

Towards Omni-RAG: Comprehensive Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Large Language Models in Medical Applications

Zhe Chen^{1,3}, Yusheng Liao^{1,3}, Shuyang Jiang^{2,3}, Pingjie Wang^{1,3},
Yiqiu Guo^{2,3}, Yanfeng Wang^{1,3}, Yu Wang^{1,3}

¹Shanghai JiaoTong University ²Fudan University
³Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory

{chenzhe2018, liao20160907, pingjiawang, yuwangsytu, wangyanfeng622}@sjtu.edu.cn
{shuyangjiang23, yqguo22}@m.fudan.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) hold promise for addressing healthcare challenges but often generate hallucinations due to limited integration of medical knowledge. Incorporating external medical knowledge is therefore critical, especially considering the breadth and complexity of medical content, which necessitates effective multi-source knowledge acquisition. We address this challenge by framing it as a source planning problem, where the task is to formulate context-appropriate queries tailored to the attributes of diverse knowledge sources. Existing approaches either overlook source planning or fail to achieve it effectively due to misalignment between the model’s expectation of the sources and their actual content. To bridge this gap, we present MedOmniKB, a comprehensive repository comprising multigenre and multi-structured medical knowledge sources. Leveraging these sources, we propose the Source Planning Optimisation (SPO) method, which enhances multi-source utilisation through explicit planning optimisation. Our approach involves enabling an expert model to explore and evaluate potential plans while training a smaller model to learn source alignment using positive and negative planning samples. Experimental results demonstrate that our method substantially improves multi-source planning performance, enabling the optimised small model to achieve state-of-the-art results in leveraging diverse medical knowledge sources¹.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated impressive language capabilities, including the ability to address healthcare-related inquiries (Zhou et al., 2023; Singhal et al., 2023; Nori et al., 2023; Saab et al., 2024). However, these models can produce factually incorrect responses—often termed





Figure 1: Diagram of source planning in medical scenarios.

“hallucinations”—when their internal knowledge is insufficient (Ji et al., 2023). Such inaccuracies pose significant challenges for medical applications, where correctness and trustworthiness are paramount. To mitigate this issue, recent work has explored medical Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) techniques (Xiong et al., 2024; Yang et al., 2024; Jeong et al., 2024), which enhance the accuracy and transparency of model responses.

Medicine is a broad and multifaceted field, requiring the integration of diverse knowledge sources—such as textbooks, clinical guidelines, and cutting-edge research—to address complex healthcare questions (Xiong et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024; Corbeil, 2024). Existing methods typically treat all sources uniformly, using the original question to retrieve information without tailoring the search strategy to different types of sources (Xiong et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024; Neupane et al., 2024; Jeong et al., 2024). Although subsequent approaches have introduced prompting strategies to guide LLMs in leveraging retrieval sources (Ma et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024b),

: Corresponding author.

¹The database and codes will be made available at [URL]

these still fail to construct proper queries for each source. The restricted information presented in source description prompts causes the misalignment between what the model expects from the sources and what the sources actually contain. Similarly, recent reflection methods (Shinn et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2024; Liao et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024), which iteratively retrieve and self-improve queries, also struggle due to the limited self-reflective capacity when facing multiple sources. In essence, current works cannot construct appropriate queries for each knowledge source based on its unique attributes, which is referred to as the “source planning” problem in our work (see Figure 1).

A key obstacle in studying the source planning problem is the lack of sufficiently broad and diverse medical knowledge bases. To address this, we introduce MedOmniKB, a more comprehensive and varied knowledge repository than previously available resources (Xiong et al., 2024; Corbeil, 2024; Xu et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2024b). MedOmniKB includes five representative types of sources—“Book,” “Guideline,” “Research,” “Wiki,” and “Graph”—offering both depth and breadth of information. Its diversity in categories allows for a more meaningful exploration of source planning.

Leveraging MedOmniKB, we propose a Source Planning Optimisation (SPO) method to improve multi-source retrieval planning in LLMs. Our approach proceeds as follows: First, we use an expert LLM to perform planning exploration for each question, generating a range of candidate sub-plans. Next, we evaluate whether the documents retrieved by these sub-plans support the correct answer, thereby creating positive and negative plan sets. Finally, we employ a smaller language model to undergo supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on the positive plans and then apply Direct Preference Optimisation (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) to further align the model with the knowledge sources. Extensive experiments show that SPO substantially boosts multi-source planning capability compared to existing techniques. Notably, our optimised small model outperforms substantially larger models (with 10 times the parameters) in retrieval planning. Furthermore, SPO demonstrates robustness under various training conditions and achieves a high utilisation rate of training data.

In summary, our contributions are three-fold:

- We identify the challenge of multi-source planning in the medical domain and introduce MedOmniKB, a richly diverse and structured

knowledge base, as a foundation for research in this area.

- Based on MedOmniKB, we propose the SPO approach to empower language models with the ability to plan retrieval strategies that adapt to the characteristics of multiple, complex sources.
- Our extensive experiments confirm that the optimised model achieves more efficient source planning than existing methods, offering insights into improving retrieval strategies in complex, knowledge-intensive domains.

2 Related Work

2.1 Medical Retrieval-augmented Generation

RAG has been successfully applied to a broad spectrum of medical tasks, including clinical decision-making (Shi et al., 2023; Thompson et al., 2023), clinical prediction (Ye et al., 2021; Naik et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2024), and medical question-answering (QA) (Xiong et al., 2024; Jeong et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024c; Li et al., 2024b). Among these applications, medical QA presents significant challenges due to its demand for extensive and precise knowledge integration. While existing studies have developed multi-content retrieval engines for medical information (Xiong et al., 2024; Corbeil, 2024; Xu et al., 2024), our approach offers a distinct advantage by utilizing a substantially larger knowledge base that incorporates structured knowledge graphs. As illustrated in Table 1, our knowledge base not only surpasses others in size but also enhances data organization and retrieval accuracy through structured representations. This comprehensive and well-organized knowledge infrastructure enables our medical QA system to deliver more accurate, relevant, and nuanced responses, thereby advancing the effectiveness of medical knowledge retrieval and utilization.

2.2 Query Construction

Constructing queries is crucial for retrieval augmented generation as it directly determines how retrieval is done (Anantha et al., 2021; Ma et al., 2023; Yoon et al., 2024). Some works directly use large language models to enhance the query (Ma et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023b, 2024c; Wu et al., 2024b; Wang et al., 2024a; Chen et al., 2024), and others rely on multiple retrievals and reflection to improve the query quality (Shinn et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024; Liao et al., 2024).

Database	#Book	#Guideline	#Research	#Wiki	#Graph
MedCorp (2024)	9.6k	-	23.9M	6.5M	✗
ClinicalCorp (2024)	9.4k	46.1k	150.4k	-	✗
Self-BioRAG (2024)	18	35.7k	37.5M	-	✗
RAM-EHR (2024)	-	-	230k	150k	✓
BioKGBench (2024b)	-	-	5.7k	-	✓
MedOmniKB	27.7k	45.7k	25.3M	6.4M	✓

Table 1: Comparison of MedOmniKB with existing medical retrieval knowledge bases in terms of #Docs. “-” denotes the type doesn’t exist.

They all struggle to construct proper queries because they either lack the perception of sources or have only limited self-reflective capacity.

There are also works that concentrate on constructing query-related training data. **However, the signals they choose for constructing data are each flawed and they all focus on the single-source querying.** Ma et al. (2023) use the performance of the downstream task to measure the value of the query, which can be affected by the intrinsic knowledge of LLM. Mao et al. (2024) use rerank scores directly, which are fast yet limited to the relevance ranking. Chan et al. (2024) let ChatGPT produce three types of enhanced queries as training data, but they ignore the evaluation of these enhanced queries. Yoon et al. (2024); Wang et al. (2024d) adopt the retriever’s feedback, which relies heavily on the gold document annotation, which is unavailable in general scenarios. In contrast, we follow the LLM-as-a-judge paradigm (Li et al., 2024a) and obtain high-quality training data by LLM judging. Moreover, Wang et al. (2023a, 2024b) focus solely on source selection, neglecting query reformulation. Therefore, the problem of effective retrieval source planning needs to be highlighted.

