to  $f_\theta$ . In contrast to the coupled storage, where the entries are being updated dynamically online usually influenced by joint optimization of  $f_\theta$  and  $g_\omega$ , decoupled storage involves offline population of entries, i.e., storage becomes read-only during the online stage. There are a few notable characteristics about REML systems with decoupled memory, including but not limited to the following.

*Ease of Implementation.* Since the retriever is completely independent from the predictive model, the implementation of the REML system becomes a lot easier compared to that with coupled storage [2, 14, 78, 100, 250]. When training the REML system, in decoupled storage architecture, one can either train the retriever separately or use an off-the-shelf retriever already publicly available [199]. This also means that one can easily edit a REML system by simply replacing its components. Therefore, this design can guarantee a liberation from storage staleness and cold start problem unlike the coupled storage architecture. The ease of implementation stands out when the systems need to incorporate multiple storage that are multi-modal or multi-source [47, 245, 253], where it can be tricky to be implemented with coupled memory architecture.

*Performance sub-optimality.* Generally, it is known that in REML systems with multiple components, end-to-end training yields a better performance compared to training each component individually [183, 218, 255]. However, in REML systems with decoupled storage, the storage component and predictive model are trained separately. This configuration might lead to sub-optimal performance in the system’s downstream tasks. In other words, despite the convenience, the fixed nature of the storage during the training of the predictive model, and vice versa, in decoupled storage systems, prevents them from adapting to each other’s needs.

## 7 Optimization

As depicted in Figure 2, a REML system consists of the multiple components interacting with each other. Optimization can be done either end-to-end (i.e., optimizing all model parameters simultaneously for a common goal). Alternatively, optimization can be done for a subset of model parameters, such as independent optimization of each component in REML. For instance, for optimizing the Query Generation component, ground-truth queries are required for independent optimization of this component. Obtaining such data is difficult to obtain for some components. Distant or weak supervision is a potential solution to address this issue. In the rest of this section, we mainly focus on the optimization of the retrieval model and the predictive model as the two main components of REML systems.

### 7.1 Retrieval Model Optimization

**7.1.1 No REML Optimization.** In a wide range of studies, retrieval models are not optimized. In many of them, queries and documents are in the form of unstructured text. In that case, query and document representations are often computed based on term statistics, such as term frequencies in the documents or document frequencies in the document collection. Using retrieval models such as TF-IDF [190], BM25 [178], and query likelihood [166], with default parameters, belongs to this category. For example, the Dr.QA model [18] uses the ElasticSearch implementation of TF-IDF for document retrieval from Wikipedia for factoid question answering. The SelfMem model [25] uses BM25 for document retrieval for a number of retrieval-augmented text generation tasks, such as translation and dialogue.

Pre-trained language models can be also used to produce latent representations for queries and documents, where simple similarity functions, such as dot product or cosine similarity, are used for computing relevance scores for a query-document pair. Even though these language models went through expensive optimization procedures, their optimizations are not REML-specific.

Note that employing language model representations for retrieval with no optimization often do not perform well. For instance, Lien et al. [127] demonstrated that using plain BERT or RoBERTa representations for zero-shot retrieval is substantially worse than term matching models, like BM25.

More recently, it has been observed that large-scale instruction-tuned language models, such as GPT-3.5, can be carefully instructed to rank a few documents for a given query [208]. These models can perform effectively, but cannot be applied to large document collections and could be only used as re-ranking models.

Retrieving from databases through structured queries, such as SQL, also belong to this category. A wide range of task-oriented dialogue systems, such as intelligent assistants for travel booking and restaurant reservation, require access to databases for up-to-date availability [19].

**7.1.2 Independent Optimization.** REML may take advantage of retrieval models whose optimization is independent of the predictive model’s parameters. Retrieval models are often trained using a set of query-document-relevance triplets. The relevance signal may come from (1) explicit annotations, e.g., from expert assessors or crowdworkers, (2) implicit feedback [91, 92], e.g., user clicks, dwell time, mouse movements, etc, or (3) automatically generated weak signals (also known as distant supervision signals), such as appearance of a phrase, e.g., answer in the context of QA, in the documents, retrieval scores from another retrieval model [36], or annotations produced by large language models [210]. Using these training triplets, retrieval models can be optimized using three different approaches: (1) pointwise, (2) pairwise, or (3) listwise ranking. Refer to Liu [133] for more information on various ranking loss functions.

In the context of REML, a large set of studies, e.g., [69, 88, 135, 216], use commercial search engines, such as Bing or Google, as their retrieval models. These search engines are optimized using a combination of the relevance signals mentioned above. Therefore, they are considered as independent optimization models. A set of approaches, such as [83], train retrieval models on explicitly labeled collections, such as MS MARCO [16] or provenance labels in the KILT benchmark [165], and then use the trained models on an often out-of-domain REML scenario. Weak or distant supervision is also used in [171, 172, 187] for open-domain (visual) question answering by assuming that any document that contains the answer phrase is relevant.

**7.1.3 Conditional Optimization.** In conditional optimization, the retrieval model is optimized, conditioned on the predictive model  $f_{\theta}$ . A group of conditional optimization approaches use knowledge distillation. For instance, Izcard and Grave [82] use the aggregation of cross-attention weights in the fusion-in-decoder architecture as weak signals to train the retrieval model. Here, the decoder that provides the weights plays the role of a teacher model and a dense passage retrieval model plays the role of a student model. Alternatively, Yang and Seo [247] use the similarity score produced by an answer span selection model, i.e., the reader, as teacher scores and minimize the KL-divergence between them and retrieval scores.

As shown by Izcard and Grave [82], knowledge distillation from the downstream ML model to the retrieval model can be done iteratively, as follows:

$$\omega^{(t+1)} = \arg \min_{\omega} \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \mathcal{L}(f_{\theta^{(t)}}(x; g_{\omega}), y) \quad (15)$$

where the retrieval model in iteration (or epoch)  $t + 1$  is optimized based on the parameters of the predictive model at iteration  $t$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the downstream loss function.

## 7.2 Predictive Model Optimization

**7.2.1 No REML Optimization.** Similar to retrieval models, predictive models may also be used as ‘black-box’ systems without REML-specific training. For instance, a wide range of query expansion approaches, such as the Rocchio’s algorithm [179], relevance models [118], and divergence minimization model [260] expand the queries based on the appearance of terms and concepts in the retrieval results. Using pre-trained large language models in a zero-shot setting is another example that has received considerable attention in recent years [186, 199].

**7.2.2 Independent Optimization.** Predictive models in REML can be optimized independent of the retrieval model’s parameters. For instance, we can optimize predictive models by assuming that the retrieval model is optimal (i.e., retrieving ground truth

relevant documents). In this case, the optimization of predictive model  $f_\theta$  can be modeled as:

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \mathcal{L}(f_\theta(x; g_{\text{opt}}), y) \quad (16)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the loss function for the downstream task. For instance, a number of open-domain QA models are optimized to extract or generate answers given the question and the gold (ground truth) passage [18]. Some may relax the optimality assumption of retrieval models and inject non-relevant documents to the ground truth set. These documents can be either sampled randomly or from the output of a retrieval model, but not  $g_\omega$ .

**7.2.3 Conditional Optimization.** Alternatively, predictive models can be trained conditioned on the retrieval model’s performance. Without loss of generality, this can be seen as an iterative process, where the predictive model is optimized in one iteration and the retrieval model is optionally optimized in the next iteration. With this formulation, the parameters of a predictive model at iteration  $t$  can be obtained as follows:

$$\theta^{(t)} = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \mathcal{L}(f_\theta(x; g_{\omega^{(t)}}), y) \quad (17)$$

### 7.3 Joint Optimization of Retrieval and Predictive Models

**7.3.1 Joint Multi-Task Optimization.** Retrieval and predictive models can be trained jointly. Joint optimization can be modeled end-to-end (explained later in this section) or through multi-task learning. In joint multi-task optimization, for any training instance, both the retrieval results and the predictive model parameters will be updated. For instance, FiD-Light [73] generates the documents with positive provenance score in addition to the output text for retrieval-augmented text generation tasks. The generated document IDs are then used for re-ranking the result list. Therefore, this can be seen as a joint optimization of re-ranking and generation.

**7.3.2 End-to-End Optimization.** Following the risk minimization framework, end-to-end optimization in REML can be modeled as follows:

$$\theta^*, \omega^* = \arg \min_{\theta, \omega} \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{(x,y) \in T} \mathcal{L}(f_\theta(x; g_\omega), y) \quad (18)$$

where both parameters sets  $\theta$  and  $\omega$  get updated simultaneously by optimizing an appropriate loss function for the downstream machine learning task. End-to-end optimization of REML, however, can be challenging. It is mostly due to the top  $k$  item selection process of information access models in REML that makes the end-to-end REML model non-differentiable. Existing work make some simplifying assumptions to turn the optimization to a differentiable process. For instance, the RAG model from Lewis et al. [123] by marginalizing the retrieved document set to a set of pre-selected documents. A similar approach was later utilized by Sachan et al. [183] for open-domain question answering. In addition to marginalization, RetGen [264] and EMDR<sup>2</sup> [203] make a document independence assumption and computes the loss function as a summation over each individual document.

## 8 Evaluation

Our goal in evaluation is to understand whether a change to the system—including a full replacement—is better than keeping the status quo. For example, we might be interested in knowing whether changing the search component improves predictive performance. We will refer to this evaluation metric as  $\mu$ , whose arguments will be explained shortly. We compute the expected metric value with respect to a distribution over some population  $\Pr(X)$ , which is ideally the same distribution used for training data.

We classify evaluation as either *extrinsic*, looking at the final performance of the predictive model, or *intrinsic*, looking at the performance of a component of the system using a local measure of quality rather than predictive model performance [205]. An intrinsic evaluation of a model can be an efficient approximation for an extrinsic evaluation or can measure some independent value such as resource consumption.



