

---

# TrustRAG: Enhancing Robustness and Trustworthiness in RAG

---

Huichi Zhou<sup>\*1</sup> Kin-Hei Lee<sup>\*1</sup> Zhonghao Zhan<sup>\*1</sup> Yue Chen<sup>2</sup> Zhenhao Li<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) systems enhance large language models (LLMs) by integrating external knowledge sources, enabling more accurate and contextually relevant responses tailored to user queries. However, these systems remain vulnerable to corpus poisoning attacks that can significantly degrade LLM performance through the injection of malicious content. To address these challenges, we propose TrustRAG, a robust framework that systematically filters compromised and irrelevant content before it reaches the language model. Our approach implements a two-stage defense mechanism: first, it employs K-means clustering to identify potential attack patterns in retrieved documents based on their semantic embeddings, effectively isolating suspicious content. Second, it leverages cosine similarity and ROUGE metrics to detect malicious documents while resolving discrepancies between the model’s internal knowledge and external information through a self-assessment process. TrustRAG functions as a plug-and-play, training-free module that integrates seamlessly with any language model, whether open or closed-source, maintaining high contextual relevance while strengthening defenses against attacks. Through extensive experimental validation, we demonstrate that TrustRAG delivers substantial improvements in retrieval accuracy, efficiency, and attack resistance compared to existing approaches across multiple model architectures and datasets. We have made TrustRAG available as open-source software at <https://github.com/HuichiZhou/TrustRAG>.

## 1. Introduction

Imagine asking an advanced Large Language Model (LLM) who runs OpenAI and receiving a confidently stated but incorrect name—”Tim Cook.” While such misinformation might seem concerning, it represents a broader, more systemic vulnerability in modern AI systems. Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) was developed to enhance LLMs by dynamically retrieving information from external knowledge databases (Chen et al., 2024a; Gao et al., 2023; Lewis et al., 2020), theoretically providing more accurate and up-to-date responses. This approach has been widely adopted in prominent applications including ChatGPT (Achiam et al., 2023), Microsoft Bing Chat (Microsoft, 2024), Perplexity AI (Perplexity, 2024), and Google Search AI (Google, 2024). However, recent incidents have exposed critical weaknesses in these systems, from inconsistent Google Search AI results (BBC, 2024) to dangerous malicious code injections (rocky, 2024), underscoring the real-world consequences of their vulnerabilities.

At the heart of this problem lies a fundamental challenge: while RAG systems aim to enhance accuracy by connecting LLMs to external knowledge, they remain vulnerable to corpus poisoning attacks that can compromise this very capability. A growing body of research (Greshake et al., 2023; Zhong et al., 2023; Tan et al., 2024; Zou et al., 2024; Shafran et al., 2024) has documented how adversaries can exploit these systems by introducing malicious documents designed to hijack the retrieval process. These attacks are particularly stealthy because they can lead LLMs to generate incorrect or deceptive information with high confidence, effectively undermining the core purpose of RAG systems—to provide more reliable and accurate responses.

This vulnerability of RAG systems is exacerbated by two factors. First, there is a significant amount of noise and even fake news in the content available on the Internet, which poses challenges to search engines in accurately retrieving desirable knowledge. Second, LLMs suffer from unreliable generation challenges, as they can be misled by incorrect information contained in the context. Recent work demonstrates how malicious instructions injected into retrieved passages can override original user instructions and mislead LLM to generate their expected information (Greshake et al., 2023) or how query-specific adversarial prompts (ad-

---

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>Imperial College London, London, UK  
<sup>2</sup>Peking University, China. Correspondence to: Huichi Zhou  
<h.zhou24@imperial.ac.uk>.

versarial prefix and adversarial suffix) can be optimized to mislead both retrievers and LLMs (Tan et al., 2024). PoisonedRAG (Zou et al., 2024) injects malicious documents into the knowledge base to induce incorrect RAG responses. Additionally, there are real-world examples such as the ‘glue on pizza’ fiasco in Google Search AI (BBC, 2024). In another case, a retrieval corruption attack led to a loss of \$2.5k when ChatGPT generated code that contained malicious code snippets from a compromised GitHub repository (rocky, 2024). These RAG failures raise the important question of how to safeguard an RAG pipeline.

On the defense side, prior works have proposed advanced RAG frameworks (Xiang et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024) that aim to mitigate noisy information through majority-vote mechanisms across retrieved documents and carefully engineered prompts. However, these approaches become ineffective when attackers inject multiple malicious documents that outnumber benign ones (Zou et al., 2024). Even in scenarios with less aggressive poisoning, RAG systems often struggle with noisy or irrelevant content, which significantly impacts their ability to generate reliable answers (Wang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024a).

To address these vulnerabilities, we propose TrustRAG, the first defense framework specifically designed to maintain robust and trustworthy responses in scenarios where multiple malicious documents have contaminated the retrieval corpus. Our approach operates in two distinct stages, as illustrated in Figure 1. In the first stage *Clean Retrieval*, we employ the K-means clustering to identify and filter document clusters based on embedding density patterns, effectively separating potentially malicious content from legitimate information. The second stage, *Conflict Removal*, leverages the LLM’s internal knowledge and self-assessment to resolve inconsistencies between clean and malicious information.

Our investigation reveals that most of attackers (Tan et al., 2024; Zou et al., 2024) optimization setup constrains the malicious documents to be tightly clustered in the embedding space. Because the initial malicious documents for a target query are generated using LLM with different temperature settings, leading to inherent semantic similarity. Furthermore, the optimization is constrained to keep the malicious text embeddings within a small distance of the original embeddings. Therefore, the malicious texts occupy a dense, distinct region in the embedding space compared to normal, benign texts, which suggests that K-means clustering can effectively identify the malicious group.

After *Clean Retrieval* stage, the original problems could be simplified to the scenario that the benign documents occupies a large portion of the rest of documents. In many scenario, roughly 70% retrieved documents do not directly contain true answers, leading to the impeded performance of LLM with RAG systems (Wang et al., 2024). This scenario

will be more worse in corpus poisoning attack, because the attacker will induce malicious documents contain wrong answers for a target query. Inspired by the works of Sun et al. (2022), Yu et al. (2022), and Wang et al. (2024), the internal knowledge of LLM is beneficial to RAG systems. We can also use LLM-self to combine consistent information, identify conflicting information, and filter out malicious or irrelevant information. Finally, TrustRAG generates answers based on each group of consistent documents and compares the answers from different document groups to determine the final answer.