3 MedOmniKB

This section introduces MedOmniKB, a comprehensive multigenre, multistructured medical knowledge base. We investigate the knowledge sources required for existing medical knowledge-intensive problems and correspondingly organise a knowledge base containing five sources: “Book”, “Guideline”, “Research”, “Wiki” and “Graph”. The richness and diversity of categories establish the basis for our study of medical source planning.

3.1 Unstructured Source

Book. Medical textbooks encompass foundational medical knowledge, covering essential concepts, principles, and practices that are crucial for

Source	#Docs	#Chunks	#Words/Chunk
Book	27.7k	13.1M	150.1
Guideline	45.7k	647.7k	106.7
Research	25.3M	48.0M	128.7
Wiki	6.4M	29.7M	112.1
	#Concepts	#Definitions	#Relations
Graph	1.7M	317.9k	2.9M

Table 2: Statistics of MedOmniKB.

understanding the field of medicine. Following Jin et al. (2020); Wu et al. (2024a), 18,182 PDFs are gathered from online libraries and reputable publishers, whose categories cover medicine, surgery, imaging, etc. Their details are in Appendix C. These PDFs were de-duplicated and filtered (URLs, references, citations, etc.) to get documents. We also include StatPearls and Textbooks proposed in MedRAG (Xiong et al., 2024).

Guideline. Clinical practice guidelines (CPGs) help healthcare practitioners and patients make informed decisions about diagnosis and treatment. We reuse the guideline data from (Chen et al., 2023), and for the non-redistributable parts, we crawl webpages using the provided scripts. In the end, we get 45,679 articles from 13 guideline sources.

Research. Research articles offer insights and findings from cutting-edge research, thereby providing a solid theoretical basis for clinical practice and public health decision-making. We download the 2024 PubMed baseline², which is a complete snapshot of PubMed data and then extract the valid titles and abstracts.

Wiki. Wikipedia acts as a valuable resource by providing knowledge in general domains. We obtain the processed English data from Huggingface³.

For retrieval, we process these texts into chunks of no more than 1000 characters, followed by encoding them as vectors using the MedCPT-article-encoder model (Jin et al., 2023). We adopt the Qdrant library⁴ for fast dense vector searching.

3.2 Structured Source

Graph. Structured graphs provide clear definitions of concepts and illustrate relationships be-

²<https://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/baseline>

³<https://huggingface.co/datasets/wikimedia/wikipedia>

⁴<https://qdrant.tech>




Figure 2: Framework of our proposed SPO approach. First, an expert LLM performs plan exploration for each source, generating multiple queries. Then the expert LLM determines whether the documents retrieved by each query support the answer gold answer or not. The final positive and negative sets are utilised for planning learning.

tween them, potentially improving evidence-based decision-making in healthcare. We adopt the Unified Medical Language System (UMLS) (Bodenreider, 2004) as our graph database. We download the UMLS Metathesaurus Full Subset and clean the data based on language, whether it is a null character, etc. The concept definitions and relationships are stored in SQLite⁵, avoiding the network and latency issues of the online UMLS API.

For a given concept, we will obtain its definition and all its one-hop relationships. Next, reranking will be applied to filter through the many relationships (possibly thousands) following Yang et al. (2023, 2024).

4 Method

4.1 Problem Formulation

We provide a general formulation of our medical source planning problem. For a medical question x , multiple knowledge sources $K = \{K^i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N_K\}$ will be retrieved to supply medical knowledge, where K^i denotes the i_{th} source and N_K denotes the number of sources. Specifically, a planner model \mathcal{M}_θ will construct the source plan $P = \{(i, j, q_j^i) \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N_K, j = 1, 2, \dots, N_q^i\}$ for the question x , where q_j^i denotes the j_{th} query in the i_{th} source, and N_q^i represents the number of queries for the i_{th} source. We then

obtain the retrieved document $D = \{d_j^i \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, N_K, j = 1, 2, \dots, N_q^i\}$, where d_j^i represents the top- k documents retrieved by the query q_j^i . Then a language model Reader will read D and answer question x , resulting in an answer y . Our task is to construct the optimal P so that D includes as many documents supporting the gold answer as possible. Additionally, the number of queries per source N_q^i will be limited to fewer than 4 due to the context length restriction of the Reader.

4.2 Source Planning Optimisation

In this section, we introduce our Source Planning Optimisation (SPO) method to empower the planner \mathcal{M}_θ to retrieve valuable information from multiple healthcare knowledge sources efficiently. Our method comprises three steps: Planning Exploration (Section 4.2.1), Planning Judging (Section 4.2.2) and Planning Learning (Section 4.2.3).

4.2.1 Planning Exploration

We begin with planning exploration to identify potential multi-source planning strategies. This process is performed on a training set consisting of comprehensive, knowledge-intensive medical problems. In our approach, we prompt an expert LLM, Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-AWQ (Qwen Team, 2024), to generate multiple queries for each source. The exploration prompt is guided by two principles: diversity within a single source and alignment with

⁵<https://www.sqlite.org>

the characteristics of different sources⁶. The diversity principle encourages a wide range of queries from the same source, promoting varied perspectives and minimizing redundancy. The alignment principle ensures that queries are tailored to fit the unique properties of each source. Experimental results on query diversity are discussed in Appendix A.1, and the number of queries per source is fixed at six.

Subsequently, we use the queries to retrieve their corresponding sources and gather the top- k documents for each query. The superscripts “+” and “-” represent positive and negative ones, respectively.

4.2.2 Planning Judging

Inspired by the recent emergence of LLM-as-a-judge (Li et al., 2024a), we prompt the superior LLM Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-AWQ to judge whether the documents retrieved by the query support the gold answer⁷. Each q_j^i will be categorized as “positive” or “negative”, which can be formulated as:

$$q_j^i = \begin{cases} q_j^{i,+} & d_j^i \text{ support gold answer,} \\ q_j^{i,-} & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where d_j^i represents the top- k documents retrieved by the query q_j^i .

4.2.3 Planning Learning

Based on the judgements, we employ \mathcal{M}_θ to perform supervised fine-tuning (SFT) first, followed by direct preference optimisation (DPO) to further align with the multi-aspect knowledge base.

Supervised Fine-tuning. For the case where more than 3 positive queries exist in a single source, we randomly select 3 of them. For the case where no positive queries exist for a single source, we leave this source empty, meaning it is not used. For the case where no positive queries exist in all sources, we filter the sample out, meaning that none of the sources can provide valuable information. To assess knowledge from all sources, up to 3 positive queries q^+ on each source are ensembled to construct the positive plan P^+ for each question. We perform standard SFT, whose training objective is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SFT}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, P^+) \sim \mathcal{D}^+} \log \mathcal{M}_\theta(P^+ | x) \quad (2)$$

⁶The exploration prompt is provided in Prompt G.3.

⁷The judging prompt is shown in Prompt G.4.

Direct Preference Optimisation The planner \mathcal{M}_θ , which builds upon the SFT, is further aligned to multiple source knowledge bases. To achieve this, we generate negative plans for each question in the same manner as the positive plans. The positive and negative plans are then paired for each question to construct the dataset \mathcal{D}^\pm . Importantly, we only retain samples where both positive and negative plans are available to ensure balanced training. Subsequently, we employ DPO learning (Rafailov et al., 2023), a method shown to provide stable and effective alignment. The training objective is expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(x, P^+, P^-) \sim \mathcal{D}^\pm} \log \sigma(r_\theta(x, P^+) - r_\theta(x, P^-)), \quad (3)$$

where

$$r_\theta(x, P) = \beta \log \frac{\mathcal{M}_\theta(P | x)}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{SFT}}(P | x)}. \quad (4)$$

We expect that this method will enable the planner to achieve precise alignment with complex knowledge sources, thereby facilitating effective multi-source planning.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Settings

5.1.1 Datasets

Dataset	Training Set	Development Set	Test Set
MedQA	10,178	1,272	1,273
MedMCQA	12,000	2,000	1,200
MMLU-Med	-	-	1,089
PubMedQA	400	100	500
BioASQ	560	140	782
Combinaton	23,138	3,512	-

Table 3: The statistics of datasets in our experiments. The training and development sets are combined to expect universal planning capabilities.