### 8.1 Extrinsic evaluation

In all situations, we are most often interested in the expected value of the metric for a system. That is, for a model  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and evaluation data  $L_{\text{test}}$ , compute,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}(x))] = \frac{1}{|L_{\text{test}}|} \sum_{x \in L_{\text{test}}} \mu(\mathcal{M}(x)) \quad (19)$$

When evaluating a system extrinsically, we can pose hypotheses about relative system performance in several ways [66, 123, 165]. In *non-overlapping system comparison*, given two model tuples  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle f_{\theta'}, g_{\omega'} \rangle$ , determine if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}(x))] > \mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}'(x))]$ . In *fixed retrieval model comparison*, given two model tuples  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle f_{\theta'}, g_\omega \rangle$ , determine if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}(x))] > \mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}'(x))]$ . As a special case, we can consider  $g_{\omega^*}$  an optimal ranker according to some intrinsic criteria; this allows us to examine whether a system can effectively incorporate relevant items. In *fixed predictive model comparison*, given two model tuples  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle f_\theta, g_{\omega'} \rangle$ , determine if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}(x))] > \mathbb{E}[\mu(\mathcal{M}'(x))]$ . In this case, we can consider  $f_{\theta^*}$  as an optimal predictive model according to some intrinsic criteria; this allows us to examine whether a system can effectively retrieve relevant items.

### 8.2 Intrinsic evaluation

REML systems comprise numerous components, each capable of individual assessment. Intrinsic evaluation of a component involves comparing systems based on their isolated performance with respect to that component. Nevertheless, such systems' most important components are the retrieval and predictive models.

**8.2.1 Intrinsic evaluation of retrieval.** Intrinsic evaluation of a retrieval model focuses on comparing systems according to their isolated retrieval performance. In this case, assuming single-turn retrieval, we can pose two styles of hypothesis. In *non-overlapping system comparison*, given two model tuples  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle f_{\theta'}, g_{\omega'} \rangle$ , determine if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu(g_\omega(f_\theta(x)))] > \mathbb{E}[\mu(g_{\omega'}(f_{\theta'}(x)))]$ , where, with some abuse of notation,  $f_\theta(x)$  and  $f_{\theta'}(x)$  considers only the query processing for  $g_\omega$  and  $g_{\omega'}$ . In *fixed query processing comparison*, given two model tuples  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle f_\theta, g_{\omega'} \rangle$ , determine if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu(g_\omega(f_\theta(x)))] > \mathbb{E}[\mu(g_{\omega'}(f_\theta(x)))]$ . The choice of metric  $\mu$  depends on the task but should be some retrieval metric, unless the retrieval result is not a ranking. Such metrics require some relevance estimate for each item. In the case of REML, this can come from,

- (1) Explicit labels gathered from human raters. This requires instances, targets, and items to be interpretable. 'provenance Labels' in the KILT benchmark for some tasks such as Natural Questions [113] and ELI5 [48] can be thought as such labels.
- (2) Inferred labels from the target. For example, in QA, we could compute the similarity between a retrieved item and the target. 'Context Relevance' from RAGAs [46] and ARES [182] can be thought as a variant of this case.
- (3) Attributed labels from the model prediction. For example, in QA, if a model generates an answer correctly, we can try to attribute the answer correctness to each of the retrieved items. This method, drawing inspiration from eRAG [188], assesses the retrieval model's performance by quantifying the contribution of each retrieved document towards achieving the correct answer.

**8.2.2 Intrinsic evaluation of consumption.** Intrinsic evaluation of consumption focuses on comparing systems according to their isolated ability to translate retrieval results into effective predictions. Although extrinsic evaluation measures the effectiveness of the system in general, intrinsic evaluation of consumption focuses on whether a prediction is attributable to retrieval results (e.g., versus information already in the consumption model parameters). In *fixed retrieval comparison*, given two model tuples  $\mathcal{M} = \langle f_\theta, g_\omega \rangle$  and  $\mathcal{M}' = \langle f_{\theta'}, g_{\omega'} \rangle$ , determine if  $\mathbb{E}[\mu(f_\theta(\mathcal{R}_{\omega,x}), \mathcal{R}_{\omega,x})] > \mathbb{E}[\mu(f_{\theta'}(\mathcal{R}_{\omega,x}), \mathcal{R}_{\omega,x})]$ . The choice of metric  $\mu(\tilde{y}, \tilde{\mathcal{R}})$  depends on the task but measures whether the prediction  $\tilde{y}$  is related to the retrieval results  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ . 'Faithfulness' from RAGAs [46] and ARES [182] can be thought as a variant of this case.

### 8.3 Datasets and Benchmarks

REML systems can be evaluated on various tasks. In literature, various benchmarks and datasets serve to assess these systems from diverse angles. Broadly, datasets fall into two categories: 1) those exclusively considering extrinsic evaluation of REML systems, assessing them solely based on end-to-end performance. 2) those furnishing retrieval relevance labels for intrinsic evaluation in addition to end-to-end performance. Table 5 illustrates the most commonly employed datasets and benchmarks in the literature.

End-to-End Evaluation (§8.3)		
Task	Datasets	Corpus
Entity Related QA	PopQA[141], EntityQuestions[197]	Wikipedia
Current Events Related QA	RealtimeQA[97]	News Websites
Science Related Multiple-choice QA	ARC [28]	Subset of Web
Science Related QA	Qasper[34]	Scientific Articles
Story Related Long-form QA	NarrativeQA[110]	A Long Story
Query-based Summarization	QMSum[269]	A Meeting Transcript
Personalized Classification and Generation	LaMP[186]	A User Profile
End-to-End & Retrieval Evaluation (§8.3)		
Open-domain Multi-Hop QA	2WikiMultiHopQA[71], HotpotQA[165, 248]	Wikipedia
Open-domain Short-form QA	Natural Questions[113, 165], TriviaQA[93, 165], StrategyQA[55]	Wikipedia
Open-domain Long-form QA	ELI5[48, 165], ASQA[54]	Wikipedia
Dialogue Generation	Wizard of Wikipedia[38, 165]	Wikipedia
Slot Filling	ZeroShot RE[122, 165], T-REx[44, 165]	Wikipedia
Entity Linking	AIDA CoNLL-YAGO[72, 165], WNED-WIKI/CWEB [1, 165]	Wikipedia
Fact Verification	FEVER[165, 212]	Wikipedia
Open-domain Visual QA	OK-VQA[143, 172]	Wikipedia
Open-domain Visual QA	FVQA[221]	A Supporting Facts Set

Table 5. Datasets available for training and evaluating REML systems (not an exhaustive list). Some focus on end-to-end evaluation, while others provide retrieval evaluation labels.

## 9 Future Directions

To enhance REML systems, we propose future work for each of the previously discussed sections.

### 9.1 Querying

*9.1.1 Query with Instruction.* Recent advancements in instruction tuning for LLMs have demonstrated substantial improvements in performance across downstream tasks [151, 224, 227]. Moreover, recent research on retrieval utilizing instructions has surpassed competitive baselines, showcasing superior performance in terms of retrieval efficiency [8]. With that in mind, developing transformation functions for query generation that produce task and query-specific instructions alongside the query can significantly enhance the retrieval model’s capacity to fulfill the requirements of the predictive model.

*9.1.2 Retrieval System Aware Query Generation.* Most query generation and decomposition functions overlook the type and configuration of the retrieval model, but aligning queries with the model’s specifics can enhance performance. For instance, BM25, which emphasizes exact term matching, performs better with queries that closely align with terms in relevant documents. On the other hand, dense retrieval models, which focus on semantic similarity, benefit more from queries that are semantically aligned with the content of relevant documents. Tailoring query generation to the retrieval model ensures the queries meet the model’s unique requirements, improving retrieval effectiveness.

*9.1.3 Dissociated Interface between Retrieval and Predictive Model.* Most REML systems use natural language for communication between predictive and retrieval models. Models like kNN-LM [100], which uses hidden representations of the predictive model as queries and keys, the representations are all from the predictive model. However, relying solely on natural language or the representation of one model may not be optimal. An alternative is to train both retrieval and predictive models jointly to learn a shared hidden space, enabling more effective communication. This approach can convey information more efficiently and enhance the interaction between the models, leading to better performance and coordination.

### 9.2 Searching

*9.2.1 Predictive Model-Aware Retrieval Systems.* Approaches like search personalization could be used for tailoring retrieval results to a specific predictive model. For example, there can be a situation where multiple predictive models are being served by a few retrieval models [189]. In this case, the retrieval model can store meta-data of the predictive models they are serving, opening up opportunities to tailor the retrieval results to each predictive model.

*9.2.2 Redefining Relevancy.* In predictive model-aware retrieval systems, IR models usually evaluate a document’s relevance based on how well it meets a human user’s information need. However, in REML, the primary consumer is the predictive model, not the human user. Research shows that *utility judgments*—assessing a document’s usefulness for a specific task—correlate more strongly with the REML model’s performance than traditional relevance labels [108, 188, 262]. This underscores the need for further research on how to best represent relevance in the context of REML.

### 9.3 Presentation & Consumption

*9.3.1 Task-Specialized Presentation and Consumption.* Similar to how task-specific retrieval is beneficial for distinguishing between fact verification, entity linking, QA, and so on, it will likely be better to use a document representation specific to the task at hand. This may materialize as a prompt with task-specific instructions, task-specific intermediate steps (including explanation for how the document is relevant), or even task-specific embeddings of documents.

*9.3.2 Proactive REML.* In practice, it is beneficial to not only answer the immediate question posed by the query, but also address potential follow up questions [126, 191]. Follow up questions can transition to a new topic (e.g. purchasing a hotel after booking a flight), or dive deep on part of the initial answer.