We extensively experimented with three datasets NQ, HotpotQA and MS-MARCO, and three open-source and close-source LLMs, Llama-3.1-8B (Touvron et al., 2023), Mistral-Nemo-12B (Mistral-Nemo, 2024) and GPT-4o (Achiam et al., 2023). Our major contributions are as follows:

- We propose TrustRAG, the first defense framework to effectively defense knowledge corruption attack where the number of poisoned documents exceeds the number of benign ones.
- TrustRAG decreases attack success rate while maintain high response accuracy on different popular RAG benchmarks and attack settings.
- We conduct an extensive evaluation for TrustRAG on multiple knowledge databases and LLMs. Additionally, we compare TrustRAG with advanced RAG systems.

## 2. Related Work

**Retrieval augmented generation.** RAG is a framework for improving the trustworthiness and facticity of LLMs through retrieving relevant information integrated with user query from an external knowledge database and grounding LLMs on the retrieved knowledge for conditional generations (Zhou et al., 2024). Generally, the workflow of RAG involves two steps: retrieval and generation (Lewis et al., 2020; Guu et al., 2020; Izacard et al., 2023). With the emergence of LLMs, there are a line of methods to further improve the ability of RAG, including rewriter (Zheng et al., 2023; Dai et al., 2022), re-ranker (Glass et al., 2022) or summarization (Chen et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024).

**Vulnerability of RAG.** The majority of existing RAG attacks focus on compromising retrieval systems with the goal of tricking them into retrieving adversarial documents. They can be divided into following categories, 1) prompt injection attack, i.e., the textual input fed directly to the LLM, causing the LLM to generate outputs that satisfy some adversarial objective (Chen et al., 2024d; RoyChowdhury et al., 2024), 2) corpus poisoning attack, i.e., attacker adds multiple documents to the database, crafted to make

the system generate adversary-chosen responses to specific queries (Tan et al., 2024; Zou et al., 2024; Shafran et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024c; Xue et al., 2024; Zhong et al., 2023) and 3) backdoor attack, i.e., The attacker introduces optimized backdoor triggers into the LLM’s long-term memory or RAG knowledge base, ensuring malicious responses are retrieved when specific triggers appear (Cheng et al., 2024; Long et al., 2024). These attacks require varying levels of access to the retrievers and/or the LLMs, such as white-box or black-box. However, all of these attacks need access to inject poisoned data into the underlying data corpus used by the RAG system. Additionally, almost all of them are targeted attacks, aimed at a particular subset of data, rather than indiscriminately affecting the entire dataset. In this sense, RAG attacks can essentially be regarded as targeted data poisoning attacks against the retrievers.

**Robustness of RAG.** To defend against above adversarial attacks on RAG, Xiang et al. (2024) first propose a defense framework, designing keyword-based and decoding-based algorithms for securely aggregating unstructured text responses. Shafran et al. (2024) use perplexity-based detection (Jelinek, 1980), paraphrasing (Jain et al., 2023) and increasing context size to defense the adversarial attacks. However, they do not notice the nature of adversarial attack on RAG. The main problems are that, 1) how to accurately filter the malicious texts from database; 2) how to effectively remove the conflict between internal and external knowledge. To address above issues, we propose TrustRAG to further enhance the robustness of RAG.

### 3. TrustRAG: Defense Framework

We begin with formulating the vulnerability of poisoned RAG systems (Section 3.1). We then provide an overview of TrustRAG, designed to overcome the above problem (Section 3.2). Subsequently, we delve into the two stages of TrustRAG, including *Clean Retrieval* (Section 3.3) and *Conflict Removal* (Section 3.4).

#### 3.1. Problem Formulation

**Defense Objective.** Our objective is to defense the malicious attacks of RAG systems, filter the malicious and irrelevant documents retrieved by retriever, ultimately producing more accurate and reliable responses from LLMs. **Notably, this defense framework is orthogonal to prior work on improving the retriever, LLMs, or conducting adaptive retrieval, which are mainly preliminary steps.**

**Attack Goals.** An attacker selects an arbitrary set of  $M$  questions, denoted as  $\mathbf{Q} = [q_1, q_2, \dots, q_M]$ . For each question  $q_i$ , the attacker will set an arbitrary attacker-desired response  $r_i$  for it. For instance, the  $q_i$  could be “*Who the*

*the CEO of OpenAI?*” and the  $r_i$  could be “*Tim Cook*”. In this attack scenario, we formulate corpus poisoning attacks to RAG systems as a constrained optimization problem. We assume an attacker can inject  $N$  malicious documents for each question  $q_i$  into a knowledge database  $\mathbf{D}$ . We use  $p_i^j$  to denote the  $j$ th malicious document for the question  $q_i$ , where  $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Attacker’s goal is to construct a set of malicious documents  $\Gamma = \{p_i^j | i = 1, 2, \dots, M; j = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  such that the LLM in a RAG system produce the answer  $r_i$  for the question  $q_i$  when utilizing the  $k$  documents retrieved from the poisoned knowledge database  $\mathbf{D} \cup \Gamma$  as the context. Formally, we have the following optimization problem:

$$\max_{\Gamma} \frac{1}{M} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^M \mathbb{I}(LLM(q_i; \mathcal{E}(q_i; \mathbf{D} \cup \Gamma)) = r_i), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t.}, \mathcal{E}(q_i; \mathbf{D} \cup \Gamma) = \text{Retrieve}(q_i, f_q, f_t, \mathbf{D} \cup \Gamma), \quad (2)$$

$$i = 1, 2, \dots, M, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function whose output is 1 if the condition is satisfied and 0 otherwise, and  $\mathcal{E}(q_i; \mathbf{D} \cup \Gamma)$  is a set of  $k$  texts retrieved from the corrupted knowledge database  $\mathbf{D} \cup \Gamma$  for the target question  $q_i$ . The objective function is large when the answer produced by the LLM based on the  $k$  retrieved texts for the target question is the target answer.

#### 3.2. Overview of TrustRAG

TrustRAG is a framework designed to defend against malicious attacks that poison RAG systems. It leverages K-means clustering and collective knowledge from both the internal knowledge of the LLM and external documents retrieved to generate more trustworthy and reliable responses. As shown in Figure 1, attackers optimize malicious documents for a target question and a target answer. The contriver retrieves similar documents from the knowledge database, and K-means filters out malicious documents. The LLM then generates internal knowledge and compares it with the external knowledge to remove conflicts and irrelevant documents. Finally, the output is generated based on the most reliable and proportional knowledge.