We conduct our experiments on five medical knowledge-intensive datasets: MedQA (Jin et al., 2020), MedMCQA (Pal et al., 2022), MMLU-Med (Hendrycks et al., 2021), PubMedQA (Jin et al., 2019) and BioASQ (Tsatsaronis et al., 2015), following Xiong et al. (2024). They cover various aspects of the medical domain consisting of multiple choice questions and use accuracy as metrics, ensuring large-scale evaluation (Singhal et al., 2022; Nori et al., 2023; Liévin et al., 2024). The statistics of datasets are shown in Table 3, and more details can be found in Appendix D.

Planner	Method	MedQA	MedMCQA	MMLU-Med	PubMedQA	BioASQ	Average
<i>Reader: Frozen Qwen2.5-7B</i>							
-	No Retrieval	60.80	56.17	76.95	34.60	74.81	60.67
	Original Question (Xiong et al., 2024)	62.14	62.75	80.17	46.60	89.26	68.18
	Query2Doc (Wang et al., 2023b)	62.92	<u>65.33</u>	79.16	46.60	88.36	68.47
Frozen Qwen2.5-72B	Prompting (Ma et al., 2023)	72.11	64.83	81.45	53.00	90.28	72.33
	Reflexion (Shinn et al., 2023)	73.45	<u>65.33</u>	78.88	51.60	90.28	71.91
	SeRTS (Hu et al., 2024)	72.43	63.92	<u>81.82</u>	54.20	90.66	72.61
Trained Qwen2.5-7B	Trainable Planning (Ma et al., 2023)	72.19	64.50	81.45	<u>55.80</u>	90.92	<u>72.97</u>
	RaFe Planning (Mao et al., 2024)	73.21	63.00	81.82	53.20	90.79	72.40
	SPO Planning (Ours)	77.30	72.00	84.11	61.20	90.54	77.03
<i>Reader: Frozen Llama3.1-8B</i>							
-	No Retrieval	65.99	59.50	76.58	56.20	81.97	68.05
	Original Question (Xiong et al., 2024)	60.09	57.50	72.18	74.20	86.96	70.19
	Query2Doc (Wang et al., 2023b)	60.02	60.83	72.45	72.60	87.34	70.65
Frozen Qwen2.5-72B	Prompting (Ma et al., 2023)	68.58	62.17	75.94	71.00	87.21	72.98
	Reflexion (Shinn et al., 2023)	69.60	63.33	<u>76.86</u>	71.00	87.34	73.63
	SeRTS (Hu et al., 2024)	<u>70.38</u>	<u>64.83</u>	<u>76.86</u>	71.60	86.70	<u>74.07</u>
Trained Qwen2.5-7B	Trainable Planning (Ma et al., 2023)	68.58	62.17	76.77	71.20	<u>87.85</u>	73.31
	RaFe Planning (Mao et al., 2024)	68.34	62.58	<u>76.86</u>	72.40	87.60	73.56
	SPO Planning (Ours)	73.06	68.17	79.80	<u>74.00</u>	88.24	76.65
<i>Reader: Frozen Mistral0.3-7B</i>							
-	No Retrieval	49.18	45.58	63.54	47.40	73.27	55.79
	Original Question (Xiong et al., 2024)	53.18	57.58	68.87	66.80	88.75	67.04
	Query2Doc (Wang et al., 2023b)	52.40	<u>60.00</u>	70.80	<u>65.80</u>	86.83	67.17
Frozen Qwen2.5-72B	Prompting (Ma et al., 2023)	64.26	57.75	72.73	59.80	88.75	68.66
	Reflexion (Shinn et al., 2023)	64.65	58.42	<u>73.46</u>	62.00	89.00	<u>69.51</u>
	SeRTS (Hu et al., 2024)	<u>65.67</u>	58.33	<u>72.73</u>	61.20	<u>88.87</u>	69.36
Trained Qwen2.5-7B	Trainable Planning (Ma et al., 2023)	64.26	56.83	72.73	61.40	<u>88.87</u>	68.82
	RaFe Planning (Mao et al., 2024)	65.51	59.42	<u>72.73</u>	60.40	<u>88.87</u>	69.39
	SPO Planning (Ours)	70.78	64.50	77.78	65.20	89.00	73.45

Table 4: Comparison of our method with baselines. **Bold** represents the best result, while underlining represents the second-best result. All models are in the Instruct version. Models of 72B size are applied AWQ.

5.1.2 Retrieval Procedure

We adopt the proposed MedOmniKB as our retrieval knowledge base. For the unstructured sources, the format of the queries is “query θ ; query1; ...”. We retrieve top-20 documents and then rerank top-10 documents using MedCPT models (Jin et al., 2023). For the structured source, the format of the queries is “term θ , query θ ; term θ , query1; ...”. First, we search for the definition of each “term” and all its one-hop relationships. Then we rerank the numerous relations with the corresponding “query” and get the top-10 relations.

5.2 Baselines

Given the limited research on efficient multi-source planning for medical information retrieval, we replicate single-source querying approaches as baselines. Unsupervised methods include No Retrieval, Original Question (Xiong et al., 2024), Query2Doc (Wang et al., 2023b), Prompting (Ma et al., 2023), Reflexion (Shinn et al., 2023), and SeRTS (Hu et al., 2024), all of which are adapted to support multi-source planning. Supervised methods consist of Trainable Planning (Ma

et al., 2023) and RaFe Planning (Mao et al., 2024), implemented with modifications by adjusting the judgment signal, specifically using QA results and rerank scores for query evaluation, respectively. Additional details on the baseline methods can be found in Appendix E.

5.3 Main Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of our method, we incorporate three frozen readers with varying intrinsic knowledge: Qwen2.5-7B (Qwen Team, 2024), Llama3.1-8B (Dubey et al., 2024), and Mistral0.3-7B (Jiang et al., 2023). The main results are summarized in Table 4, leading to the following key observations:

1. Effectiveness of Planning Methods: Planning approaches (retrieval baselines excluding Original Question and Query2Doc) consistently outperform direct retrieval methods that rely on the original question or pseudo-document queries across most test cases. This underscores the importance of multi-source planning, which enables language models to retrieve information dynamically from diverse sources. However, for PubMedQA and

Sources	MedQA	MedMCQA	MMLU-Med	PubMedQA	BioASQ	Average
All	77.30	72.00	84.11	61.20	90.54	77.03
- Book	71.48 (-7.53%)	62.33 (-13.43%)	79.52 (-5.46%)	49.40 (-19.28%)	89.64 (-0.99%)	70.47 (-8.51%)
- Guideline	73.45 (-4.98%)	65.42 (-9.14%)	80.72 (-4.03%)	58.80 (-3.92%)	90.15 (-0.43%)	73.71 (-4.31%)
- Research	71.88 (-7.01%)	64.08 (-11.00%)	81.36 (-3.27%)	32.20 (-47.39%)	82.48 (-8.90%)	66.40 (-13.80%)
- Wiki	72.51 (-6.20%)	66.00 (-8.33%)	80.81 (-3.92%)	59.00 (-3.59%)	89.26 (-1.41%)	73.52 (-4.56%)
- Graph	73.61 (-4.77%)	64.42 (-10.53%)	79.61 (-5.35%)	59.20 (-3.27%)	89.26 (-1.41%)	73.22 (-4.95%)
No	60.80 (-21.35%)	56.17 (-21.99%)	76.95 (-8.51%)	34.60 (-43.46%)	74.81 (-17.37%)	60.67 (-21.24%)

Table 5: Performance and **relative drop ratio** when dropping each source.




Figure 3: Average performances of different planners and sizes of readers.