### 9.4 Storing

*9.4.1 Shared Storage.* Figure 2 depicts a single  $f_{\theta}$  interacting with multiple information access system. However, it is also possible to map multiple  $f_{\theta_i}$  to a single information access system. In this scenario, where multiple predictive model is sharing a single collection, the ability of the models to learn what is important to store becomes crucial as pushing irrelevant content to the shared storage can cause degradation in its usefulness and cause performance degradation of other  $f_{\theta_i}$  sharing the same collection. This direction is particularly valuable to explore in multi-agent settings [161].

*9.4.2 Storage Staleness.* While training the REML model, the updated retriever often makes the previously-built storage stale. Although there have been many attempts to detour this issue, no studies have found a profound way to solve the problem. This persistent challenge necessitates further research into adaptive storage mechanisms that can dynamically align with retriever updates, ensuring data integrity and model efficiency.

### 9.5 Optimization

*9.5.1 Effective and Efficient End-to-End Optimization.* The non-differentiable nature of some components in REML or their interaction makes it challenging to optimize REML systems end-to-end. Existing approaches are based on some simplifying assumptions and developing more accurate and robust approximations for end-to-end REML optimization is an important research direction. Moreover, reward-based optimization of these systems, based on both human and AI feedback, is relatively underexplored. Better understanding of exploration and exploitation of information items provided by the information access system is required.

*9.5.2 Learning from Online and Session-based Feedback.* Interaction between the predictive and information access models can be sequential. Simple forms of such sequential interaction already exists in the context of multi-hop question answering. Using the feedback provided by the predictive model during an inference session and its users to adjust the REML output is critical to develop effective *interactive* REML systems.

*9.5.3 Efficient Approximation of Feedback for Optimization.* Both end-to-end and conditional optimization approaches require feedback from different components of the REML system. As the field moves towards larger and more expensive, developing efficient and accurate feedback approximations could substantially reduce the cost of REML training. This would not only reduce the monetary cost associated with REML training, but would also speed up research progress and lead to more sustainable and environmental-friendly systems.

*9.5.4 One Information Access and Multiple Predictive Models.* Most prior work focuses on developing a REML system for one task. On the other hand, information access systems can serve multiple predictive models, similar to the current search engines that serve billions of users [189]. Optimizing information access components that provide service to multiple predictive models,

aggregating and calibrating feedback across predictive models, and “personalizing” the retrieval result lists for each predictive model are important future directions.

## 9.6 Evaluation

*9.6.1 Broadening Evaluation Approaches.* Evaluations of REML systems predominantly focus on extrinsic measures of system effectiveness, and studies that conduct both extrinsic and intrinsic evaluations mainly employ reference-based methods with relevance labels. Researchers could broaden this scope by assessing additional qualities of REML systems, such as citation quality [54], robustness [251], and context utilization [180]. Additionally, an often overlooked aspect is the evaluation of trustworthiness and societal impact; although recognized as important, these factors are typically discussed in non-REML contexts like pure information retrieval or text generation. In REML applications, trustworthiness evaluation might present new research directions. For instance, existing definitions of fairness may require revision within the REML context [108], and the propagation of related issues through retrieval and consumption processes may need re-examination. Regarding transparency in evaluation, most model-based, reference-free automatic evaluations of REML models rely on large language models [46, 62, 182, 188], which often lack transparency because they do not provide clear reasoning for their assessments. These automatic evaluation models can be meta-evaluated based on measurement theory [67] for further validation.

## 10 Conclusion

In this work, we survey the current literature on retrieval-enhanced machine learning (REML) and synthesize it into consistent mathematical concepts, providing researchers with a formalized framework for REML. By bridging the gap between information retrieval research and REML, we also identify new opportunities and open avenues for future studies in this emerging research paradigm.

## References

- [1] Harith Alani, Zhaochen Guo, and Denilson Barbosa. 2018. Robust named entity disambiguation with random walks. *Semant. Web* 9, 4 (2018), 459–479. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-170273>
- [2] Uri Alon, Frank Xu, Junxian He, Sudipta Sengupta, Dan Roth, and Graham Neubig. 2022. Neuro-symbolic language modeling with automaton-augmented retrieval. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 468–485.
- [3] Abrar Anwar, John Welsh, Joydeep Biswas, Soha Pouya, and Yan Chang. 2024. ReMemBR: Building and Reasoning Over Long-Horizon Spatio-Temporal Memory for Robot Navigation. arXiv:2409.13682 [cs.RO]
- [4] Samuel David Arcadinho, David Aparicio, Hugo Veiga, and Antonio Alegria. 2022. T5QL: Taming language models for SQL generation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Natural Language Generation, Evaluation, and Metrics (GEM)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 276–286. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.gem-1.23>
- [5] Anurag Arnab, Mostafa Dehghani, Georg Heigold, Chen Sun, Mario Lučić, and Cordelia Schmid. 2021. ViViT: A Video Vision Transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 6836–6846.
- [6] Akari Asai, Matt Gardner, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. Evidentiality-guided Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2226–2243. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.162>
- [7] Akari Asai, Sewon Min, Zexuan Zhong, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Retrieval-based Language Models and Applications. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 41–46.
- [8] 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3650–3675. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.225>
- [9] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. Self-RAG: Learning to Retrieve, Generate, and Critique through Self-Reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hSyW5go0v8>
- [10] R. Attar and A. S. Fraenkel. 1977. Local Feedback in Full-Text Retrieval Systems. *J. ACM* 24, 3 (1977), 397–417.
- [11] Jinheon Baek, Alham Fikri Aji, and Amir Saffari. 2023. Knowledge-Augmented Language Model Prompting for Zero-Shot Knowledge Graph Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Natural Language Reasoning and Structured Explanations (NLRSE)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 78–106. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.nlrse-1.7>
- [12] Dara Bahri, Yi Tay, Che Zheng, Donald Metzler, and Andrew Tomkins. 2020. Choppy: Cut Transformer for Ranked List Truncation. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 1513–1516. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401188>
- [13] Amanda Bertsch, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Matthew R. Gormley. 2023. Unlimiformer: Long-Range Transformers with Unlimited Length Input. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JWUJWLCJo>
- [14] Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2206–2240.
- [15] Mikhail S. Burtsev, Yuri Kuratov, Anton Peganov, and Grigory V. Sapunov. 2021. Memory Transformer. arXiv:2006.11527 [cs.CL]

- [16] Daniel Fernando Campos, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, Li Deng, and Bhaskar Mitra. 2016. MS MARCO: A Human Generated MACHine Reading COMprehension Dataset. *30th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS (2016)*.
- [17] Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom Brown, Dawn Song, Ulfar Erlingsson, et al. 2021. Extracting training data from large language models. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. 2633–2650.
- [18] Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. Reading Wikipedia to Answer Open-Domain Questions. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1870–1879. <https://aclanthology.org/P17-1171>
- [19] Hongshen Chen, Xiaorui Liu, Dawei Yin, and Jiliang Tang. 2017. A Survey on Dialogue Systems: Recent Advances and New Frontiers. *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.* 19, 2 (2017), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3166054.3166058>
- [20] Jifan Chen, Grace Kim, Aniruddh Sriram, Greg Durrett, and Eunsol Choi. 2024. Complex Claim Verification with Evidence Retrieved in the Wild. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3569–3587. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.naacl-long.196>
- [21] Wenhui Chen, Hexiang Hu, Chitwan Saharia, and William W. Cohen. 2023. Re-Imagen: Retrieval-Augmented Text-to-Image Generator. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=XSEBx0iSjFQ>
- [22] Wenhui Chen, Pat Verga, Michiel de Jong, John Wieting, and William W. Cohen. 2023. Augmenting Pre-trained Language Models with QA-Memory for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1597–1610. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.eacl-main.117>
- [23] Xiang Chen, Lei Li, Ningyu Zhang, Xiaozhuan Liang, Shumin Deng, Chuanqi Tan, Fei Huang, Luo Si, and Huajun Chen. 2022. Decoupling Knowledge from Memorization: Retrieval-augmented Prompt Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 23908–23922. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/file/97011c648eda678424f9292dadae72e-Paper-Conference.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/97011c648eda678424f9292dadae72e-Paper-Conference.pdf)
- [24] Xu Chen, Hongteng Xu, Yongfeng Zhang, Jiayi Tang, Yixin Cao, Zheng Qin, and Hongyuan Zha. 2018. Sequential Recommendation with User Memory Networks. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 108–116. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3159652.3159668>
- [25] Xin Cheng, Di Luo, Xiuying Chen, Lema Liu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2024. Lift yourself up: Retrieval-augmented text generation with self-memory. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [26] Animesh Basak Chowdhury, Marco Romanelli, Benjamin Tan, Ramesh Karri, and Siddharth Garg. 2024. Retrieval-Guided Reinforcement Learning for Boolean Circuit Minimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=0t1O8ziRZp>
- [27] Yung-Sung Chuang, Wei Fang, Shang-Wen Li, Wen-tau Yih, and James Glass. 2023. Expand, Rerank, and Retrieve: Query Reranking for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 12131–12147. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.768>
- [28] Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have Solved Question Answering? Try ARC, the AI2 Reasoning Challenge. arXiv:1803.05457 [cs.AI]
- [29] Patrick Cramer. 2021. AlphaFold2 and the future of structural biology. *Nature structural & molecular biology* 28, 9 (2021), 704–705.
- [30] W. B. Croft and D. J. Harper. 1979. Using Probabilistic Models of Document Retrieval Without Relevance Information. *J. of Documentation* 35, 4 (1979), 285–295.
- [31] Zihang Dai, Zhilin Yang, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Quoc Le, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. Transformer-XL: Attentive Language Models beyond a Fixed-Length Context. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2978–2988. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1285>
- [32] Rajarshi Das, Ameya Godbole, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Manzil Zaheer, and Andrew McCallum. 2020. A Simple Approach to Case-Based Reasoning in Knowledge Bases. In *Automated Knowledge Base Construction*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=AEY9tRqU7>
- [33] Rajarshi Das, Ameya Godbole, Dilip Kavarthapu, Zhiyu Gong, Abhishek Singhal, Mo Yu, Xiaoxiao Guo, Tian Gao, Hamed Zamani, Manzil Zaheer, and Andrew McCallum. 2019. Multi-step Entity-centric Information Retrieval for Multi-Hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Machine Reading for Question Answering*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 113–118.
- [34] 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4599–4610. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.365>
- [35] Michiel De Jong, Yury Zemlyanskiy, Nicholas FitzGerald, Joshua Ainslie, Sumit Sanghai, Fei Sha, and William W. Cohen. 2023. Pre-Computed Memory or on-the-Fly Encoding? A Hybrid Approach to Retrieval Augmentation Makes the Most of Your Compute. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML '23)*. JMLR.org, Article 290, 14 pages.
- [36] Mostafa Dehghani, Hamed Zamani, Aliaksei Severyn, Jaap Kamps, and W. Bruce Croft. 2017. Neural Ranking Models with Weak Supervision. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080832>
- [37] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4171–4186.
- [38] Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. Wizard of Wikipedia: Knowledge-Powered Conversational Agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1173iRqKm>
- [39] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. A Survey on In-context Learning. arXiv:2301.00234 [cs.LG]
- [40] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. 2021. An Image is Worth 16x16 Words: Transformers for Image Recognition at Scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=YicbFdNTTy>
- [41] Longxu Dou, Yan Gao, Mingyang Pan, Dingzirui Wang, Wanxiang Che, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dechen Zhan. 2023. Unisar: A unified structure-aware autoregressive language model for text-to-sql semantic parsing. *International Journal of Machine Learning and Cybernetics* 14, 12 (2023), 4361–4376.
- [42] Matthijs Douze, Alexandr Guzhva, Chengqi Deng, Jeff Johnson, Gergely Szilvasy, Pierre-Emmanuel Mazaré, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, and Hervé Jégou. 2024. The Faiss library. arXiv:2401.08281 [cs.LG]