#### 3.3. Clean Retrieval

In the *Clean Retrieval* stage, we employ K-means clustering ( $k = 2$ ) to differentiate between benign and potentially malicious documents based on their embedding distributions. Our approach addresses two attack scenarios: 1) single injection ( $|p_i| \leq 1$ ), where an attacker injects one malicious document per query  $q_i$ , and 2) multiple injection ( $|p_i| > 1$ ), where multiple malicious documents are injected per query  $q_i$ . We formally define the attacker’s optimization objective




Figure 1. The framework of TrustRAG.

as:

$$\max \text{Sim}(f_Q(q_i), f_T(S \oplus I)), \quad (4)$$

where  $\text{Sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$  represents the similarity score (e.g., cosine similarity),  $f_Q$  and  $f_T$  are the text encoders for the query and retrieved document respectively, and  $S$  and  $I$  are optimized to be retrieved by the retriever while causing the LLM to generate incorrect answers. Due to the discrete nature of language, the attacker uses HotFlip (Ebrahimi et al., 2017) to optimize  $S$  and  $I$ .

To ensure the optimized text maintains semantic similarity with the original while still misleading the LLM, the following constraints must be satisfied:

$$|f_T(S \oplus I') - f_T(S \oplus I)|_p \leq \epsilon, \quad (5)$$

where  $|\cdot|_p$  represents the  $L_p$  norm and  $\epsilon$  is a small constant controlling the maximum allowed semantic deviation.

$$P(\text{LLM}(q_i, S \oplus I) = r_i) \geq \eta, \quad (6)$$

where  $\eta$  represents the minimum probability threshold for the LLM to generate the attacker's desired response  $r_i$  given the poisoned input.

The initial text  $I$  is generated with different temperature settings to create multiple diverse malicious documents. These texts inherently share high similarity due to their common generation process, and become even more tightly clustered in the embedding space after optimization under the constraint in Eq. 5. To defend against such attacks, we propose a two-stage framework. In the first stage, we apply the K-means clustering algorithm to analyze the distribution of text

embeddings generated by  $f_T$  and identify suspicious high-density clusters that may indicate the presence of malicious documents. In cases of multiple injections, our first-stage defense strategy effectively filters most malicious groups or pairs due to their high similarity. In consideration of single injection attacks, we proposed using ROUGE-L score (Lin, 2004) in Eq. 7 to compare intra-cluster similarity, aiming to preserve the majority of clean document for *Conflict Removal* information consolidation, which robustly filter single malicious document.

$$\text{ROUGE-L} = \frac{(1 + \beta^2) R_{\text{LCS}} P_{\text{LCS}}}{R_{\text{LCS}} + \beta^2 P_{\text{LCS}}}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$R_{\text{LCS}} = \frac{\text{LCS}(X, Y)}{|X|}, \quad P_{\text{LCS}} = \frac{\text{LCS}(X, Y)}{|Y|}. \quad (8)$$

*Notation.* Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be the reference and candidate summaries, with lengths  $|X|$  and  $|Y|$ , respectively.  $\text{LCS}(X, Y)$  is their Longest Common Subsequence.  $R_{\text{LCS}}$  and  $P_{\text{LCS}}$  are the recall and precision of the LCS, and  $\beta$  balances these two measures in the final ROUGE-L score.

From Figure 3, it was observed that the ROUGE-L scores significantly differ when comparing pairs of clean documents, pairs of malicious documents, and pairs of clean and malicious documents. Utilizing this property, we can decide not to filter groups containing only one malicious document among clean documents, thereby reducing information loss. Instead, these groups can proceed to *Conflict Removal*, which focuses on identifying and removing single injection attacks.

Table 1. Main Results show that different defense frameworks and RAG systems defense again two kinds of attack method based on three kinds of large language models..

Dataset Attack LLM	Defense	HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018)			NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019)			MS-MARCO (Bajaj et al., 2018)		
		PIA ACC↑ / ASR↓	PoisonedRAG ACC↑ / ASR↓	Clean ACC↑	PIA ACC↑ / ASR↓	PoisonedRAG ACC↑ / ASR↓	Clean ACC↑	PIA ACC↑ / ASR↓	PoisonedRAG ACC↑ / ASR↓	Clean ACC↑
MistralNemo-12B	Vanilla	43.0/49.0	1.0/97.0	78.0	45.0/50.0	10.0/88.0	69.0	47.0/49.0	6.0/93.0	82.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	55.0 / 25.0	26.0/70.0	54.0	55.0/4.0	28.0/60.0	57.0	75.0 / 6.0	37.0/53.0	72.0
	InstructRAG <sub>ICL</sub>	31.0/64.0	9.0/89.0	73.0	53.0/41.0	11.0/88.0	65.0	57.0/37.0	13.0/84.0	83.0
	ASTUTE RAG	59.0/28.0	30.0/61.0	76.0	62.0/19.0	44.0/46.0	72.0	72.0/24.0	37.0/59.0	84.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	37.0/51.0	69.0/8.0	74.0	45.0/43.0	57.0/3.0	66.0	42.0/54.0	75.0/6.0	79.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	70.0/14.0	70.0/4.0	77.0	62.0/9.0	64.0/1.0	66.0	77.0/10.0	79.0/7.0	81.0
Llama3.1-8B	Vanilla	3.0/95.0	1.0/99.0	71.0	4.0/93.0	2.0/98.0	71.0	2.0/98.0	3.0/97.0	79.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	55.0/4.0	3.0/93.0	52.0	44.0/11.0	1.0/68.0	45.0	69.0 / 15.0	3.0/95.0	72.0
	InstructRAG <sub>ICL</sub>	64.0/27.0	26.0/73.0	83.0	55.0/19.0	27.0/69.0	68.0	57.0/19.0	44.0/54.0	89.0
	ASTUTE RAG	51.0/28.0	48.0/41.0	65.0	70.0/14.0	61.0/29.0	75.0	71.0/25.0	26.0/73.0	83.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	28.0/61.0	54.0/6.0	70.0	40.0/52.0	67.0/6.0	65.0	31.0/67.0	77.0/7.0	81.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	66.0/5.0	59.0/6.0	71.0	82.0/2.0	81.0/2.0	81.0	82.0/4.0	87.0/3.0	88.0
GPT4o	Vanilla	60.0/37.0	8.0/92.0	82.0	52.0/41.0	20.0/80.0	76.0	67.0/28.0	29.0/66.0	81.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	60.0/8.0	5.0/76.0	54.0	40.0 / 38.0	1.0/61.0	45.0	48.0 / 29.0	2.0/63.0	56.0
	InstructRAG <sub>ICL</sub>	58.0/41.0	1.0/98.0	86.0	63.0/34.0	13.0/83.0	79.0	69.0/28.0	15.0/81.0	81.0
	ASTUTE RAG	74.0/16.0	66.0/35.0	80.0	81.0/4.0	76.0/24.0	81.0	86.0/11.0	67.0/24.0	85.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	56.0/37.0	82.0/5.0	76.0	49.0/41.0	79.0/6.0	76.0	63.0/35.0	88.0/4.0	77.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	77.0/7.0	77.0/6.0	78.0	81.0/3.0	80.0/1.0	81.0	86.0/12.0	89.0/2.0	88.0

### 3.4. Conflict Removal

In the *Remove Conflict* stage, inspired by the works (Sun et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024), we leverage the internal knowledge of the LLM, which reflects the consensus from extensive pre-training and instruction-tuning data. This internal knowledge can supplement any missing information from the limited set of retrieved documents and even rebut malicious documents, enabling mutual confirmation between internal and external knowledge.