BioASQ, non-planning approaches yield competitive results. This can be attributed to the strong alignment between these datasets and the “Research” source, reducing the need for planning.

2. Superiority of SPO Training Signals: The SPO method demonstrates superior training signals compared to existing trainable approaches. By leveraging the reasoning capabilities of the LLM judge, SPO avoids the risk of intrinsic knowledge overshadowing retrieved knowledge (Ma et al., 2023). Additionally, it provides more accurate judgments than those proposed in Mao et al. (2024), further validating the effectiveness of our method.

3. Performance Across Readers: When paired with each reader, SPO planning achieves the best performance in most configurations, outperforming models with up to 10 times the number of parameters. Compared to the no-retrieval baseline, SPO planning enhances the average performance of the three readers by 26.97%, 12.64%, and 31.65%, respectively. These improvements highlight SPO planning’s ability to deliver proper queries for each source and provide readers with abundant and relevant knowledge.

5.4 Enhancement for Different Sizes of Readers

We also use models of different sizes as readers. We use 7B, 14B, 32B, and 72B Qwen2.5-Instruct

models as readers and show the average of five test set results as shown in Figure 3. Models of 32B and 72B sizes are applied AWQ. In general, the performances of the models in all cases rise with increasing model size. This is attributed to the increasing intrinsic knowledge of the model. Moreover, it can be found that the SPO planner brings the most enhancements compared to “No Retrieval” among all planners, although the intrinsic knowledge increases as the Reader model size increases.

5.5 Effectiveness of Different Sources

To investigate the effects of each retrieval source, we systematically exclude documents from each source one at a time after applying the SPO method for document retrieval. We utilise the Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct model as the Reader in our experiments. Table 5 presents the results obtained after removing each source and the corresponding differences. Overall, every retrieval source enhances the ability to answer medical questions to varying degrees, with the “Book” and “Research” sources providing the most significant improvements. This is intuitive, as these sources are highly relevant to medical topics. Additionally, the “Research” source notably impacts performance on the PubMedQA and BioASQ datasets, which aligns with the “Research” style inherent to these datasets. Interestingly, we observe that PubMedQA accuracy decreases when the “Research” source is excluded (“No Research”) compared to when no retrieval is performed (“No Retrieval”). We attribute this decline to the presence of supplemental sources, excluding “Research,” which may introduce confusion for the model. Specifically, in the “No Research” scenario, 69.6% of erroneous answers are categorized as the “maybe” option, compared to 64.8% in the “No Retrieval” scenario. Moreover, the visualization of source planning statistics is shown in Appendix A.2.




Figure 4: Performances of trained Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct planner using different categories of training data. “w/o MedQA”, “w/o MedMCQA” and “w/o Pub.&Bio.” represents all data excluding MedQA, MedMCQA and PubMedQA&BioASQ, respectively.

Training Strategy	MedQA	MedMCQA	PubMedQA
Frozen	62.92	62.42	51.80
+ SFT	74.39	70.00	59.00
+ SFT + DPO	77.30	72.00	61.20
+ DPO	65.59	62.17	54.00

Table 6: Performances of trained Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct planner using different training strategies.

5.6 Effectiveness of Training Stages

To examine the impact of the two training phases, SFT and DPO, in the SPO method, we present the results of the small planner model trained under different configurations in Table 6. Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct is used as the Reader. It is important to note that the Frozen model referenced here is 7B, whereas the Frozen model in Table 4 is 72B. The results demonstrate that SFT significantly enhances the model’s multi-source planning capability, providing a strong foundational planning ability. The subsequent DPO phase further refines and strengthens this capability. However, applying DPO directly to the planner yields only limited improvements, underscoring the critical role of the SFT phase in establishing the model’s initial planning proficiency.

5.7 Robustness to Training Data Category and Quantity

We construct a diverse training dataset spanning multiple categories for the SPO method, as described in Appendix D. This section evaluates the robustness of the SPO method to variations in both the quantity and category of training data, utilising Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct as the Reader.

To analyze the impact of data categories, we systematically exclude the training data for individual categories and assess the planner’s performance.




Figure 5: Performances of trained Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct planner using different ratios of training data.

Figure 4 compares the performance of models without training, trained with the full dataset, and trained with data from specific categories excluded. The results reveal that excluding data aligned with the test set’s topic leads to the most significant performance drop. Notably, even training with data from unrelated topics improves the planner’s performance on the test topic, underscoring the value of diverse topic coverage in fostering universal planning capabilities.

We further examine the impact of data quantity by sampling different proportions of the training dataset and applying the same experimental setup as in the main study. As shown in Figure 5, planning performance improves consistently with increasing data volume but begins to plateau at higher levels. These results indicate that the SPO method significantly enhances planning capability even with limited data, while larger datasets provide diminishing yet notable additional benefits.

6 Conclusion

This study tackles the challenge of multi-source planning in healthcare by introducing the MedOmniKB knowledge base and proposing the Source Planning Optimisation method. The MedOmniKB combines diverse medical information sources with high relevance. The Source Planning Optimisation method significantly enhances language models’ ability to retrieve from various knowledge sources. Extensive experiments show our optimised small model has outperformed the larger one in planning efficiency. In this work, we underscore the importance of effective source planning. Our model effectively integrates multi-source knowledge, advancing the application of language models in the healthcare field.

Limitations

There are some limitations in our work. First, our constructed MedOmniKB is incomplete. Some scenario-specific medical resources, such as DragBank (Wishart et al., 2008), and MIMIC-IV-Note (Johnson et al., 2023) are not included. This is because the five sources we select are both representative and essential for medical QA. Moreover, our five sources contain most scenario-specific knowledge, such as DragBank’s drug information and MIMIC-IV-Note’s diagnostic reports. Other medical knowledge not covered by the five sources still needs to be identified and incorporated into MedOmniKB.

Moreover, the exploration and judging steps in our SPO approach incur a relatively large retrieval and inference cost. The retrieval cost arises from the large and diverse retrieval repository, while the inference cost is due to the need for the LLM to evaluate each query separately. In our opinion, the accurate judgement of each query is essential for the model to learn source planning. We alleviate the cost problems by multi-process parallelism, optimised retrieval framework based on Qdrant, batch inference and vLLM acceleration (Kwon et al., 2023).

Ethical Consideration

The deployment of large language models (LLMs) in healthcare raises significant ethical challenges that warrant careful consideration. Ensuring accuracy is paramount, as inaccuracies may adversely affect patient outcomes. Our Source Planning Optimisation (SPO) method addresses this concern by enhancing the retrieval of information from credible sources. It can help models generate accurate and reliable responses.

Furthermore, transparency in model outputs is markedly improved through access to the retrieved knowledge. By documenting the sources of information utilized in generating responses, healthcare professionals can understand the foundations of the information presented to them. This transparency also enables practitioners to assess the reliability of the model responses.

References

Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. [Open-domain question answering](#)

[goes conversational via question rewriting](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2021, Online, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 520–534. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Olivier Bodenreider. 2004. [The unified medical language system \(UMLS\): integrating biomedical terminology](#). *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 32(Database-Issue):267–270.

Chi-Min Chan, Chunpu Xu, Ruibin Yuan, Hongyin Luo, Wei Xue, Yike Guo, and Jie Fu. 2024. [RQ-RAG: learning to refine queries for retrieval augmented generation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.00610.

Guanhua Chen, Wenhan Yu, and Lei Sha. 2024. [Unlocking multi-view insights in knowledge-dense retrieval-augmented generation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.12879.

Zeming Chen, Alejandro Hernández-Cano, Angelika Romanou, Antoine Bonnet, Kyle Matoba, Francesco Salvi, Matteo Pagliardini, Simin Fan, Andreas Köpf, Amirkeivan Mohtashami, Alexandre Sallinen, Alireza Sakhaeirad, Vinitra Swamy, Igor Krawczuk, Deniz Bayazit, Axel Marmet, Syrielle Montariol, Mary-Anne Hartley, Martin Jaggi, and Antoine Bosselut. 2023. [MEDITRON-70B: scaling medical pretraining for large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.16079.