- [43] Andrew Drozdov, Nathanael Schärli, Ekin Akyürek, Nathan Scales, Xinying Song, Xinyun Chen, Olivier Bousquet, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Compositional Semantic Parsing with Large Language Models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [44] Hady Elsahar, Pavlos Vougiouklis, Arslan Remaci, Christophe Gravier, Jonathon Hare, Frederique Laforest, and Elena Simperl. 2018. T-REx: A Large Scale Alignment of Natural Language with Knowledge Base Triples. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA). <https://aclanthology.org/L18-1544>
- [45] Mihail Eric, Lakshmi Krishnan, Francois Charette, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. Key-Value Retrieval Networks for Task-Oriented Dialogue. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual SIGdial Meeting on Discourse and Dialogue*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-5506>
- [46] Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa Anke, and Steven Schockaert. 2024. RAGAs: Automated Evaluation of Retrieval Augmented Generation. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 150–158. <https://aclanthology.org/2024.eacl-demo.16>
- [47] Angela Fan, Claire Gardent, Chloé Braud, and Antoine Bordes. 2021. Augmenting Transformers with KNN-Based Composite Memory for Dialog. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 82–99.
- [48] 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3558–3567. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1346>
- [49] Fernando Fernández and Manuela Veloso. 2006. Probabilistic Policy Reuse in a Reinforcement Learning Agent. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS '06)*. ACM, 720–727.
- [50] Thibault Formal, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2021. SPLADE: Sparse Lexical and Expansion Model for First Stage Ranking. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2288–2292. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3463098>
- [51] Markus Freitag and Yaser Al-Onaizan. 2017. Beam Search Strategies for Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 56–60. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W17-3207>
- [52] Feng Gao, Qing Ping, Govind Thattai, Aishwarya Reganti, Ying Nian Wu, and Prem Natarajan. 2022. Transform-retrieve-generate: Natural language-centric outside-knowledge visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 5067–5077.
- [53] Luyu Gao, Zhuyun Dai, Panupong Pasupat, Anthony Chen, Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Yicheng Fan, Vincent Zhao, Ni Lao, Hongrae Lee, Da-Cheng Juan, and Kelvin Guu. 2023. RARR: Researching and Revising What Language Models Say, Using Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 16477–16508.
- [54] Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Enabling Large Language Models to Generate Text with Citations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6465–6488.
- [55] Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 346–361.
- [56] Michael Glass, Gaetano Rossiello, Md Faisal Mahub Chowdhury, and Alfio Gliozzo. 2021. Robust Retrieval Augmented Generation for Zero-shot Slot Filling. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1939–1949. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.148>
- [57] Anirudh Goyal, Abram Friesen, Andrea Banino, Theophane Weber, Nan Rosemary Ke, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, Arthur Guez, Mehdi Mirza, Peter C Humphreys, Ksenia Konyushova, Michal Valko, Simon Osindero, Timothy Lillicrap, Nicolas Heess, and Charles Blundell. 2022. Retrieval-Augmented Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Vol. 162. PMLR, 7740–7765.
- [58] Edouard Grave, Armand Joulin, and Nicolas Usunier. 2017. Improving Neural Language Models with a Continuous Cache. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=B184E5qee>
- [59] Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, and Ivo Danihelka. 2014. Neural Turing Machines. arXiv:1410.5401 [cs.NE]
- [60] Alex Graves, Greg Wayne, Malcolm Reynolds, Tim Harley, Ivo Danihelka, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwińska, Sergio Gómez Colmenarejo, Edward Grefenstette, Tiago Ramalho, John Agapiou, et al. 2016. Hybrid computing using a neural network with dynamic external memory. *Nature* 538, 7626 (2016), 471–476.
- [61] Liangke Gui, Borui Wang, Qiuyuan Huang, Alexander Hauptmann, Yonatan Bisk, and Jianfeng Gao. 2022. KAT: A Knowledge Augmented Transformer for Vision-and-Language. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 956–968.
- [62] Gauthier Guinet, Behrooz Omidvar-Tehrani, Anoop Deoras, and Laurent Callot. 2024. Automated Evaluation of Retrieval-Augmented Language Models with Task-Specific Exam Generation. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=4jqOV6NIUz>
- [63] Caglar Gulcehre, Sarath Chandar, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Memory Augmented Neural Networks with Wormhole Connections. arXiv:1701.08718 [cs.LG]
- [64] Jiafeng Guo, Yixing Fan, Liang Pang, Liu Yang, Qingyao Ai, Hamed Zamani, Chen Wu, W. Bruce Croft, and Xueqi Cheng. 2020. A Deep Look into neural ranking models for information retrieval. *Information Processing & Management* 57, 6 (2020), 102067.
- [65] Ruiqi Guo, Philip Sun, Erik Lindgren, Quan Geng, David Simcha, Felix Chern, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2020. Accelerating large-scale inference with anisotropic vector quantization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 3887–3896.
- [66] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2020. REALM: Retrieval-Augmented Language Model Pre-Training. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML '20)*. JMLR.org, Article 368, 10 pages.
- [67] D.J. Hand. 2010. *Measurement Theory and Practice: The World Through Quantification*. Wiley.
- [68] Helia Hashemi, Hamed Zamani, and W. Bruce Croft. 2020. Guided Transformer: Leveraging Multiple External Sources for Representation Learning in Conversational Search. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 1131–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401061>
- [69] Helia Hashemi, Hamed Zamani, and W. Bruce Croft. 2021. Learning Multiple Intent Representations for Search Queries. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 669–679. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3459637.3482445>
- [70] Junxian He, Graham Neubig, and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. 2021. Efficient Nearest Neighbor Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5703–5714.
- [71] Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2020. Constructing A Multi-hop QA Dataset for Comprehensive Evaluation of Reasoning Steps. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics, 6609–6625. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.580>