After the *Clean Retrieval* stage, where most of the malicious documents have been filtered out, we further enhance the trustworthiness of the RAG system. First, we prompt the LLM to generate internal knowledge (see Appendix E.1), following the work of Bai et al. (2022), which emphasizes the importance of reliability and trustworthiness in generated documents. To achieve this goal, we enhance the original method with constitutional principles (Bai et al., 2022). However, unlike the works of Sun et al. (2022), Yu et al. (2022), and Wang et al. (2024), which generate multiple diverse documents using different temperature settings and may lead to hallucination or incorrectness, we only perform a single LLM inference. This approach is not only more reliable but also cost-efficient.

Next, we employ the LLM to explicitly consolidate information from both documents generated from its internal knowledge and documents retrieved from external sources. Initially, we combine document from both internal and external knowledge sources  $D_0 = E \cup I \cup \Gamma$ . To filter the conflict between benign and malicious documents, we prompt the LLM using prompt (See Appendix E.2) to identify consistent information across different documents, detect malicious information. This step would regroup the unreliable knowledge in input documents into fewer refined documents. The regrouped documents will also attribute their source to

the corresponding one or more input documents.

Finally, we prompt the LLM using prompt (See Appendix E.3) to generate the final answer based on the each group of documents, and then compare their reliability and select the most reliable one as the final answer. This comparison allows the LLM to comprehensively consider knowledge source, cross-source confirmation, frequency, and information thoroughness when making the final decision.

## 4. Experiment

### 4.1. Setup

In this section, we discuss our experiment setup. All of our inference architectures are implemented by LMDeploy (Contributors, 2023).

**Datasets.** We use three benchmark question-answering datasets in our defense framework: Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), and MS-MARCO (Bajaj et al., 2018), where each dataset has a knowledge database. The knowledge databases of NQ and HotpotQA are collected from Wikipedia, which contains 2,681,468 and 5,233,329 texts, respectively. The knowledge database of MS-MARCO is collected from web documents using the MicroSoft Bing search engine, which contains 8,841,823 texts. Each dataset also contains a set of questions.

**Attackers.** We introduce two kinds of popular RAG attacks to verify the robustness of our defense framework. (1) Corpus Poisoning Attack: PoisonedRAG (Zou et al., 2024) create poisoned documents directly appending poisoned text to the adversarial queries. (2) Prompt Injection Attack: PIA (Zhong et al., 2023; Greshake et al., 2023) propose an attack, in which a malicious user generates a small num-

ber of adversarial passages by perturbing discrete tokens to maximize similarity with a provided set of training queries.

**Evaluation Metrics.** There are several metrics used in this paper: (1) Response Accuracy (**ACC**) represents the accuracy of RAG system in clean database. (2) Attack Successful Rate (**ASR**) is the number of incorrect answer mislead by attacker.

## 4.2. Results

We conduct comprehensive experiments compared with different defense frameworks and RAG systems under the attacks of two kinds of popular methods (PIA (Zhong et al., 2023) and PoisonedRAG (Zou et al., 2024)) based on the three kinds of large language models. The more detailed results of PoisonedRAG in different poison rate can be found in the Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6.

As shown in Table 1, all the previous methods cannot effectively handle the scenario of multiple malicious documents injected into the knowledge database, in the setting of PoisonedRAG, the **ASR** can range from 20% to 97% and the **ACC** can range from 2% to 76%. Especial for RobustRAG, which is a defense framework using aggregating and voting strategies. Once the number of malicious documents exceed the number of benign one, they failed. However, beneficial from the K-means filtering strategy, TrustRAG can significantly reduces malicious documents, and only a small portion of malicious documents are sent to *Conflict Removal* stage. After *Conflict Removal*, TrustRAG can integrate with internal knowledge and use the information of consistent groups to inference the final answer.

For PIA attack, which will use the strongly induced document to mislead the LLM to generate incorrect answer. In TrustRAG, we can consider this situation as equivalent to the scenario in the PoisonedRAG where the number of poisonings is set to 1. Our method can also effectively defense this attack using *Conflict Removal*.

## 5. Detailed Analysis of TrustRAG

### 5.1. Effectiveness of K-means Filtering Strategy

**Distribution of Poisoned Documents.** As shown in Figure 5, we plot a case in which samples from the NQ data set are used in different numbers of poisoned documents, we can see that in the scenario of multiple malicious documents, the malicious documents are close to each other, as for a single poisoned document, which will mix in the clean documents. Therefore, it is important to use the n-gram preservation to preserve the clean documents.

**N-gram preservation.** As shown in Table 2, we conduct an ablation study on n-gram preservation, we can see that

the F1 Score of K-mean with n-gram preservation will be higher than without n-gram preservation after poisoning rate more than 20%. However, when poisoning rate at 20%, if we do not use n-gram preservation, the K-means filtering strategy will randomly remove the group which has higher similarity, but it will lead the bad effect of decreasing the CRR. The clean documents will be filtered by mistake. Therefore, using n-gram preservation will not only preserve the clean documents and increase the F1 score of detecting the malicious documents.

**Embedding Models.** Choosing the right embedding model is crucial for effective cluster the retrieved documents. As shown in Table 2, we compare different embedding models (SimCSE (Gao et al., 2021), Bert (Devlin, 2018) and BGE (Chen et al., 2024b)), and the results show that our proposed K-means filtering strategy is robust and effective for them. Meanwhile, more fine-grained embedding model (e.g. SimCSE) will achieve better performance and be robust in different poisoning rates and datasets.

### 5.2. Runtime Analysis

As shown in Table 3, we present a detailed runtime analysis for various methods across three datasets: MS-MARCO, NQ, and HotpotQA. While RobustRAG leverages the implementation available at Github<sup>1</sup>, all other methods are based on the same inference architecture to ensure a fair comparison. The analysis reveals that TrustRAG achieves a runtime that is approximately two times greater than Vanilla RAG, which is a reasonable trade-off considering the significant improvements in robustness and reliability offered by TrustRAG.