Jean-Philippe Corbeil. 2024. [Iryonlp at MEDIQA-CORR 2024: Tackling the medical error detection & correction task on the shoulders of medical agents](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.15488.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurélien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Rozière, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Al-lonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Grégoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel M. Kloumann, Ishan Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph

- Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, and et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2407.21783.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net.
- Minda Hu, Licheng Zong, Hongru Wang, Jingyan Zhou, Jingjing Li, Yichen Gao, Kam-Fai Wong, Yu Li, and Irwin King. 2024. [Serts: Self-rewarding tree search for biomedical retrieval-augmented generation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 1321–1335. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Minbyul Jeong, Jiwoong Sohn, Mujeen Sung, and Jaewoo Kang. 2024. [Improving medical reasoning through retrieval and self-reflection with retrieval-augmented large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2401.15269.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. [Survey of hallucination in natural language generation](#). *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(12):248:1–248:38.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L lio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.06825.
- Xinke Jiang, Yuchen Fang, Rihong Qiu, Haoyu Zhang, Yongxin Xu, Hao Chen, Wentao Zhang, Ruizhe Zhang, Yuchen Fang, Xu Chu, Junfeng Zhao, and Yasha Wang. 2024. [Tc-rag:turing-complete rag’s case study on medical LLM systems](#). *CoRR*, abs/2408.09199.
- Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. 2020. [What disease does this patient have? A large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams](#). *CoRR*, abs/2009.13081.
- Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William W. Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. [Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering](#). *CoRR*, abs/1909.06146.
- Qiao Jin, Won Kim, Qingyu Chen, Donald C. Comeau, Lana Yeganova, W. John Wilbur, and Zhiyong Lu. 2023. [Medcpt: Contrastive pre-trained transformers with large-scale pubmed search logs for zero-shot biomedical information retrieval](#). *Bioinform.*, 39(10).
- Alistair EW Johnson, Lucas Bulgarelli, Lu Shen, Alvin Gayles, Ayad Shammout, Steven Horng, Tom J Pollard, Sicheng Hao, Benjamin Moody, Brian Gow, et al. 2023. [Mimic-iv, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset](#). *Scientific data*, 10(1):1.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). *CoRR*, abs/2309.06180.
- Dawei Li, Bohan Jiang, Liangjie Huang, Alimohammad Beigi, Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Amrita Bhattacherjee, Yuxuan Jiang, Canyu Chen, Tianhao Wu, Kai Shu, Lu Cheng, and Huan Liu. 2024a. [From generation to judgment: Opportunities and challenges of llm-as-a-judge](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2411.16594*.
- Xingxuan Li, Ruochen Zhao, Yew Ken Chia, Bosheng Ding, Shafiq Joty, Soujanya Poria, and Lidong Bing. 2024b. [Chain-of-knowledge: Grounding large language models via dynamic knowledge adapting over heterogeneous sources](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Yusheng Liao, Shuyang Jiang, Yanfeng Wang, and Yu Wang. 2024. [Reflectool: Towards reflection-aware tool-augmented clinical agents](#). *CoRR*, abs/2410.17657.
- Valentin Li vin, Christoffer Egeberg Hother, Andreas Geert Motzfeldt, and Ole Winther. 2024. [Can large language models reason about medical questions?](#) *Patterns*, 5(3):100943.
- Ji Lin, Jiaming Tang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Wei-Ming Chen, Wei-Chen Wang, Guangxuan Xiao, Xingyu Dang, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. 2024a. [AWQ: activation-aware weight quantization for on-device LLM compression and acceleration](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Conference on Machine Learning and Systems, MLSys 2024, Santa Clara, CA, USA, May 13-16, 2024*. mlsys.org.
- Xinna Lin, Siqi Ma, Junjie Shan, Xiaojing Zhang, Shell Xu Hu, Tiannan Guo, Stan Z. Li, and Kaicheng Yu. 2024b. [Biokgbench: A knowledge graph checking benchmark of AI agent for biomedical science](#). *CoRR*, abs/2407.00466.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. [Query rewriting for retrieval-augmented large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.14283.
- Shengyu Mao, Yong Jiang, Boli Chen, Xiao Li, Peng Wang, Xinyu Wang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2024. [Rafe: Ranking](#)

- feedback improves query rewriting for RAG. *CoRR*, abs/2405.14431.
- Aakanksha Naik, Sravanthi Parasa, Sergey Feldman, Lucy Lu Wang, and Tom Hope. 2022. [Literature-augmented clinical outcome prediction](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, pages 438–453. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Subash Neupane, Shaswata Mitra, Sudip Mittal, Noorbakhsh Amiri Golilarz, Shahram Rahimi, and Amin Amirlatifi. 2024. [Medinsight: A multi-source context augmentation framework for generating patient-centric medical responses using large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.08607.
- Harsha Nori, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. 2023. [Capabilities of GPT-4 on medical challenge problems](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.13375.
- Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikanan Sankarasubbu. 2022. [Medmcqa : A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering](#). *CoRR*, abs/2203.14371.
- Qwen Team. 2024. [Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models](#).
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Stefano Ermon, Christopher D. Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.18290.
- Khaled Saab, Tao Tu, Wei-Hung Weng, Ryutaro Tanno, David Stutz, Ellery Wulczyn, Fan Zhang, Tim Strother, Chunjong Park, Elahe Vedadi, Juanma Zambrano Chaves, Szu-Yeu Hu, Mike Schaekermann, Aishwarya Kamath, Yong Cheng, David G. T. Barrett, Cathy Cheung, Basil Mustafa, Anil Palepu, Daniel McDuff, Le Hou, Tomer Golany, Luyang Liu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Neil Houlsby, Nenad Tomasev, Jan Freyberg, Charles Lau, Jonas Kemp, Jeremy Lai, Shekoofeh Azizi, Kimberly Kanada, SiWai Man, Kavita Kulkarni, Ruoxi Sun, Siamak Shakeri, Luheng He, Benjamin Caine, Albert Webson, Natasha Latysheva, Melvin Johnson, Philip Andrew Mansfield, Jian Lu, Ehud Rivlin, Jesper Anderson, Bradley Green, Renee Wong, Jonathan Krause, Jonathon Shlens, Ewa Dominowska, S. M. Ali Eslami, Katherine Chou, Claire Cui, Oriol Vinyals, Koray Kavukcuoglu, James Manyika, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Yossi Matias, Dale R. Webster, Joelle K. Barral, Greg Corrado, Christopher Semturs, S. Sara Mahdavi, Juraj Gottweis, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. 2024. [Capabilities of gemini models in medicine](#). *CoRR*, abs/2404.18416.
- Wenqi Shi, Yuchen Zhuang, Yuanda Zhu, Henry J. Iwinski, J. Michael Wattenbarger, and May Dongmei Wang. 2023. [Retrieval-augmented large language models for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis patients in shared decision-making](#). In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology, and Health Informatics, BCB 2023, Houston, TX, USA, September 3-6, 2023*, pages 14:1–14:10. ACM.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2023. [Reflection: language agents with verbal reinforcement learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Kumar Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, Perry Payne, Martin Seneviratne, Paul Gamble, Chris Kelly, Nathaneal Schärli, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Philip Andrew Mansfield, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Dale R. Webster, Gregory S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Katherine Chou, Juraj Gottweis, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Alvin Rajkomar, Joelle K. Barral, Christopher Semturs, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. 2022. [Large language models encode clinical knowledge](#). *CoRR*, abs/2212.13138.
- Karan Singhal, Tao Tu, Juraj Gottweis, Rory Sayres, Ellery Wulczyn, Le Hou, Kevin Clark, Stephen Pfohl, Heather Cole-Lewis, Darlene Neal, Mike Schaekermann, Amy Wang, Mohamed Amin, Sami Lachgar, Philip Andrew Mansfield, Sushant Prakash, Bradley Green, Ewa Dominowska, Blaise Agüera y Arcas, Nenad Tomasev, Yun Liu, Renee Wong, Christopher Semturs, S. Sara Mahdavi, Joelle K. Barral, Dale R. Webster, Gregory S. Corrado, Yossi Matias, Shekoofeh Azizi, Alan Karthikesalingam, and Vivek Natarajan. 2023. [Towards expert-level medical question answering with large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2305.09617.
- Will E. Thompson, David M. Vidmar, Jessica K. De Freitas, John M. Pfeifer, Brandon K. Fornwalt, Ruijun Chen, Gabriel Altay, Kabir Manghnani, Andrew C. Nelsen, Kellie Morland, Martin C. Stumpe, and Riccardo Miotto. 2023. [Large language models with retrieval-augmented generation for zero-shot disease phenotyping](#). *CoRR*, abs/2312.06457.
- George Tsatsaronis, Georgios Balikas, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Ioannis Partalas, Matthias Zschunke, Michael R. Alvers, Dirk Weissenborn, Anastasia Krithara, Sergios Petridis, Dimitris Polychronopoulos, Yannis Almirantis, John Pavlopoulos, Nicolas Baskiotis, Patrick Gallinari, Thierry Artières, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, Norman Heino, Éric Gaussier, Liliana Barrio-Alvers, Michael Schroeder, Ion Androusoopoulos, and Georgios Paliouras. 2015. [An overview of the BIOASQ large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition](#). *BMC Bioinform.*, 16:138:1–138:28.
- Haoyu Wang, Ruirui Li, Haoming Jiang, Jinjin Tian, Zhengyang Wang, Chen Luo, Xianfeng Tang, Monica Xiao Cheng, Tuo Zhao, and Jing Gao. 2024a.