- [72] Johannes Hoffart, Mohamed Amir Yosef, Ilaria Bordino, Hagen Fürstenu, Manfred Pinkal, Marc Spaniol, Bilyana Taneva, Stefan Thater, and Gerhard Weikum. 2011. Robust Disambiguation of Named Entities in Text. In *Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 782–792. <https://aclanthology.org/D11-1072>
- [73] Sebastian Hofstätter, Jiecao Chen, Karthik Raman, and Hamed Zamani. 2023. Fid-light: Efficient and effective retrieval-augmented text generation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1437–1447.
- [74] Chris Hokamp and Qun Liu. 2017. Lexically Constrained Decoding for Sequence Generation Using Grid Beam Search. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1535–1546.
- [75] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. 2020. The Curious Case of Neural Text Degeneration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rygGQyrFvH>
- [76] J. Edward Hu, Huda Khayrallah, Ryan Culkin, Patrick Xia, Tongfei Chen, Matt Post, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2019. Improved Lexically Constrained Decoding for Translation and Monolingual Rewriting. In *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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 839–850. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1090>
- [77] Linmei Hu, Zeyi Liu, Ziwang Zhao, Lei Hou, Liqiang Nie, and Juanzi Li. 2023. A survey of knowledge enhanced pre-trained language models. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2023).
- [78] Kai Hui, Honglei Zhuang, Tao Chen, Zhen Qin, Jing Lu, Dara Bahri, Ji Ma, Jai Gupta, Cicero Nogueira dos Santos, Yi Tay, and Donald Metzler. 2022. ED2LM: Encoder-Decoder to Language Model for Faster Document Re-ranking Inference. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3747–3758. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.295>
- [79] Peter Conway Humphreys, Arthur Guez, Olivier Tieleman, Laurent Sifre, Theophane Weber, and Timothy P Lillcrap. 2022. Large-Scale Retrieval for Reinforcement Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [80] Siqing Huo, Negar Arabzadeh, and Charles Clarke. 2023. Retrieving Supporting Evidence for Generative Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region (SIGIR-AP '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3624918.3625336>
- [81] Ahmet Iscen, Mathilde Caron, Alireza Fathi, and Cordelia Schmid. 2024. Retrieval-Enhanced Contrastive Vision-Text Models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=b2UlHeyyC0>
- [82] Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. 2021. Distilling Knowledge from Reader to Retriever for Question Answering. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=NTEz-6wysdb>
- [83] Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. 2021. Leveraging Passage Retrieval with Generative Models for Open Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 874–880. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.74>
- [84] Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. 2024. Atlas: few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 24, 1, Article 251 (2024).
- [85] Minbyul Jeong, Jiwoong Sohn, Mujeen Sung, and Jaewoo Kang. 2024. Improving medical reasoning through retrieval and self-reflection with retrieval-augmented large language models. *Bioinformatics* 40, Supplement\_1 (2024), i119–i129. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btae238>
- [86] Soyeong Jeong, Jinheon Baek, Sukmin Cho, Sung Ju Hwang, and Jong C Park. 2024. Adaptive-RAG: Learning to Adapt Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models through Question Complexity. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. 7029–7043.
- [87] Fan Jiang, Tom Drummond, and Trevor Cohn. 2024. Pre-training Cross-lingual Open Domain Question Answering with Large-scale Synthetic Supervision. arXiv:2402.16508 [cs.CL]
- [88] Zhengbao Jiang, Frank Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Active Retrieval Augmented Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 7969–7992. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.495>
- [89] Qiao Jin, Yifan Yang, Qingyu Chen, and Zhiyong Lu. 2024. Genegpt: Augmenting large language models with domain tools for improved access to biomedical information. *Bioinformatics* 40, 2 (2024), btae075.
- [90] Baoyu Jing, Si Zhang, Yada Zhu, Bin Peng, Kaiyu Guan, Andrew Margenot, and Hanghang Tong. 2022. Retrieval Based Time Series Forecasting. arXiv:2209.13525 [cs.AI]
- [91] Thorsten Joachims. 2002. Optimizing Search Engines Using Clickthrough Data. In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '02)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.1145/775047.775067>
- [92] Thorsten Joachims, Adith Swaminathan, and Tobias Schnabel. 2017. Unbiased Learning-to-Rank with Biased Feedback. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 781–789. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3018661.3018699>
- [93] Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. TriviaQA: A Large Scale Distantly Supervised Challenge Dataset for Reading Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1601–1611.
- [94] Mingxuan Ju, Wenhao Yu, Tong Zhao, Chuxu Zhang, and Yanfang Ye. 2022. Grape: Knowledge Graph Enhanced Passage Reader for Open-domain Question Answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 169–181. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-emnlp.13>
- [95] John Jumper, Richard Evans, Alexander Pritzel, Tim Green, Michael Figurnov, Olaf Ronneberger, Kathryn Tunyasuvunakool, Russ Bates, Augustin Židek, Anna Potapenko, et al. 2021. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *nature* 596, 7873 (2021), 583–589.
- [96] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6769–6781. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.550>
- [97] Jungo Kasai, Keisuke Sakaguchi, yoichi takahashi, Ronan Le Bras, Akari Asai, Xinyan Velocity Yu, Dragomir Radev, Noah A. Smith, Yejin Choi, and Kentaro Inui. 2023. RealTime QA: What’s the Answer Right Now?. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HfKOIPCvsv>
- [98] Nora Kassner and Hinrich Schütze. 2020. BERT-kNN: Adding a kNN Search Component to Pretrained Language Models for Better QA. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3424–3430.

- [99] Urvashi Khandelwal, Angela Fan, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2021. Nearest Neighbor Machine Translation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7wCBOFj8hJM>
- [100] Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2020. Generalization through Memorization: Nearest Neighbor Language Models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HklBjCEKvH>
- [101] Daniel Khashabi, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, and Dan Roth. 2017. Learning What is Essential in Questions. In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 80–89.
- [102] Omar Khattab, Arnav Singhvi, Paridhi Maheshwari, Zhiyuan Zhang, Keshav Santhanam, Sri Vardhamanan A, Saiful Haq, Ashutosh Sharma, Thomas T. Joshi, Hanna Moazam, Heather Miller, Matei Zaharia, and Christopher Potts. 2024. DSPy: Compiling Declarative Language Model Calls into State-of-the-Art Pipelines. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=sY5N0zY5Od>
- [103] Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. ColBERT: Efficient and Effective Passage Search via Contextualized Late Interaction over BERT. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401075>
- [104] Ekaterina Khramtsova, Shengyao Zhuang, Mahsa Baktashmotlagh, Xi Wang, and Guido Zuccon. 2023. Selecting which Dense Retriever to use for Zero-Shot Search. In *Proceedings of the Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region*. 223–233.
- [105] Ekaterina Khramtsova, Shengyao Zhuang, Mahsa Baktashmotlagh, and Guido Zuccon. 2024. Leveraging LLMs for Unsupervised Dense Retriever Ranking. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 1307–1317. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657798>
- [106] Gangwoo Kim, Sungdong Kim, Byeongguk Jeon, Joonsuk Park, and Jaewoo Kang. 2023. Tree of Clarifications: Answering Ambiguous Questions with Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 996–1009. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.63>
- [107] Jaehyung Kim, Jaehyun Nam, Sangwoo Mo, Jongjin Park, Sang-Woo Lee, Minjoon Seo, Jung-Woo Ha, and Jinwoo Shin. 2024. SuRe: Summarizing Retrievals using Answer Candidates for Open-domain QA of LLMs. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=w4DW6qkRmt>
- [108] To Eun Kim and Fernando Diaz. 2024. Towards Fair RAG: On the Impact of Fair Ranking in Retrieval-Augmented Generation. arXiv:2409.11598 [cs.IR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.11598>
- [109] Brendan King and Jeffrey Flanigan. 2023. Diverse Retrieval-Augmented In-Context Learning for Dialogue State Tracking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5570–5585.
- [110] Tomáš Kočiský, Jonathan Schwarz, Phil Blunsom, Chris Dyer, Karl Moritz Hermann, Gábor Melis, and Edward Grefenstette. 2018. The NarrativeQA Reading Comprehension Challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 6 (2018), 317–328.
- [111] Mojtaba Komeili, Kurt Shuster, and Jason Weston. 2022. Internet-Augmented Dialogue Generation. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 8460–8478.
- [112] Ankit Kumar, Ozan Irsoy, Peter Ondruska, Mohit Iyyer, James Bradbury, Ishaan Gulrajani, Victor Zhong, Romain Paulus, and Richard Socher. 2016. Ask me anything: Dynamic memory networks for natural language processing. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1378–1387.
- [113] 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. 2019. Natural Questions: A Benchmark for Question Answering Research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 7 (2019), 452–466. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00276](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00276)
- [114] Tiziano Labruna, Jon Ander Campos, and Gorka Azkune. 2024. When to Retrieve: Teaching LLMs to Utilize Information Retrieval Effectively. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19705* (2024).
- [115] Guillaume Lample, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Marc' Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Herve Jegou. 2019. Large Memory Layers with Product Keys. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [116] Tian Lan, Deng Cai, Yan Wang, Heyan Huang, and Xian-Ling Mao. 2023. Copy is All You Need. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=CROIOA9Nd8C>
- [117] Victor Lavrenko, Martin Choquette, and W. Bruce Croft. 2002. Cross-lingual relevance models. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '02)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 175–182. <https://doi.org/10.1145/564376.564408>
- [118] Victor Lavrenko and W. Bruce Croft. 2001. Relevance based language models. In *Proceedings of the 24th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. ACM Press, 120–127.
- [119] Angeliki Lazaridou, Elena Gribovskaya, Wojciech Stokowiec, and Nikolai Grigorev. 2022. Internet-augmented language models through few-shot prompting for open-domain question answering. arXiv:2203.05115 [cs.CL]
- [120] Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Latent Retrieval for Weakly Supervised Open Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6086–6096. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1612>
- [121] Sangho Lee, Jinyoung Sung, Youngjae Yu, and Gunhee Kim. 2018. A memory network approach for story-based temporal summarization of 360 videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 1410–1419.
- [122] Omer Levy, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Zero-Shot Relation Extraction via Reading Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 333–342. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/K17-1034>
- [123] Patrick S. H. 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. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33.
- [124] Cheng Li, Mingyang Zhang, Qiaozhu Mei, Yaqing Wang, Spurthi Amba Hombiah, Yi Liang, and Michael Bendersky. 2023. Teach LLMs to Personalize – An Approach inspired by Writing Education. arXiv:2308.07968 [cs.CL]
- [125] Zonglin Li, Ruiqi Guo, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2022. Decoupled Context Processing for Context Augmented Language Modeling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=02dbnEbEfn>
- [126] Lizi Liao, Grace Hui Yang, and Chirag Shah. 2023. Proactive Conversational Agents in the Post-ChatGPT World. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 3452–3455. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3539618.3594250>