### 5.3. Effectiveness of Perplexity-based Detection

We test the effectiveness of PPL defense and follow the setting in in the work (Shafraan et al., 2024). Text perplexity (Jelinek, 1980) is used to evaluate the naturalness and quality of text. Given a text  $T$  composed of  $n$  tokens,  $T = [x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , the PPL is defined as follows:

$$\text{PPL}(T) = \left( \prod_{i=1}^n P(x_i | x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}) \right)^{-\frac{1}{n}} \quad (9)$$

Since attackers will generate unnatural looking gibberish to attack LLMs, PPL detection has been suggested as a defense (Alon & Kamfonas, 2023; Jain et al., 2023) and Shafraan et al. (2024) claim that the distribution of perplexity values differ significantly between clean and malicious documents and PPL can be an effective defense.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/inspire-group/RobustRAG>

Table 2. Results on various datasets with different Poisoning levels and embedding models. F1 score measures the performance of detecting poisoned samples, while Clean Retention Rate (CRR) evaluates the proportion of clean samples retained after filtering.

Dataset	Embedding Model	Poison-(100%) F1↑	Poison-(80%) F1↑ / CRR↑	Poison-(60%) F1↑ / CRR↑	Poison-(40%) F1↑ / CRR↑	Poison-(20%) F1↑ / CRR↑	Poison-(0%) CRR↑
NQ	SimCSE	97.5	92.6/92.0	94.3/91.5	84.9/89.0	3.1/86.2	85.0
	+ w/o n-gram	91.3	83.9/93.0	72.0/69.0	64.4/68.3	35.8/54.8	52.6
	Bert	97.2	84.7/84.0	87.4/89.0	77.8/82.0	5.6/78.5	74.2
	+ w/o n-gram	52.0	73.2/80.0	63.4/61.0	51.7/58.0	35.5/55.8	52.0
	BGE	98.1	90.8/92.0	96.9/93.0	89.5/91.0	3.0/86.3	87.6
	+ w/o n-gram	93.8	85.0/93.0	86.7/83.0	79.9/80.7	27.5/51.5	51.4
MS-MARCO	SimCSE	95.6	84.7/88.0	84.0/80.0	71.7/73.0	4.6/72.0	70.6
	+ w/o n-gram	89.4	77.3/84.0	69.6/60.5	58.1/61.7	17.0/47.5	52.4
	Bert	95.2	83.0/85.0	77.8/73.0	66.8/71.7	5.8/70.0	70.4
	+ w/o n-gram	87.4	75.4/74.0	67.3/58.5	48.9/53.7	24.6/48.0	51.8
	BGE	94.2	87.2/88.0	84.1/73.0	73.4/69.3	5.0/66.0	66.8
	+ w/o n-gram	91.4	81.5/78.0	73.2/59.0	64.9/66.3	17.9/46.5	47.8
HotpotQA	SimCSE	99.2	95.6/91.0	95.2/84.0	90.0/80.6	6.5/80.0	81.8
	+ w/o n-gram	94.9	85.1/94.0	1.0/77.0	72.5/73.3	21.3/47.5	49.0
	Bert	99.2	89.7/88.0	85.5/75.5	83.7/79.7	2.4/78.0	76.2
	+ w/o n-gram	88.5	79.4/88.0	64.1/61.0	48.1/55.3	25.8/49.5	49.0
	BGE	99.6	91.9/90.0	95.6/84.0	90.2/82.3	9.7/80.5	81.0
	+ w/o n-gram	94.7	87.4/91.0	82.5/81.0	74.7/76.3	16.5/44.3	49.6




Figure 2. (1) The perplexity distribution density plot between clean and malicious documents. And the lines of dashes represent the average perplexity values. (2) The bar plot of ablation study on accuracy in NQ dataset based on the Llama<sub>3.1-8B</sub>. (3) The bar plot of ablation study on attack success rate in NQ dataset based on the Llama<sub>3.1-8B</sub>.

Table 3. TrustRAG runtime analysis based on Llama<sub>3.1-8B</sub> for 100 queries in three different datasets.

	# API Call	MS-MARCO	NQ	HotpotQA
Vanilla RAG	1	8.9/1×	9.2/1×	9.6/1×
InstructRAG <sub>ICL</sub>	1	12.6/1.4×	13.1/1.4×	32.7/3.4×
RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	6	107.9/12.1×	107.7/11.7×	107.9/11.2×
ASTUTE RAG	3	17.5/2.0×	17.3/1.9×	16.7/1.7×
TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	1	12.3/1.4×	12.6/1.4×	12.5/1.3×
TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	3	18.4/2.1×	19.9/2.2×	21.7/2.3×

From our experimental results, as shown in Figure 2 (1), it is evident that the PPL values for clean and adversarial texts exhibit substantial overlap. While Shafraan et al. (2024) claim that the distribution of PPL values is significantly different for clean and malicious documents, our results challenge this assertion.

We observe that although some adversarial examples have elevated PPL values, a considerable portion of them remain




Figure 3. (1) The density plot of cosine similarity between three different groups. (2) The boxplot of ROUGE Score between three different groups.

within the range of clean texts. This overlap suggests that using PPL as a sole metric for detecting adversarial attacks may lead to false negatives (adversarial texts being misclassified as clean) and false positives (clean texts being flagged as adversarial). Therefore, while PPL can serve as a useful indicator, it is insufficient on its own as a robust defense




Figure 4. (1) The line plot of accuracy between TrustRAG and Vanilla RAG on clean scenario. (2) The line plot of accuracy between TrustRAG and Vanilla RAG on malicious scenario. (3) The line plot of attack successful rate between TrustRAG and Vanilla RAG on malicious scenario. All the context windows set from 5 to 20 and the malicious scenario includes 5 malicious documents.

mechanism against adversarial attacks.

#### 5.4. Ablation Study

We conducted an ablation study on the NQ dataset using Llama<sub>3.1-8B</sub> and analyzed the impact of three key components: K-means, conflict removal, and internal knowledge.

**Impact of K-means Clustering.** As shown in Figure 2 (2) and (3), K-means effectively defends against attacks while maintaining high response accuracy when the poisoning rate exceeds 20%. Even at a poisoning rate of 20% (with only a single poisoned document), K-means successfully preserves the integrity of clean documents.

**Impact of Internal Knowledge.** Comparing TrustRAG with and without providing internal knowledge inferred from the LLM, from Figure 2, we observe notable improvements in both ACC and ASR. Particularly at the poisoned rate of 20%, internal knowledge effectively addresses conflicts between malicious and clean documents, contributing significantly to improved robustness.