- Blendfilter: Advancing retrieval-augmented large language models via query generation blending and knowledge filtering. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2024, Miami, FL, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 1009–1025. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongru Wang, Minda Hu, Yang Deng, Rui Wang, Fei Mi, Weichao Wang, Yasheng Wang, Wai-Chung Kwan, Irwin King, and Kam-Fai Wong. 2023a. Large language models as source planner for personalized knowledge-grounded dialogues. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 9556–9569. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hongru Wang, Wenyu Huang, Yang Deng, Rui Wang, Zezhong Wang, Yufei Wang, Fei Mi, Jeff Z. Pan, and Kam-Fai Wong. 2024b. Unims-rag: A unified multi-source retrieval-augmented generation for personalized dialogue systems. *CoRR*, abs/2401.13256.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, and Furu Wei. 2023b. Query2doc: Query expansion with large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2303.07678.
- Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, and Wenhui Chen. 2024c. Augmenting black-box llms with medical textbooks for biomedical question answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 1754–1770. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yujing Wang, Hainan Zhang, Liang Pang, Binghui Guo, Hongwei Zheng, and Zhiming Zheng. 2024d. Maferw: Query rewriting with multi-aspect feedbacks for retrieval-augmented large language models. *CoRR*, abs/2408.17072.
- David S. Wishart, Craig Knox, Anchi Guo, Dean Cheng, Savita Shrivastava, Dan Tzur, Bijaya Gautam, and Murtaza Hassanali. 2008. Drugbank: a knowledge-base for drugs, drug actions and drug targets. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 36(Database-Issue):901–906.
- Chaoyi Wu, Weixiong Lin, Xiaoman Zhang, Ya Zhang, Weidi Xie, and Yanfeng Wang. 2024a. Pmc-llama: toward building open-source language models for medicine. *J. Am. Medical Informatics Assoc.*, 31(9):1833–1843.
- Ridong Wu, Shuhong Chen, Xiangbiao Su, Yuankai Zhu, Yifei Liao, and Jianming Wu. 2024b. A multi-source retrieval question answering framework based on RAG. *CoRR*, abs/2405.19207.
- Guangzhi Xiong, Qiao Jin, Zhiyong Lu, and Aidong Zhang. 2024. Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for medicine. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 6233–6251. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ran Xu, Wenqi Shi, Yue Yu, Yuchen Zhuang, Bowen Jin, May D. Wang, Joyce C. Ho, and Carl Yang. 2024. RAM-EHR: retrieval augmentation meets clinical predictions on electronic health records. *CoRR*, abs/2403.00815.
- Rui Yang, Haoran Liu, Edison Marrese-Taylor, Qingcheng Zeng, Yuhe Ke, Wanxin Li, Lechao Cheng, Qingyu Chen, James Caverlee, Yutaka Matsuo, and Irene Li. 2024. Kg-rank: Enhancing large language models for medical QA with knowledge graphs and ranking techniques. *CoRR*, abs/2403.05881.
- Rui Yang, Edison Marrese-Taylor, Yuhe Ke, Lechao Cheng, Qingyu Chen, and Irene Li. 2023. Integrating UMLS knowledge into large language models for medical question answering. *CoRR*, abs/2310.02778.
- Muchao Ye, Suhan Cui, Yaqing Wang, Junyu Luo, Cao Xiao, and Fenglong Ma. 2021. Medretriever: Target-driven interpretable health risk prediction via retrieving unstructured medical text. In *CIKM '21: The 30th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, Virtual Event, Queensland, Australia, November 1 - 5, 2021*, pages 2414–2423. ACM.
- Chanwoong Yoon, Gangwoo Kim, Byeongguk Jeon, Sungdong Kim, Yohan Jo, and Jaewoo Kang. 2024. Ask optimal questions: Aligning large language models with retriever’s preference in conversational search. *CoRR*, abs/2402.11827.
- Qingfei Zhao, Ruobing Wang, Xin Wang, Daren Zha, and Nan Mu. 2024. Towards multi-source retrieval-augmented generation via synergizing reasoning and preference-driven retrieval. *CoRR*, abs/2411.00689.
- Hongjian Zhou, Boyang Gu, Xinyu Zou, Yiru Li, Sam S. Chen, Peilin Zhou, Junling Liu, Yining Hua, Chengfeng Mao, Xian Wu, Zheng Li, and Fenglin Liu. 2023. A survey of large language models in medicine: Progress, application, and challenge. *CoRR*, abs/2311.05112.

A Additional Experiments

A.1 Optimal Number of Queries in Planning Exploration




Figure 6: The query diversity of varying queries on the development set.

In this section, we aim to identify the optimal number of queries for each source in Planning Exploration (4.2.1). Our objective is to balance the need for diverse queries with the constraints of retrieval and inference costs, which can become significant with excessive querying. To achieve this, we define the optimal number based on the diversity of the source’s queries, as our primary goal is to ensure diverse exploration. Specifically, the diversity of a source’s queries q^i is quantified as:

$$D = \frac{1}{\binom{N}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=j+1}^N \text{distance}(q_j^i, q_k^i), \quad (5)$$

where N is the number of $\{q^i\}$ and $\text{distance}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the cosine distance between encoded query vectors.

Figure 6 illustrates the query diversity across different sources on the development set. In the SPO approach, we set the number of queries per source to 6, as the diversity peaks when the number of queries ranges between 5 and 6.

A.2 Visualization of Planning Statistics

Figure 7 visualizes the average number of queries generated by the baselines (Original Question, Prompting, and SeRTS) and our SPO method. This comparison highlights the extent to which the planners prioritize different sources. In terms of total queries, SPO generates more queries on MedQA compared to the baselines, reflecting the dataset’s

Category	Count
Anatomy	417
Biochemistry	1,968
Ethics and Law in Medicine	254
Immunology	568
Internal Medicine	2,268
Microbiology	755
Neurology	1,713
Obstetrics and Gynecology	518
Pathology	1,774
Pediatrics	648
Pharmacology	1,194
Physiology	753
Psychiatry	1,226
Public Health	1,351
Radiology	1,084
Surgery	1,691
Total	18,182

Table 7: Statistics of collected books.

need for comprehensive knowledge as it deals with long-form medical diagnosis. Conversely, for MedMCQA and PubMedQA, which involve short-text medical knowledge questions, SPO generates more concise queries than the baselines. Additionally, regarding the planner’s focus on sources, SPO provides a more balanced query distribution for MedQA and MedMCQA. It allocates more focused attention to the “Research” source in PubMedQA, aligning with the real requirements.