- [127] Yen-Chieh Lien, Hamed Zamani, and Bruce Croft. 2024. Generalized Weak Supervision for Neural Information Retrieval. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 42, 5, Article 121 (2024), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3647639>
- [128] Chyi-Jiunn Lin, Guan-Ting Lin, Yung-Sung Chuang, Wei-Lun Wu, Shang-Wen Li, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Hung-yi Lee, and Lin-shan Lee. 2024. SpeechDPR: End-to-End Spoken Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Spoken Question Answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13463* (2024).
- [129] Weizhe Lin and Bill Byrne. 2022. Retrieval Augmented Visual Question Answering with Outside Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 11238–11254.
- [130] Weizhe Lin, Jinghong Chen, Jingbiao Mei, Alexandru Coca, and Bill Byrne. 2023. Fine-grained Late-interaction Multi-modal Retrieval for Retrieval Augmented Visual Question Answering. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [131] Lingqing Liu, Minghan Li, Jimmy Lin, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. 2022. Query Expansion Using Contextual Clue Sampling with Language Models. *arXiv:2210.07093* [cs.CL]
- [132] Shengchao Liu, Jiong Xiao Wang, Yijin Yang, Chengpeng Wang, Ling Liu, Hongyu Guo, and Chaowei Xiao. 2024. Conversational Drug Editing Using Retrieval and Domain Feedback. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=yRrPfkYjQ2>
- [133] Tie-Yan Liu. 2009. Learning to Rank for Information Retrieval. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.* 3, 3 (2009), 225–331. <https://doi.org/10.1561/1500000016>
- [134] Yuanhua Lv and ChengXiang Zhai. 2009. Positional language models for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '09)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 299–306. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1571941.1571994>
- [135] Xiaozhong Lyu, Stefan Grafberger, Samantha Biegel, Shaopeng Wei, Meng Cao, Sebastian Schelter, and Ce Zhang. 2023. Improving Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models via Data Importance Learning. *arXiv:2307.03027* [cs.LG]
- [136] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Peter Clark, and Yiming Yang. 2022. Memory-assisted prompt editing to improve GPT-3 after deployment. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2833–2861. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.183>
- [137] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2024. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [138] Seiji Maekawa, Hayate Iso, Sairam Gurajada, and Nikita Bhutani. 2024. Retrieval Helps or Hurts? A Deeper Dive into the Efficacy of Retrieval Augmentation to Language Models. *arXiv:2402.13492* [cs.CL]
- [139] Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Bhavana Dalvi, Peter Jansen, Oyvind Tafjord, Niket Tandon, Li Zhang, Chris Callison-Burch, and Peter Clark. 2024. CLIN: A Continually Learning Language Agent for Rapid Task Adaptation and Generalization. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=d5DGVHMDsC>
- [140] Yu A. Malkov and D. A. Yashunin. 2020. Efficient and Robust Approximate Nearest Neighbor Search Using Hierarchical Navigable Small World Graphs. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 42, 4 (2020), 824–836. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2018.2889473>
- [141] Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When Not to Trust Language Models: Investigating Effectiveness of Parametric and Non-Parametric Memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 9802–9822.
- [142] Yuning Mao, Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Yelong Shen, Jianfeng Gao, Jiawei Han, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Generation-Augmented Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4089–4100.
- [143] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. 2019. Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/cvf conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 3195–3204.
- [144] Pedro Henrique Martins, Zita Marinho, and Andre Martins. 2022.  $\infty$ -former: Infinite Memory Transformer. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5468–5485.
- [145] Chuan Meng, Negar Arabzadeh, Arian Askari, Mohammad Aliamejadi, and Maarten de Rijke. 2024. Ranked List Truncation for Large Language Model-based Re-Ranking. In *SIGIR*.
- [146] Jacob Menick, Maja Trebacz, Vladimir Mikulik, John Aslanides, Francis Song, Martin Chadwick, Mia Glaese, Susannah Young, Lucy Campbell-Gillingham, Geoffrey Irving, and Nat McAleese. 2022. Teaching language models to support answers with verified quotes. *arXiv:2203.11147* [cs.CL]
- [147] Donald Metzler and W. Bruce Croft. 2005. A Markov random field model for term dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '05)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 472–479. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1076034.1076115>
- [148] Grégoire Mialon, Roberto Dessi, Maria Lomeli, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Roberta Raileanu, Baptiste Roziere, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Asli Celikyilmaz, Edouard Grave, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Augmented Language Models: a Survey. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jh7wH2AzKK>
- [149] Sewon Min, Weijia Shi, Mike Lewis, Xilun Chen, Wen-tau Yih, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. Nonparametric Masked Language Modeling. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2097–2118. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.132>
- [150] Sewon Min, Victor Zhong, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. Multi-hop Reading Comprehension through Question Decomposition and Rescoring. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6097–6109. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1613>
- [151] Swaroop Mishra, Daniel Khashabi, Chitta Baral, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. Cross-Task Generalization via Natural Language Crowdsourcing Instructions. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3470–3487. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.244>
- [152] Bhaskar Mitra and Nick Craswell. 2018. An Introduction to Neural Information Retrieval. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.* 13, 1 (2018), 1–126.
- [153] Ryan Musa, Xiaoyan Wang, Achille Fokoue, Nicholas Mattei, Maria Chang, Pavan Kapanipathi, Bassem Makni, Kartik Talamadupula, and Michael Witbrock. 2019. Answering Science Exam Questions Using Query Reformulation with Background Knowledge. In *Automated Knowledge Base Construction (AKBC)*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=HJxYZ-5paX>
- [154] Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, Xu Jiang, Karl Cobbe, Tyna Eloundou, Gretchen Krueger, Kevin Button, Matthew Knight, Benjamin Chess, and John Schulman. 2022. WebGPT: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv:2112.09332* [cs.CL]

- [155] Tomáš Nekvinda and Ondřej Dušek. 2022. AARGH! End-to-end Retrieval-Generation for Task-Oriented Dialog. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 283–297.
- [156] Benjamin Newman, Luca Soldaini, Raymond Fok, Arman Cohan, and Kyle Lo. 2023. A Question Answering Framework for Decontextualizing User-facing Snippets from Scientific Documents. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3194–3212. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.193>
- [157] Jianmo Ni, Chenguang Zhu, Weizhu Chen, and Julian McAuley. 2019. Learning to Attend On Essential Terms: An Enhanced Retriever-Reader Model for Open-domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 335–344.
- [158] Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Passage Re-ranking with BERT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.04085* (2019).
- [159] Long Ouyang et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 27730–27744.
- [160] Xiaoman Pan, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Dian Yu, Dong Yu, and Jianshu Chen. 2023. Knowledge-in-Context: Towards Knowledgeable Semi-Parametric Language Models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=a2jNdqE2102>
- [161] Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. 2023. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST ’23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Article 2, 22 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606763>
- [162] Kristen Parton, Kathleen R. McKeown, James Allan, and Enrique Henestroza. 2008. Simultaneous multilingual search for translanguing information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM ’08)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 719–728. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1458082.1458179>
- [163] Ethan Perez, Patrick Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Kyunghyun Cho, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Unsupervised Question Decomposition for Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 8864–8880. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.713>
- [164] Fabio Petroni, Samuel Broscheit, Aleksandra Piktus, Patrick Lewis, Gautier Izacard, Lucas Hosseini, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Maria Lomeli, Timo Schick, Michele Bevilacqua, et al. 2023. Improving wikipedia verifiability with ai. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 5, 10 (2023), 1142–1148.
- [165] 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. 2021. KILT: a Benchmark for Knowledge Intensive Language Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2523–2544. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.200>
- [166] Jay M. Ponte and W. Bruce Croft. 1998. A Language Modeling Approach to Information Retrieval. In *SIGIR’98*. 275–281.
- [167] Matt Post and David Vilar. 2018. Fast Lexically Constrained Decoding with Dynamic Beam Allocation for Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1314–1324. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1119>
- [168] Ronak Pradeep, Kai Hui, Jai Gupta, Adam Lelkes, Honglei Zhuang, Jimmy Lin, Donald Metzler, and Vinh Tran. 2023. How Does Generative Retrieval Scale to Millions of Passages?. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1305–1321. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.83>
- [169] Peng Qi, Xiaowen Lin, Leo Mehr, Zijian Wang, and Christopher D. Manning. 2019. Answering Complex Open-domain Questions Through Iterative Query Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2590–2602.
- [170] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Lauren Hong, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2023. ToolLLM: Facilitating Large Language Models to Master 16000+ Real-world APIs. *arXiv:2307.16789* [cs.AI]
- [171] Chen Qu, Liu Yang, Cen Chen, Minghui Qiu, W. Bruce Croft, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Open-Retrieval Conversational Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR ’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 539–548. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3397271.3401110>
- [172] Chen Qu, Hamed Zamani, Liu Yang, W. Bruce Croft, and Erik Learned-Miller. 2021. Passage Retrieval for Outside-Knowledge Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 1753–1757. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3404835.3462987>
- [173] Jack W Rae, Jonathan J Hunt, Tim Harley, Ivo Danihelka, Andrew Senior, Greg Wayne, Alex Graves, and Timothy P Lillicrap. 2016. Scaling Memory-Augmented Neural Networks with Sparse Reads and Writes. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS’16)*. Curran Associates Inc., 3628–3636.
- [174] Jack W. Rae, Anna Potapenko, Siddhant M. Jayakumar, Chloe Hillier, and Timothy P. Lillicrap. 2020. Compressive Transformers for Long-Range Sequence Modelling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SylKikSYDH>
- [175] Dinesh Raghu, Shantanu Agarwal, Sachindra Joshi, and Mausam. 2021. End-to-End Learning of Flowchart Grounded Task-Oriented Dialogs. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4348–4366. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.357>
- [176] Ori Ram, Yoav Levine, Itay Dalmedigos, Dor Muhlgay, Amnon Shashua, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Yoav Shoham. 2023. In-context retrieval-augmented language models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 1316–1331.
- [177] Rita Ramos, Bruno Martins, and Desmond Elliott. 2023. LMCap: Few-shot Multilingual Image Captioning by Retrieval Augmented Language Model Prompting. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1635–1651. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-acl.104>
- [178] Stephen Robertson, S. Walker, S. Jones, M. M. Hancock-Beaulieu, and M. Gatford. 1995. Okapi at TREC-3. In *Proceedings of the Third Text REtrieval Conference (TREC-3)*. Gaithersburg, MD: NIST, 109–126.
- [179] J. J. Rocchio. 1971. Relevance Feedback in Information Retrieval. In *The SMART Retrieval System - Experiments in Automatic Document Processing*. Prentice Hall.
- [180] Dongyu Ru, Lin Qiu, Xiangkun Hu, Tianhang Zhang, Peng Shi, Shuaichen Chang, Cheng Jiayang, Cunxiang Wang, Shichao Sun, Huanyu Li, Zizhao Zhang, Binjie Wang, Jiarong Jiang, Tong He, Zhiguo Wang, Pengfei Liu, Yue Zhang, and Zheng Zhang. 2024. RAGChecker: A Fine-grained Framework for Diagnosing