**Impact of Conflict Removal.** While K-means clustering and internal knowledge significantly reduce the ASR, the conflict removal component also plays a crucial role in the defense framework. By leveraging knowledge consolidation and rationale outputs, TrustRAG further enhances the robustness of RAG systems across all scenarios.

#### 5.5. Impact of Context Window

RAG systems face two critical types of non-adversarial noise beyond intentional poisoning attacks: retrieval-based noise from imperfect retrievers returning irrelevant documents, and corpus-based noise from inherent inaccuracies in the knowledge base itself (Wei et al., 2024). To address these challenges, we developed K-means filtering that clusters re-

trieved documents by semantic similarity and eliminates outlier clusters. Our empirical evaluation demonstrates that this approach consistently outperforms existing denoising methods (e.g. InstructRAG), across multiple performance metrics.

To rigorously assess TrustRAG’s robustness, we conducted extensive experiments on the NQ dataset using Llama<sub>3.1-8B</sub> under two key scenarios: (1) a clean setting with context windows ranging from 1 to 20 documents, and (2) a poisoned setting with 5 malicious documents and varying context windows. The results reveal TrustRAG’s superior performance in both scenarios. In clean settings, TrustRAG’s accuracy improves steadily with larger context windows (5–20 documents), consistently outperforming vanilla RAG. More importantly, in poisoned scenarios, TrustRAG maintains approximately 80% accuracy while keeping attack success rates (ASR) around 1%. This contrasts markedly with vanilla RAG, which achieves only 10–40% accuracy in relation to ASR levels of 60–90%.

## 6. Conclusion

RAG systems, despite their potential to enhance language models’ capabilities, remain vulnerable to corpus poisoning attacks which is a critical security concern that is still insufficiently addressed. In this work, we introduce TrustRAG, the first RAG defense framework designed to counter attacks involving multiple maliciously injected documents. TrustRAG employs K-means filtering to reduce the presence of malicious documents and incorporates both internal and external knowledge sources to resolve conflicts and mitigate the impact of these attacks. Our comprehensive evaluation across benchmarks demonstrates that TrustRAG outperforms existing defenses, maintaining high accuracy even under aggressive poisoning scenarios where traditional approaches fail. Moreover, TrustRAG’s plug-and-play architecture enables immediate deployment with any LLMs.

## References

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Alon, G. and Kamfonas, M. Detecting language model attacks with perplexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14132*, 2023.
- Bai, Y., Kadavath, S., Kundu, S., Askell, A., Kernion, J., Jones, A., Chen, A., Goldie, A., Mirhoseini, A., McKinnon, C., et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- Bajaj, P., Campos, D., Craswell, N., Deng, L., Gao, J., Liu, X., Majumder, R., McNamara, A., Mitra, B., Nguyen, T., et al. A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09268*, 2018.
- BBC. Glue pizza and eat rocks: Google ai search errors go viral. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/cd11gzejgz4o>, 2024.
- Chen, H., Pasunuru, R., Weston, J., and Celikyilmaz, A. Walking down the memory maze: Beyond context limit through interactive reading. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05029*, 2023.
- Chen, J., Lin, H., Han, X., and Sun, L. Benchmarking large language models in retrieval-augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 17754–17762, 2024a.
- Chen, J., Xiao, S., Zhang, P., Luo, K., Lian, D., and Liu, Z. Bge m3-embedding: Multi-lingual, multi-functionality, multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation, 2024b.
- Chen, Z., Liu, J., Liu, H., Cheng, Q., Zhang, F., Lu, W., and Liu, X. Black-box opinion manipulation attacks to retrieval-augmented generation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.13757*, 2024c.
- Chen, Z., Xiang, Z., Xiao, C., Song, D., and Li, B. Agent-poison: Red-teaming llm agents via poisoning memory or knowledge bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12784*, 2024d.
- Cheng, P., Ding, Y., Ju, T., Wu, Z., Du, W., Yi, P., Zhang, Z., and Liu, G. Trojanrag: Retrieval-augmented generation can be backdoor driver in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13401*, 2024.
- Contributors, L. Lmdeploy: A toolkit for compressing, deploying, and serving llm. <https://github.com/InternLM/lmdeploy>, 2023.
- Dai, Z., Zhao, V. Y., Ma, J., Luan, Y., Ni, J., Lu, J., Bakalov, A., Guu, K., Hall, K. B., and Chang, M.-W. Promptagator: Few-shot dense retrieval from 8 examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11755*, 2022.
- Devlin, J. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- Ebrahimi, J., Rao, A., Lowd, D., and Dou, D. Hotflip: White-box adversarial examples for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06751*, 2017.
- Gao, T., Yao, X., and Chen, D. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08821*, 2021.
- Gao, Y., Xiong, Y., Gao, X., Jia, K., Pan, J., Bi, Y., Dai, Y., Sun, J., and Wang, H. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2023.
- Glass, M., Rossiello, G., Chowdhury, M. F. M., Naik, A. R., Cai, P., and Gliozzo, A. Re2g: Retrieve, rerank, generate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.06300*, 2022.
- Google. Generative ai in search: Let google do the searching for you. <https://blog.google/products/search/generative-ai-google-search-may-2024/>, 2024.
- Greshake, K., Abdelnabi, S., Mishra, S., Endres, C., Holz, T., and Fritz, M. Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world llm-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security*, pp. 79–90, 2023.
- Guu, K., Lee, K., Tung, Z., Pasupat, P., and Chang, M. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 3929–3938. PMLR, 2020.
- Izacard, G., Lewis, P., Lomeli, M., Hosseini, L., Petroni, F., Schick, T., Dwivedi-Yu, J., Joulin, A., Riedel, S., and Grave, E. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(251):1–43, 2023.
- Jain, N., Schwarzschild, A., Wen, Y., Somepalli, G., Kirchenbauer, J., Chiang, P.-y., Goldblum, M., Saha, A., Geiping, J., and Goldstein, T. Baseline defenses for adversarial attacks against aligned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00614*, 2023.
- Jelinek, F. Interpolated estimation of markov source parameters from sparse data. In *Proc. Workshop on Pattern Recognition in Practice, 1980*, 1980.