B Case Studies

Two case studies are conducted as shown in Table 8. In the first case, it is difficult to retrieve useful information from various knowledge sources with such a complex medical diagnosis directly as a search term. Our proposed SPO is able to propose queries that better fit the characteristics of the sources, compared to Prompting and SeRTS. Specifically, appropriate queries for the “Guideline” source are constructed by SPO, whereas queries proposed by Prompting and SeRTS are only roughly descriptive and have a high degree of duplication with other sources’ queries. Moreover, for such complex problems, queries with more perspectives are generated by SPO, such as those in the “Wiki”, to provide comprehensive knowledge. In the second case, where a concise biomedical question is presented, the SPO method prioritizes the most relevant “Research” source. In contrast, the other two methods continue to consider the irrelevant “Guideline” source, primarily due to their limited awareness of the multi-source knowledge base.




Figure 7: Average number of queries of SPO method for different sources on test sets. “Q.” represents “Question”, and “P.” represents “Planning”. Note that the maximum number of queries per source is 3, catering for the LLM context length limit.

Case Study 1	
Original Question	A 48-year-old man is brought to the emergency department for sudden onset of difficulty breathing 6 hours ago. For the past several months, he has had shortness of breath on exertion and while lying down on the bed, frequent headaches, and swelling of his feet. He does not take any medications despite being diagnosed with hypertension 10 years ago. His pulse is 90/min, respirations are 20/min, blood pressure is 150/110 mm Hg, and temperature is 37.0°C (98.6°F). Physical examination shows an overweight male in acute distress with audible wheezes. Crackles are heard bilaterally and are loudest at the lung bases. Which of the following findings on cardiac auscultation will most likely be present in this patient? A. Loud P2. B. S3 gallop. C. Absent S4. D. A loud S1.
Prompting	<book> Cardiac auscultation in heart failure ; Physical examination findings in heart failure ; S3 gallop in heart failure </book> <guideline> Clinical presentation of heart failure ; Auscultation findings in heart failure </guideline> <research> Auscultation findings in patients with heart failure ; S3 gallop in heart failure </research> <wiki> </wiki> <graph> heart failure , auscultation findings ; S3 gallop , clinical significance ; pulmonary edema , auscultation findings </graph>
SeRTS	<book> Cardiac auscultation in heart failure ; Physical examination findings in hypertensive heart disease ; S3 gallop in heart failure </book> <guideline> Clinical presentation of heart failure ; Auscultation findings in patients with hypertension and heart failure </guideline> <research> Auscultation findings in patients with hypertensive heart failure ; S3 gallop as a marker of heart failure severity </research> <wiki> </wiki> <graph> heart failure , auscultation findings ; S3 gallop , clinical significance ; hypertensive heart disease , cardiac auscultation </graph>
SPO Planning	<book> Cardiac auscultation in heart failure ; physical examination of heart sounds in hypertensive patients ; auscultation in patients with bilateral crackles </book> <guideline> clinical guidelines for heart failure management ; guidelines for diagnosing pulmonary edema ; cardiac auscultation in patients with heart failure </guideline> <research> Auscultation findings in patients with hypertensive heart failure ; auscultation in patients with shortness of breath </research> <wiki> cardiac auscultation ; heart failure symptoms ; pulmonary edema </wiki> <graph> heart failure , auscultation findings ; S3 gallop , clinical significance ; bilateral crackles , auscultation findings </graph>
Case Study 2	
Original Question	Is the determination of specific IgE against components using ISAC 112 a reproducible technique? A. yes. B. no. C. maybe.
Prompting	<book> reproducibility of ISAC 112 for specific IgE determination ; validation studies of ISAC 112 ; reliability of ISAC 112 in clinical practice </book> <guideline> reproducibility of ISAC 112 in clinical guidelines ; recommendations for ISAC 112 use in allergy testing ; guidelines on the reliability of component-resolved diagnostics </guideline> <research> reproducibility of ISAC 112 in peer-reviewed studies ; validation of ISAC 112 for specific IgE ; reliability and accuracy of ISAC 112 in allergy diagnosis </research> <wiki> ISAC 112 reproducibility ; ISAC 112 validation ; ISAC 112 reliability </wiki> <graph> ISAC 112 , reproducibility ; specific IgE , component-resolved diagnostics ; allergy testing , reliability </graph>
SeRTS	<book> reproducibility of ISAC 112 ; specific IgE component testing reproducibility ; validation of ISAC 112 technique </book> <guideline> reproducibility of ISAC 112 ; specific IgE component testing ; recommendations for ISAC 112 use </guideline> <research> reproducibility studies of ISAC 112 ; validation of specific IgE component testing </research> <wiki> ISAC 112 reproducibility ; specific IgE component testing </wiki> <graph> ISAC 112 , reproducibility ; specific IgE , component-resolved diagnostics ; allergy testing , reliability </graph>
SPO Planning	<book> reproducibility of ISAC 112 in specific IgE determination </book> <guideline> </guideline> <research> reproducibility of ISAC 112 in specific IgE testing ; ISAC 112 reliability in component-resolved diagnostics ; ISAC 112 in allergy research </research> <wiki> ISAC 112 and specific IgE testing </wiki> <graph> </graph>

Table 8: Two case studies comparing the different source planning methods.

C MedOmniKB Details

The category statistics of gathered books are detailed in Table 7.

D Training and Test Dataset Details

The Training and test dataset in our work comprises five types of datasets as shown in Table 3.

- **MedQA** (Jin et al., 2020) includes real-world questions from the US Medical Licensing Examination, which is a professional medical board exam. We adopt their 4-option English subset, which contains 10,178 training samples, 1,272 development samples and 1,273 test samples. All of their data are included in our work.
- **MedMCQA** (Pal et al., 2022) are collected from Indian medical entrance exams. Their questions cover 2,400 healthcare topics and 21 medical subjects with high topical diversity. We randomly sample 12,000 training samples from the official training split. The 2,000 development samples and 1,200 test samples are randomly selected from the official development set since their test set lacks labelled answers.
- **MMLU-Med** (Hendrycks et al., 2021) comprises six tasks related to biomedicine, which include anatomy, college biology, college medicine, clinical knowledge, human genetics and professional medicine. There are a total of 1,089 test samples. MMLU-Med is included solely in our test set due to the limited number of training and development samples available in the dataset.
- **PubMedQA** (Jin et al., 2019) is a biomedical QA dataset, containing 1,000 manually annotated questions based on PubMed abstracts. We remove the origin-given contexts for the RAG setting. The original 500 test samples are adopted as our test set. For the remaining samples, 400 samples are included in the training set, while 100 samples are included in the development set.
- **BioASQ** (Tsatsaronis et al., 2015) is from an annual competition for biomedical question-answering⁸. Following Xiong et al. (2024),

⁸<https://www.bioasq.org/>

we select the Yes/No questions in Task B of the competition from 2014 to 2024. We remove the given context also for the RAG setting. We divide all available samples into three portions: 560 samples for the training set, 140 samples for the development set, and 782 samples for the validation set.

E Baseline Details

- **No Retrieval**: The reader is prompted to think step-by-step and answer the question without external documents (Prompt G.10).
- **Original Question** (Xiong et al., 2024): The MedRAG method, which uses the original question to retrieve a single mixed source, is adapted to our multi-source setting. Specifically, the original question is used as the query for the four unstructured sources: “Book”, “Guideline”, “Research” and “Wiki”. For the “Graph” source, we prompt the Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-AWQ to extract medical terms of less than 4 (Prompt G.5), which will be used as queried terms.
- **Query2Doc** (Wang et al., 2023b): We prompt the Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-AWQ to enhance original question by producing pseudo-documents. For the four unstructured sources, we produce the documents in the corresponding style (Prompt G.6). For the structured “Graph” source, we use the same approach as in the Original Question.
- **Prompting** (Ma et al., 2023): Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-AWQ is directly prompted to construct proper queries for each source. The number of queries for each source is limited to 0-3.
- **Reflexion** (Shinn et al., 2023): Self-reflection on a single reasoning path is conducted in this baseline. Following Hu et al. (2024), we iteratively carry out the following steps: 1. Construct appropriate queries for each source by incorporating all previous feedback (if any) (Prompt G.8). 2. Generate feedback and assign scores for the new plan (Prompt G.9). If the score reaches 5 (the maximum), the loop stops. The maximum number of iterations is set to 8 due to significant inference costs. This method is adapted to our multi-source setting

by proposing and evaluating queries for all sources.

- **SeRTS** (Hu et al., 2024): Based on Reflexion, sibling nodes are added and join the reasoning process. We follow Hu et al. (2024) to perform the four operations (Selection, Expansion, Evaluation and Backpropagation) iteratively. If the score reaches 5 (the maximum), the loop stops. The maximum number of iterations is set to 8 due to significant inference costs. This method is adapted to our multi-source setting by proposing and evaluating queries for each source.
- **Trainable Planning** (Ma et al., 2023): Different from the proposed SPO Planning, we use the performance of Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-AWQ on the downstream tasks to measure the value of each query. The other SFT and DPO training processes remain the same as in SPO Planning.
- **RaFe Planning** (Mao et al., 2024): Unlike the proposed SPO Planning, we use the rerank scores between the retrieved documents and the question to assess the value of each query. The other SFT and DPO training processes remain the same as in SPO Planning.

For the baselines involving retrieval, the reader will read the retrieved documents and finally answer the question after step-by-step thinking (Prompt G.11).

F Implementation Details

We employ the superior LLM, Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct (Qwen Team, 2024) to explore multiple plans and verify their correctness. The Activation-aware Weight Quantization (AWQ) (Lin et al., 2024a) accelerates inference and reduces memory requirements.

We adopt Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct as the backbone of the SPO process. Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022) is adopted in the SFT and DPO process for Parameter-Efficient Fine-Tuning. For the hyperparameters of the SFT process, the batch size is 64, the peak learning rate is $2.5e-4$ and the number of epochs is 5. As for the DPO process, the batch size is 64, the peak learning rate is $5e-6$ and the number of epochs is 3. We use vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) for fast inference and set the temperature to 0 for reproducible outcomes.

G Prompt List

Prompt G.1: Description of sources in MedOmniKB

book: The API provides access to medical knowledge resource including various educational resources and textbooks.

guideline: The API provides access to clinical guidelines from leading health organizations.

research: The API provides access to advanced biomedical research, facilitating access to specialized knowledge and resources.

wiki: The API provides access to general knowledge across a wide range of topics.

graph: The API provides a structured knowledge graph that connects medical definitions and related terms.

Prompt G.2: Query formats of sources in MedOmniKB

book: {search_query0} ; {search_query1} ; ... (Use ; to separate the queries, 0 to 3 queries)

guideline: {search_query0} ; {search_query1} ; ... (Use ; to separate the queries, 0 to 3 queries)

research: {search_query0} ; {search_query1} ; ... (Use ; to separate the queries, 0 to 3 queries)

wiki: {search_query0} ; {search_query1} ; ... (Use ; to separate the queries, 0 to 3 queries)

graph: {medical_term0} , {query_for_term0} ; {medical_term1} , {query_for_term1} ; ... (Use ; to separate the queries, 0 to 3 queries. Each query should use , to separate the {medical_term} and {query_for_term})

Prompt G.3: Planning exploration

To answer the question labeled as # Question, please construct appropriate queries to get the information you need.

1. Each source in # Source Description must have search queries constructed.
2. Please give the search queries following the format in # Query Format. Each source should have {n_queries} queries, separated by ';'. Please ensure the diversity of queries from the same source.
3. The queries for the source should accurately reflect the specific information needs from that source.

Question
{question}

Source Description
(Prompt G.1, "0 to 3 queries" is removed)

Query Format
(Prompt G.2, "0 to 3 queries" is removed)

Prompt G.4: Planning judging

You are a professional medical expert. Please judge whether the information in the # Documents supports the # Gold Answer as a response to the # Question. Please first think step-by-step and then show your judgement. Your responses will be used for research purposes only, so please have a definite answer.

You should respond to the following question using the format <answer>yes/no</answer> at the end of your response. Please keep your entire response simple and complete, up to 100 words.

Question
{question}

Gold Answer
{gold}

Documents
{documents}

Hint: Please judge whether # Documents supports the # Gold Answer in response to the # Question, rather than evaluating if the # Question's answer is the # Gold Answer.

Prompt G.5: Original Question (extract terms for querying Graph)

You are a helpful medical expert. Please return all medical terminologies in the input # Question. Each term should be splited by `;`.

The output format should be like:

<term>term0 , term1 , ...</term> (The number of terms should be less than 4)

Question

{question}

Prompt G.6: Query2Doc

You are a professional medical expert. Please write a passage that answers the given # Question. The passage should be considered as part of the source described in the # Source Description provided. The result should be formatted as <passage>your passage</passage>. Please keep your entire passage up to 200 words.

Question

{question}

Source Description

{source_name}: {source_desc} (For a given source, provide its source name and description, which can be found in Prompt G.1.)

Prompt G.7: Prompting, Trainable Planning, RaFe Planning, SPO Planning

To answer the question labeled as # Question, please construct appropriate queries to get the information you need.

1. Please give the search queries following the format in # Query Format. The source can have up to 3 queries, separated by `;`. Please ensure the diversity of queries from the same source. For each source, if you think no information retrieval is needed, simply output an empty tag for that source, for example: <book></book>.

2. The queries for the source should accurately reflect the specific information needs from that source.

Question

{question}

Source Description

(Prompt G.1)

Query Format

(Prompt G.2)

Prompt G.8: Reflexion (reflect and propose improved queries)

To answer the question labeled as # Question, please construct appropriate queries to get the information you need. Pay attention to # Feedback from previous search queries.

1. Please give the search queries following the format in # Query Format. The source can have up to 3 queries, separated by `;`. Please ensure the diversity of queries from the same source. For each source, if you think no information retrieval is needed, simply output an empty tag for that source, for example: <book></book>.

2. The queries for the source should accurately reflect the specific information needs from that source.

Question

{question}

Feedback

{feedback}

Source Description

(Prompt G.1)

Query Format

(Prompt G.2)

Please review the multiple queries and corresponding suggestions in # Feedback, and construct improved queries.

Prompt G.9: Reflexion (produce the feedback and score)

You are a highly intelligent agent. I am currently answering the # Question. Then, I have retrieved relevant content # Documents using corresponding ## source: xxx; query: xxx.

1. Please think step by step and rate # Documents using the additive 5-point scoring system described below. Points are accumulated based on the satisfaction of each criterion:
{Five-point Rubrics}

2. Please give suggestions for constructing better queries for each source. You should also consider not using certain sources.

Question
{question}

Documents
{docs}

Source Description
{source_desc}

Please provide the suggestion using the <suggestion></suggestion> tags. You should consider enabling unused sources or abandoning used ones. Please keep the suggestion within 300 words.

Please score between 0 and 5, strictly using the aforementioned additive 5-point scoring system and the format: <score> Integer Score </score>.

<suggestion>Your suggestion here</suggestion>

<score>Your score here</score>

Prompt G.10: Reader without retrieved documents

You are a professional medical expert to answer the # Question. Please first think step-by-step and then answer the question. Your responses will be used for research purposes only, so please have a definite answer.

You should think step by step and respond in the format <answer>A/B/C/D</answer> (only one option can be chosen) at the end of your response. Please keep your entire response simple and complete, up to 100 words.

Question
{question}

Prompt G.11: Reader with retrieved documents

You are a professional medical expert to answer the # Question. Please first think step-by-step using the # Retrieved Documents and then answer the question. Your responses will be used for research purposes only, so please have a definite answer.

You should think step by step and respond in the format <answer>A/B/C/D</answer> (only one option can be chosen) at the end of your response. Please keep your entire response simple and complete, up to 100 words.

Retrieved Documents
{documents}

Question
{question}