- Retrieval-Augmented Generation. arXiv:2408.08067 [cs.CL]
- [181] Ohad Rubin and Jonathan Berant. 2023. Long-range Language Modeling with Self-retrieval. arXiv:2306.13421 [cs.CL]
- [182] Jon Saad-Falcon, Omar Khattab, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2024. ARES: An Automated Evaluation Framework for Retrieval-Augmented Generation Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 338–354.
- [183] Devendra Sachan, Mostofa Patwary, Mohammad Shoeibi, Neel Kant, Wei Ping, William L. Hamilton, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2021. End-to-End Training of Neural Retrievers for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6648–6662.
- [184] Alireza Salemi, Juan Altmayer Pizzorno, and Hamed Zamani. 2023. A Symmetric Dual Encoding Dense Retrieval Framework for Knowledge-Intensive Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3539618.3591629>
- [185] Alireza Salemi, Surya Kallumadi, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Optimization Methods for Personalizing Large Language Models through Retrieval Augmentation. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 752–762. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657783>
- [186] Alireza Salemi, Sheshera Mysore, Michael Bendersky, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. LaMP: When Large Language Models Meet Personalization. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL '24)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [187] Alireza Salemi, Mahta Rafiee, and Hamed Zamani. 2023. Pre-Training Multi-Modal Dense Retrievers for Outside-Knowledge Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval (ICTIR '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 169–176. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3578337.3605137>
- [188] Alireza Salemi and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Evaluating Retrieval Quality in Retrieval-Augmented Generation. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2395–2400. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657957>
- [189] Alireza Salemi and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Towards a Search Engine for Machines: Unified Ranking for Multiple Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 741–751. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657733>
- [190] Gerard Salton and Christopher Buckley. 1988. Term-Weighting Approaches in Automatic Text Retrieval. *Inf. Process. Manage.* 24, 5 (1988), 513–523. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573\(88\)90021-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4573(88)90021-0)
- [191] Chris Samarinas and Hamed Zamani. 2024. ProCIS: A Benchmark for Proactive Retrieval in Conversations. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 830–840. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657869>
- [192] Ramon Sanabria, Ondrej Klejch, Hao Tang, and Sharon Goldwater. 2023. Acoustic Word Embeddings for Untranscribed Target Languages with Continued Pretraining and Learned Pooling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02153* (2023).
- [193] Adam Santoro, Sergey Bartunov, Matthew Botvinick, Daan Wierstra, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2016. Meta-Learning with Memory-Augmented Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48 (ICML'16)*. JMLR.org, 1842–1850.
- [194] Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D Manning. 2024. RAPTOR: Recursive Abstractive Processing for Tree-Organized Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [195] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessi, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [196] Tal Schuster, Adam Lelkes, Haitian Sun, Jai Gupta, Jonathan Berant, William Cohen, and Donald Metzler. 2024. SEMQA: Semi-Extractive Multi-Source Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 1363–1381.
- [197] Christopher Sciavolino, Zexuan Zhong, Jinhyuk Lee, and Danqi Chen. 2021. Simple Entity-Centric Questions Challenge Dense Retrievers. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6138–6148. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.496>
- [198] Rulin Shao, Jacqueline He, Akari Asai, Weijia Shi, Tim Dettmers, Sewon Min, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Pang Wei Koh. 2024. Scaling Retrieval-Based Language Models with a Trillion-Token Datastore. arXiv:2407.12854 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.12854>
- [199] Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Richard James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2024. REPLUG: Retrieval-Augmented Black-Box Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 8364–8377.
- [200] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2023. Reflexion: language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=vAElhFcKW6>
- [201] Robik Shrestha, Yang Zou, Qiuyu Chen, Zhiheng Li, Yusheng Xie, and Siqi Deng. 2024. FairRAG: Fair human generation via fair retrieval augmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 11996–12005.
- [202] Kurt Shuster, Mojtaba Komeili, Leonard Adolphs, Stephen Roller, Arthur Szlam, and Jason Weston. 2022. Language Models that Seek for Knowledge: Modular Search & Generation for Dialogue and Prompt Completion. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 373–393. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-emnlp.27>
- [203] Devendra Singh, Siva Reddy, Will Hamilton, Chris Dyer, and Dani Yogatama. 2021. End-to-End Training of Multi-Document Reader and Retriever for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 25968–25981.
- [204] Fei Song and W. Bruce Croft. 1999. A general language model for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '99)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 316–321. <https://doi.org/10.1145/319950.320022>
- [205] Karen Sparck-Jones and Julia R. Galliers. 1996. *Evaluating Natural Language Processing Systems: An Analysis and Review*. Springer-Verlag.
- [206] Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jason Weston, Rob Fergus, et al. 2015. End-to-end memory networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [207] Theodore Sumers, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Thomas Griffiths. 2024. Cognitive Architectures for Language Agents. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2024). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=1i6ZCvflQJ>

- [208] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Pengjie Ren, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is ChatGPT Good at Search? Investigating Large Language Models as Re-Ranking Agent. *CoRR* abs/2304.09542 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2304.09542> arXiv:2304.09542
- [209] Yi Tay, Vinh Tran, Mostafa Dehghani, Jianmo Ni, Dara Bahri, Harsh Mehta, Zhen Qin, Kai Hui, Zhe Zhao, Jai Gupta, Tal Schuster, William W Cohen, and Donald Metzler. 2022. Transformer Memory as a Differentiable Search Index. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 35. Curran Associates, Inc., 21831–21843.
- [210] Paul Thomas, Seth Spielman, Nick Craswell, and Bhaskar Mitra. 2023. Large language models can accurately predict searcher preferences. arXiv:2309.10621 [cs.IR]
- [211] Romal Thoppilan et al. 2022. LaMDA: Language Models for Dialog Applications. arXiv:2201.08239 [cs.CL]
- [212] James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. FEVER: a Large-scale Dataset for Fact Extraction and VERification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 809–819. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-1074>
- [213] David Thulke, Nico Daheim, Christian Dugast, and Hermann Ney. 2021. Efficient Retrieval Augmented Generation from Unstructured Knowledge for Task-Oriented Dialog. In *Workshop on DSTC9, AACL*.
- [214] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. Interleaving Retrieval with Chain-of-Thought Reasoning for Knowledge-Intensive Multi-Step Questions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 10014–10037. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.557>
- [215] Oriol Vinyals, Meire Fortunato, and Navdeep Jaitly. 2015. Pointer Networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2015/file/29921001f2f04bd3baee84a12e98098f-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2015/file/29921001f2f04bd3baee84a12e98098f-Paper.pdf)
- [216] Tu Vu, Mohit Iyyer, Xuezhi Wang, Noah Constant, Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Chris Tar, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Denny Zhou, Quoc Le, and Thang Luong. 2023. FreshLLMs: Refreshing Large Language Models with Search Engine Augmentation. arXiv:2310.03214 [cs.CL]
- [217] Zhongwei Wan, Yichun Yin, Wei Zhang, Jiaxin Shi, Lifeng Shang, Guangyong Chen, Xin Jiang, and Qun Liu. 2022. G-MAP: General Memory-Augmented Pre-trained Language Model for Domain Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 6585–6597. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.441>
- [218] Dingmin Wang, Qiuyuan Huang, Matthew Jackson, and Jianfeng Gao. 2024. LLM Agent - Retrieve What You Need: A Mutual Learning Framework for Open-domain Question Answering. *Proceedings of Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (TACL)* (2024), 247–263.
- [219] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandilekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. Voyager: An Open-Ended Embodied Agent with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: Arxiv-2305.16291* (2023).
- [220] 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*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 9414–9423.
- [221] Peng Wang, Qi Wu, Chunhua Shen, Anthony Dick, and Anton Van Den Hengel. 2017. Fvqa: Fact-based visual question answering. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 40, 10 (2017), 2413–2427.
- [222] Weizhi Wang, Li Dong, Hao Cheng, Xiaodong Liu, Xifeng Yan, Jianfeng Gao, and Furu Wei. 2023. Augmenting Language Models with Long-Term Memory. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BryMFPQ4L6>
- [223] Weizhi Wang, Li Dong, Hao Cheng, Haoyu Song, Xiaodong Liu, Xifeng Yan, Jianfeng Gao, and Furu Wei. 2023. Visually-Augmented Language Modeling. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8IN-qLkl215>
- [224] Yizhong Wang et al. 2022. Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via Declarative Instructions on 1600+ NLP Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5085–5109. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.340>
- [225] Zhiruo Wang, Jun Araki, Zhengbao Jiang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Learning to Filter Context for Retrieval-Augmented Generation. arXiv:2311.08377 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.08377>
- [226] Zora Zhiruo Wang, Akari Asai, Xinyan Velocity Yu, Frank F. Xu, Yiqing Xie, Graham Neubig, and Daniel Fried. 2024. CodeRAG-Bench: Can Retrieval Augment Code Generation? arXiv:2406.14497 [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.14497>
- [227] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022. Finetuned Language Models are Zero-Shot Learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=gEzrGCozdqR>
- [228] Wei Wei, Xubin Ren, Jiabin Tang, Qinyong Wang, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Junfeng Wang, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2024. Llmrec: Large language models with graph augmentation for recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 806–815.
- [229] Jason Weston, Sumit Chopra, and Antoine Bordes. 2015. Memory Networks. arXiv:1410.3916 [cs.AI]
- [230] Ryen W White, Joemon M Jose, Ian Ruthven, GM Rauterberg, M Menozzi, and J Wesson. 2003. A granular approach to web search result presentation. In *9th IFIP TC13 International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction. Interact 2003*.
- [231] Chao-Yuan Wu, Yanghao Li, Karttikeya Mangalam, Haoqi Fan, Bo Xiong, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. 2022. MeMViT: Memory-Augmented Multiscale Vision Transformer for Efficient Long-Term Video Recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08383* (2022).
- [232] Jialin Wu and Raymond Mooney. 2022. Entity-Focused Dense Passage Retrieval for Outside-Knowledge Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 8061–8072. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.551>
- [233] Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Daniel M. Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Ryan Lowe, Jan Leike, and Paul Christiano. 2021. Recursively Summarizing Books with Human Feedback. arXiv:2109.10862
- [234] Qingyang Wu, Zhenzhong Lan, Kun Qian, Jing Gu, Alborz Geramifard, and Zhou Yu. 2022. Memformer: A Memory-Augmented Transformer for Sequence Modeling. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: AACL-IJCNLP 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 308–318. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-aacl.29>
- [235] Yuhuai Wu, Markus Norman Rabe, DeLesley Hutchins, and Christian Szegedy. 2022. Memorizing Transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=TrjbxzRcnf->
- [236] Yuxiang Wu, Yu Zhao, Baotian Hu, Pasquale Minervini, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2022. An Efficient Memory-Augmented Transformer for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5184–5196. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.346>
- [237] Quanting Xie, So Yeon Min, Tianyi Zhang, Kedi Xu, Aarav Bajaj, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Matthew Johnson-Roberson, and Yonatan Bisk. 2024. Embodied-RAG: General Non-parametric Embodied Memory for Retrieval and Generation. arXiv:2409.18313 [cs.RO] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.18313>