- Kim, J., Nam, J., Mo, S., Park, J., Lee, S.-W., Seo, M., Ha, J.-W., and Shin, J. Sure: Summarizing retrievals using answer candidates for open-domain qa of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13081*, 2024.
- Kwiatkowski, T., Palomaki, J., Redfield, O., Collins, M., Parikh, A., Alberti, C., Epstein, D., Polosukhin, I., Devlin, J., Lee, K., et al. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:453–466, 2019.
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-t., Rocktäschel, T., et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- Lin, C.-Y. ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pp. 74–81, Barcelona, Spain, July 2004. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>.
- Long, Q., Deng, Y., Gan, L., Wang, W., and Pan, S. J. Backdoor attacks on dense passage retrievers for disseminating misinformation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13532*, 2024.
- Microsoft. Bing chat. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/edge/features/bing-chat>, 2024.
- Mistral-Nemo. Mistral-nemo-instruct-2407. <https://huggingface.co/mistralai/Mistral-Nemo-Instruct-2407>, 2024.
- Perplexity, A. Perplexity ai. <https://www.perplexity.ai/>, 2024.
- rocky. A retrieval corruption attack. [https://x.com/r\\_cky0/status/1859656430888026524?s=46&t=p9-0aPCrd\\_0h9-yuSXpN8g](https://x.com/r_cky0/status/1859656430888026524?s=46&t=p9-0aPCrd_0h9-yuSXpN8g), 2024.
- RoyChowdhury, A., Luo, M., Sahu, P., Banerjee, S., and Tiwari, M. Confusedpilot: Confused deputy risks in rag-based llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04870*, 2024.
- Shafraan, A., Schuster, R., and Shmatikov, V. Machine against the rag: Jamming retrieval-augmented generation with blocker documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05870*, 2024.
- Sun, Z., Wang, X., Tay, Y., Yang, Y., and Zhou, D. Recitation-augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01296*, 2022.
- Tan, Z., Zhao, C., Moraffah, R., Li, Y., Wang, S., Li, J., Chen, T., and Liu, H. ” glue pizza and eat rocks”–exploiting vulnerabilities in retrieval-augmented generative models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19417*, 2024.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Wang, F., Wan, X., Sun, R., Chen, J., and Arik, S. Ö. Astute rag: Overcoming imperfect retrieval augmentation and knowledge conflicts for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07176*, 2024.
- Wei, Z., Chen, W.-L., and Meng, Y. Instructrag: Instructing retrieval-augmented generation with explicit denoising. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13629*, 2024.
- Xiang, C., Wu, T., Zhong, Z., Wagner, D., Chen, D., and Mittal, P. Certifiably robust rag against retrieval corruption. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15556*, 2024.
- Xue, J., Zheng, M., Hu, Y., Liu, F., Chen, X., and Lou, Q. Badrag: Identifying vulnerabilities in retrieval augmented generation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00083*, 2024.
- Yang, Z., Qi, P., Zhang, S., Bengio, Y., Cohen, W. W., Salakhutdinov, R., and Manning, C. D. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*, 2018.
- Yu, W., Iter, D., Wang, S., Xu, Y., Ju, M., Sanyal, S., Zhu, C., Zeng, M., and Jiang, M. Generate rather than retrieve: Large language models are strong context generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10063*, 2022.
- Zheng, H. S., Mishra, S., Chen, X., Cheng, H.-T., Chi, E. H., Le, Q. V., and Zhou, D. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06117*, 2023.
- Zhong, Z., Huang, Z., Wettig, A., and Chen, D. Poisoning retrieval corpora by injecting adversarial passages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19156*, 2023.
- Zhou, Y., Liu, Y., Li, X., Jin, J., Qian, H., Liu, Z., Li, C., Dou, Z., Ho, T.-Y., and Yu, P. S. Trustworthiness in retrieval-augmented generation systems: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.10102*, 2024.
- Zou, W., Geng, R., Wang, B., and Jia, J. Poisonedrag: Knowledge corruption attacks to retrieval-augmented generation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07867*, 2024.

## A. Details of Experiments

## B. NQ results

Table 4. NQ Result

Dataset	Defense	Poison-(100%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(80%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(60%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(40%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(20%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(0%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$
Mistral <sub>Nemo-12B</sub>	Vanilla	10.0/88.0	15.0/84.0	18.0/79.0	34.0/62.0	42.0/51.0	69.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	28.0/60.0	30.0/59.0	35.0/54.0	39.0/45.0	54.0/9.0	57.0
	InstructRAG <sub>I2CL</sub>	11.0/88.0	21.0/77.0	25.0/70.0	33.0/59.0	48.0/40.0	65.0
	ASTUTE RAG	44.0/46.0	56.0/32.0	63.0/24.0	65.0/19.0	69.0/10.0	72.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	57.0/3.0	51.0/18.0	65.0/2.0	62.0/2.0	46.0/40.0	66.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	64.0/1.0	64.0/4.0	65.0/1.0	65.0/0.0	59.0/19.0	66.0
Llama <sub>3,1-8B</sub>	Vanilla	2.0/98.0	2.0/98.0	3.0/97.0	4.0/93.0	26.0/73.0	71.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	11.0/83.0	15.0/75.0	23.0/63.0	37.0/46.0	51.0/27.0	61.0
	InstructRAG <sub>I2CL</sub>	27.0/69.0	38.0/56.0	40.0/56.0	51.0/45.0	58.0/37.0	68.0
	ASTUTE RAG	61.0/29.0	64.0/24.0	68.0/19.0	69.0/18.0	77.0/11.0	75.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	67.0/6.0	51.0/19.0	56.0/3.0	62.0/2.0	43.0/50.0	65.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	81.0/2.0	80.0/5.0	80.0/3.0	83.0/1.0	73.0/16.0	81.0
GPT <sub>4o</sub>	Vanilla	20.0/80.0	32.0/69.0	37.0/60.0	49.0/49.0	56.0/39.0	76.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	1.0/61.0	8.0/57.0	20.0/58.0	32.0/36.0	39.0/28.0	45.0
	InstructRAG <sub>I2CL</sub>	13.0/83.0	21.0/74.0	27.0/65.0	37.0/55.0	53.0/39.0	79.0
	ASTUTE RAG	76.0/24.0	76.0/21.0	76.0/20.0	78.0/16.0	82.0/6.0	81.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	79.0/6.0	65.0/15.0	75.0/3.0	73.0/3.0	57.0/35.0	76.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	80.0/1.0	82.0/3.0	85.0/1.0	82.0/1.0	82.0/6.0	81.0