- [238] Wenhan Xiong, Xiang Li, Srini Iyer, Jingfei Du, Patrick Lewis, William Yang Wang, Yashar Mehdad, Scott Yih, Sebastian Riedel, Douwe Kiela, and Barlas Oguz. 2021. Answering Complex Open-Domain Questions with Multi-Hop Dense Retrieval. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=EMHoBG0avc1>
- [239] Fangyuan Xu, Weijia Shi, and Eunsol Choi. 2024. RECOMP: Improving Retrieval-Augmented LMs with Context Compression and Selective Augmentation. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mJLVigNHp>
- [240] Maxwell Xu, Alexander Moreno, Hui Wei, Benjamin Marlin, and James Matthew Rehg. 2024. REBAR: Retrieval-Based Reconstruction for Time-series Contrastive Learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3zQo5oUvia>
- [241] Vikas Yadav, Steven Bethard, and Mihai Surdeanu. 2020. Unsupervised Alignment-based Iterative Evidence Retrieval for Multi-hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4514–4525. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.414>
- [242] Mostafa Yadegari, Ehsan Kamaloo, and Davood Rafiei. 2022. Detecting Frozen Phrases in Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 1990–1996. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477495.3531793>
- [243] Ikuya Yamada, Akari Asai, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2021. Efficient Passage Retrieval with Hashing for Open-domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 979–986. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-short.123>
- [244] Kaiyu Yang, Aidan Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan J Prenger, and Animashree Anandkumar. 2024. Leandojo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [245] Linyao Yang, Hongyang Chen, Zhao Li, Xiao Ding, and Xindong Wu. 2024. Give Us the Facts: Enhancing Large Language Models with Knowledge Graphs for Fact-aware Language Modeling. arXiv:2306.11489
- [246] Sitan Yang, Carson Eisenach, and Dhruv Madeka. 2022. MQRetNN: Multi-Horizon Time Series Forecasting with Retrieval Augmentation. arXiv:2207.10517 [cs.LG]
- [247] Sohee Yang and Minjoon Seo. 2020. Is Retriever Merely an Approximator of Reader? arXiv:2010.10999
- [248] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2369–2380. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D18-1259>
- [249] Michihiro Yasunaga, Armen Aghajanyan, Weijia Shi, Rich James, Jure Leskovec, Percy Liang, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. Retrieval-augmented multimodal language modeling. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML'23)*. JMLR.org, Article 1659, 15 pages.
- [250] Dani Yogatama, Cyprien de Masson d'Autume, and Lingpeng Kong. 2021. Adaptive Semiparametric Language Models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 9 (2021), 362–373. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00371](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00371)
- [251] Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. 2024. Making Retrieval-Augmented Language Models Robust to Irrelevant Context. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZS4m74kZpH>
- [252] Donghan Yu, Chenguang Zhu, Yuwei Fang, Wenhao Yu, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Xiang Ren, Yiming Yang, and Michael Zeng. 2022. KG-FiD: Infusing Knowledge Graph in Fusion-in-Decoder for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4961–4974.
- [253] Wenhao Yu, Chenguang Zhu, Zaitang Li, Zhiting Hu, Qingyun Wang, Heng Ji, and Meng Jiang. 2022. A Survey of Knowledge-Enhanced Text Generation. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 54, 11s, Article 227 (2022), 38 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3512467>
- [254] Wenhao Yu, Chenguang Zhu, Zhihan Zhang, Shuohang Wang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Yuwei Fang, and Meng Jiang. 2022. Retrieval Augmentation for Commonsense Reasoning: A Unified Approach. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4364–4377. <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-main.294>
- [255] Hamed Zamani and Michael Bendersky. 2024. Stochastic RAG: End-to-End Retrieval-Augmented Generation through Expected Utility Maximization. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2641–2646. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657923>
- [256] Hamed Zamani, Mostafa Dehghani, W. Bruce Croft, Erik Learned-Miller, and Jaap Kamps. 2018. From Neural Re-Ranking to Neural Ranking: Learning a Sparse Representation for Inverted Indexing. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 497–506. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3269206.3271800>
- [257] Hamed Zamani, Fernando Diaz, Mostafa Dehghani, Donald Metzler, and Michael Bendersky. 2022. Retrieval-Enhanced Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the 45th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- [258] Wojciech Zaremba and Ilya Sutskever. 2016. Reinforcement Learning Neural Turing Machines - Revised. arXiv:1505.00521 [cs.LG]
- [259] Hansi Zeng, Chen Luo, Bowen Jin, Sheikh Sarwar, Tianxin Wei, and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Scalable and Effective Generative Information Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Web Conference (WWW '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [260] Chengxiang Zhai and John Lafferty. 2001. Model-Based Feedback in the Language Modeling Approach to Information Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '01)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 403–410. <https://doi.org/10.1145/502585.502654>
- [261] Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. RepoCoder: Repository-Level Code Completion Through Iterative Retrieval and Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2471–2484. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.151>
- [262] Hengran Zhang, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten de Rijke, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. Are Large Language Models Good at Utility Judgments?. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1941–1951.
- [263] Jing Zhang, Xiaokang Zhang, Jifan Yu, Jian Tang, Jie Tang, Cuiqing Li, and Hong Chen. 2022. Subgraph Retrieval Enhanced Model for Multi-hop Knowledge Base Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5773–5784. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.396>
- [264] Yizhe Zhang, Siqi Sun, Xiang Gao, Yuwei Fang, Chris Brockett, Michel Galley, Jianfeng Gao, and Bill Dolan. 2022. Retgen: A joint framework for retrieval and grounded text generation modeling. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 36. 11739–11747.
- [265] Zihan Zhang, Meng Fang, and Ling Chen. 2024. RetrievalQA: Assessing Adaptive Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Short-form Open-Domain Question Answering. arXiv:2402.16457 [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.16457>

- [266] Andrew Zhao, Daniel Huang, Quentin Xu, Matthieu Lin, Yong-Jin Liu, and Gao Huang. 2024. Expel: Llm agents are experiential learners. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 19632–19642.
- [267] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. A Survey of Large Language Models. arXiv:2303.18223
- [268] Longtao Zheng, Rundong Wang, Xinrun Wang, and Bo An. 2024. Synapse: Trajectory-as-Exemplar Prompting with Memory for Computer Control. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Pc8AU1aF5e>
- [269] Ming Zhong, Da Yin, Tao Yu, Ahmad Zaidi, Mutethia Mutuma, Rahul Jha, Ahmed Hassan Awadallah, Asli Celikyilmaz, Yang Liu, Xipeng Qiu, and Dragomir Radev. 2021. QMSum: A New Benchmark for Query-based Multi-domain Meeting Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5905–5921. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.472>
- [270] Zexuan Zhong, Tao Lei, and Danqi Chen. 2022. Training Language Models with Memory Augmentation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 5657–5673.
- [271] Ben Zhou, Kyle Richardson, Xiaodong Yu, and Dan Roth. 2022. Learning to Decompose: Hypothetical Question Decomposition Based on Comparable Texts. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2223–2235. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.142>
- [272] Jiaming Zhou, Shiwan Zhao, Yaqi Liu, Wenjia Zeng, Yong Chen, and Yong Qin. 2024. KNN-CTC: Enhancing ASR via Retrieval of CTC Pseudo Labels. In *ICASSP 2024 - 2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. 11006–11010. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP48485.2024.10447075>
- [273] Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Frank F. Xu, Zhengbao Jiang, and Graham Neubig. 2023. DocPrompting: Generating Code by Retrieving the Docs. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZTCxT2t2Ru>
- [274] Yunchang Zhu, Liang Pang, Yanyan Lan, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. 2021. Adaptive Information Seeking for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 3615–3626. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.293>