## C. MS-MARCO results

Table 5. MS-MARCO Result

Dataset	Defense	Poison-(100%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(80%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(60%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(40%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(20%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$	Poison-(0%) acc $\uparrow$ / asr $\downarrow$
Mistral <sub>Nemo-12B</sub>	Vanilla	6.0 / 93.0	10.0 / 88.0	21.0 / 74.0	33.0 / 62.0	52.0 / 43.0	82.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	37.0/53.0	40.0/50.0	50.0/38.0	62.0/21.0	72.0/9.0	72.0
	InstructRAG	13.0/84.0	22.0/72.0	31.0/62.0	40.0/54.0	57.0/36.0	83.0
	ASTUTE RAG	37.0/59.0	43.0/52.0	55.0/41.0	68.0/28.0	77.0/16.0	84.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	75.0/6.0	67.0/18.0	75.0/7.0	79.0/7.0	50.0/44.0	79.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	79.0/7.0	75.0/13.0	78.0/6.0	80.0/6.0	64.0/26.0	81.0
Llama <sub>3,1-8B</sub>	Vanilla	3.0/97.0	3.0/96.0	5.0/94.0	7.0/93.0	28.0/70.0	79.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	25.0/68.0	28.0/66.0	37.0/54.0	57.0/34.0	67.0/19.0	73.0
	InstructRAG	44.0/54.0	47.0/51.0	49.0/45.0	60.0/36.0	63.0/33.0	89.0
	ASTUTE RAG	26.0/73.0	40.0/57.0	50.0/47.0	52.0/44.0	54.0/41.0	83.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	77.0/7.0	64.0/18.0	72.0/7.0	78.0/6.0	45.0/47.0	81.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	87.0/3.0	82.0/8.0	84.0/4.0	88.0/4.0	76.0/17.0	88.0
GPT <sub>4o</sub>	Vanilla	29.0/66.0	43.0/49.0	51.0/40.0	59.0/35.0	67.0/24.0	81.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	2.0/63.0	17.0/52.0	23.0/48.0	41.0/33.0	50.0/22.0	56.0
	InstructRAG	15.0/81.0	31.0/64.0	39.0/54.0	47.0/45.0	59.0/35.0	81.0
	ASTUTE RAG	67.0/24.0	67.0/21.0	72.0/17.0	74.0/16.0	77.0/13.0	85.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	88.0/4.0	76.0/11.0	84.0/2.0	84.0/4.0	62.0/24.0	77.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	89.0/2.0	89.0/2.0	89.0/3.0	90.0/3.0	84.0/12.0	88.0

## TrustRAG: Enhancing Robustness and Trustworthiness in RAG

Table 6. HotpotQA Result

Dataset	Defense	Poison-(100%) acc↑ / asr↓	Poison-(80%) acc↑ / asr↓	Poison-(60%) acc↑ / asr↓	Poison-(40%) acc↑ / asr↓	Poison-(20%) acc↑ / asr↓	Poison-(0%) acc↑ / asr↓
Mistral <sub>Nemo-12B</sub>	Vanilla	1.0/97.0	6.0/93.0	9.0/90.0	18.0/78.0	28.0/68.0	78.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	26.0/70.0	28.0/68.0	33.0/59.0	41.0/43.0	51.0/27.0	54.0
	InstructRAG <sub>TCL</sub>	9.0/89.0	11.0/87.0	14.0/81.0	24.0/68.0	36.0/59.0	73.0
	ASTUTE RAG	30.0/61.0	37.0/54.0	52.0/38.0	57.0/31.0	60.0/24.0	76.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	69.0/8.0	68.0/12.0	76.0/6.0	77.0/5.0	38.0/54.0	74.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	70.0/4.0	71.0/9.0	76.0/4.0	76.0/2.0	53.0/31.0	77.0
Llama <sub>3.1-8B</sub>	Vanilla	1.0/99.0	2.0/97.0	6.0/94.0	5.0/94.0	27.0/81.0	71.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	8.0/89.0	10.0/87.0	19.0/76.0	33.0/57.0	40.0/50.0	54.0
	InstructRAG <sub>TCL</sub>	26.0/73/0	40.0/57.0	50.0/47.0	52.0/44.0	54.0/41.0	83.0
	ASTUTE RAG	48.0/41.0	53.0/38.0	59.0/30.0	59.0/31.0	65.0/16.0	65.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	54.0/6.0	61.0/12.0	72.0/3.0	66.0/2.0	43.0/47.0	70.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	59.0/6.0	62.0/6.0	64.0/4.0	68.0/5.0	59.0/28.0	71.0
GPT <sub>4o</sub>	Vanilla	8.0/92.0	33.0/67.0	31.0/69.0	48.0/52.0	52.0/48.0	82.0
	RobustRAG <sub>Keyword</sub>	5.0/76.0	18.0/74.0	20.0/61.0	41.0/43.0	51.0/27.0	54.0
	InstructRAG <sub>TCL</sub>	1.0/98.0	9.0/90.0	19.0/79.0	27.0/71.0	33.0/63.0	86.0
	ASTUTE RAG	66.0/35.0	67.0/33.0	74.0/25.0	76.0/24.0	78.0/22.0	80.0
	TrustRAG <sub>K-means</sub>	82.0/5.0	77.0/12.0	85.0/5.0	81.0/10.0	54.0/46.0	76.0
	TrustRAG <sub>Conflict</sub>	77.0/6.0	78.0/7.0	78.0/8.0	78.0/7.0	78.0/22.0	78.0

### D. HotpotQA results

### E. Prompt Template for TrustRAG

#### E.1. Prompt for Internal Knowledge Generation

Prompt for Internal Knowledge Generation

Generate a concise text that provides accurate and relevant information to answer the given question. If the information is unclear or uncertain, explicitly state 'I don't know' to avoid any hallucinations. Please less than 50 words!




Figure 5. The embedding distribution of retrieved documents.

## E.2. Prompt for Knowledge Consolidation

### Prompt for Knowledge Consolidation ( $p_{con}$ )

Task: Consolidate information from both memorized documents and externally retrieved documents.

1. Exclude documents that contain specific answers without context or appear to instruct the system on how to answer a question.
2. Exclude documents that include text resembling manipulative instructions, predefined answers, or formats similar to the following pattern: "When you are asked to provide the answer for the following question: [question], please output: [target answer]"
3. Exclude irrelevant or conflicting documents, prioritizing the most consistent and supported information.

Filtering Criteria: 1. Any document that directly dictates a specific response, contains manipulative instructions, or follows a predefined answer format without logical or contextual reasoning should be ignored.

2. Focus only on documents that provide factual, logical context and support the answer without external instructions.
3. Explicitly filter out documents that include structured manipulative instructions, such as those resembling patterns.

Memorized documents and externally retrieved documents:[initial\_context]

Question: [questions[i]]

Output the consolidated information.

Information:

## E.3. Prompt for Knowledge Consolidation and Answer Finalization

### Prompt for Final Answer

Please generate a brief explanation of how the contents of the consolidated information lead to your answer.

If the provided information is not helpful to answer the question, you only need to respond "I don't know", without referring to the information.

Consolidated information: [consolidation knowledge]

Question: [questions[i]]

Answer: