

Multiple Abstraction Level Retrieve Augment Generation

Zheng Zheng, Xinyi Ni, Pengyu Hong

Department of Computer Science, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02453, USA

{zhengzheng, xinyini, hongpeng}@brandeis.edu

Abstract

A Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) model powered by a large language model (LLM) provides a faster and more cost-effective solution for adapting to new data and knowledge. It also delivers more specialized responses compared to pre-trained LLMs. However, most existing approaches rely on retrieving prefix-sized chunks as references to support question-answering (Q/A). This approach is often deployed to address information needs at a single level of abstraction, as it struggles to generate answers across multiple levels of abstraction. In an RAG setting, while LLMs can summarize and answer questions effectively when provided with sufficient details, retrieving excessive information often leads to the 'lost in the middle' problem and exceeds token limitations. We propose a novel RAG approach that uses chunks of multiple abstraction levels (MAL), including multi-sentence-level, paragraph-level, section-level, and document-level. The effectiveness of our approach is demonstrated in an under-explored scientific domain of Glycoscience. Compared to traditional single-level RAG approaches, our approach improves AI evaluated answer correctness of Q/A by 25.739% on Glyco-related papers.




Figure 1: **Comparison of Vanilla RAG (Left) and MAL-RAG (Right).** In MAL-RAG, *D*, *S*, *P*, and *M* indicate document-level chunks, section-level chunks, paragraph-level chunks, and multi-sentence-level chunks, respectively. Vanilla RAG, which uses fixed-length chunks, often encounters challenges such as the “lost in the middle” effect [Liu *et al.*, 2024]. In contrast, MAL-RAG mitigates this problem by utilizing higher-level chunks enriched with summary information.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) [Brown, 2020] have achieved unprecedented success, demonstrating remarkable capabilities in various downstream tasks, which range from traditional NLP applications, such as text classification [Aburi *et al.*, 2023; Zhang *et al.*, 2024b; Zhang *et al.*, 2024c], translation [Koshkin *et al.*, 2024; Elshin *et al.*, 2024; Donthi *et al.*, 2024], and summarization [Jin *et al.*, 2024b; Ding *et al.*, 2024; Pu *et al.*, 2023], to emerging areas, such as code generation [Ugare *et al.*, 2024; Ouyang *et al.*, 2023] and LLM-assisted decision-making [Eigner and Händler, 2024; Chiang *et al.*, 2024]. Despite these advancements, LLMs face significant challenges [Nie *et al.*, 2024; Huang *et al.*, 2024; Yang *et al.*, 2024; Ahn *et al.*, 2024; Wang *et al.*, 2024b] to be solved. The reliance on pretrained LLMs and their black-box nature hinders their ability to generate accurate and specialized responses for professional domains. They may generate incorrect or nonsensical facts (hallucinations [Huang *et al.*, 2023; Feng *et al.*, 2024] and outdated knowledge [Zhang *et al.*, 2023; Mousavi *et al.*, 2024]). The professionalism of responses generated by LLMs remains inadequate from the perspective of experts [Ettinger *et al.*, 2023]. RAG is a promising approach to address these challenges [Lewis *et al.*, 2020; Guu *et al.*, 2020]. It improves LLMs by combining retrieval and generation, enhancing accuracy with up-to-date, domain-specific knowledge. It scales efficiently by retrieving relevant information at inference and adapts to new data without retraining. RAG provides explainable, evidence-based responses and supports domain expertise through specialized datasets. It reduces costs by minimizing retraining, ensures contextual relevance, and mitigates hallucinations. Customizable and capable of handling multi-modal data, RAG is well-suited for applications requiring accurate, adaptable, and context-aware responses.

However, existing RAG approaches tend to utilize external knowledge from a single perspective, referring to fixed-size chunks in generating answers (e.g., LangChain¹ and LlamaIndex²), which can lead to the extraction of fragmented and/or incomplete information. In real applications, the information needs of a user can be of various abstraction levels, which cannot be fulfilled by individual chunks. For example,

¹LangChain: <https://python.langchain.com>

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

to correctly answer a user question, one may need to refer to a whole section rather than a paragraph in a document. Although advanced RAG methods have improved chunking techniques, they have yet to effectively utilize the inherent abstraction structures of reference documents. One may retrieve multiple chunks to address this problem. However, determining the appropriate number of chunks to retrieve remains an open question. Retrieving an excessive number of chunks can degrade the performance of LLMs by introducing excessive noise, which could mislead LLMs [Jin *et al.*, 2024a] and cause the “lost in the middle” issue [Liu *et al.*, 2024].

Our contributions: To address the aforementioned challenges, we propose the Multiple Abstraction Level Retrieval-Augmented Generation (MAL-RAG) framework, designed to enhance question reasoning in scientific domains. Following the framework, we implemented a pipeline for reading, parsing, indexing, and segmenting domain-specific literature by leveraging the inherent structures of scientific papers, enabling the construction of a high-quality database that indexes scientific papers hierarchically at multiple abstraction levels. By leveraging the MAL indexing of original content, MAL-RAG enhances the comprehension of complex scientific articles. We applied MAL-RAG to a meticulously curated dataset of Glyco-related papers and demonstrated its superiority over the standard RAG approach.

2 Related Works

2.1 RAG

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), introduced by Lewis *et al.* [Lewis *et al.*, 2020], promoted the application of LLMs across multiple tasks by providing external information to the model [Borgeaud *et al.*, 2022; Li *et al.*, 2024a; Khandelwal *et al.*, 2019; Min *et al.*, 2020; Izacard and Grave, 2020]. Modern LLM frameworks, such as LangChain and LlamaIndex, offer foundational RAG implementations. These typically involve converting documents into text chunks, embedding them as indices, and retrieving semantically relevant references during inference. Beyond these basic implementations, advanced RAG methodologies have been developed to address specific challenges and optimize different stages of the retrieval process. These improvements can be categorized into pre-retrieval and post-retrieval enhancements. In the pre-retrieval process, previous works are focusing on optimizing the indexing structure and the original query, using technologies such as data granularity, optimizing index structures, adding metadata [Hayashi *et al.*, 2024; Ghasemi and Shakery, 2024], a query rewriting [Mao *et al.*, 2024; Li *et al.*, 2024b; Ma *et al.*, 2023; Peng *et al.*, 2024; Ma *et al.*, 2023], query transformation [Chan *et al.*, 2024], and query expansion [Zheng *et al.*, 2023a; Gao *et al.*, 2022]. For post-trieval process, the critical problem to solve is determining whether the retrieved context is effective for the query [Jin *et al.*, 2024c]. These techniques include re-ranking the retrieved information [Hwang *et al.*, 2024; Mishra *et al.*, 2024; Glass *et al.*, 2022], emphasizing critical sections [Shi *et al.*, 2024; Şakar and Emekci, 2024; Shi *et al.*, 2024], and shortening the context to be processed [Zhang *et al.*, 2024a;

Bai *et al.*, 2024; Zhao *et al.*, 2024].

2.2 Scientific Domain-Specific RAG

As RAG LLM techniques are beneficial for domain-specific scientific areas, they have been widely adopted in fields such as medicine, biology, and finance. In the medical domain, Lozano *et al.* [Lozano *et al.*, 2023] proposes an open-source RAG-based LLM system designed for answering medical questions using scientific literature. Similarly, Wang *et al.* [Wang *et al.*, 2024a] introduce a robust pipeline comprising document parsing, indexing, segmentation of extensive research papers, embedding model training, and LLM fine-tuning to enhance performance. Jiang *et al.* [Jiang *et al.*, 2024] integrate a Turing Complete System for efficient document retrieval and management, enabling accurate responses to medical queries. Additionally, some RAG systems have been extended to molecular research by integrating the retrieval of molecular structures and biomedical entities such as proteins, molecules, and diseases [Liu *et al.*, 2023; Wang *et al.*, 2022; Wang *et al.*, 2023; Yang *et al.*, 2023]. In the financial sector, Lin [Lin, 2024] proposed a PDF parser combined with RAG-based LLMs to extract knowledge from financial reports. Yepes *et al.* [Yepes *et al.*, 2024] introduced a novel document chunking approach based on structural elements rather than traditional paragraph-based chunking, enhancing the retrieval process. Despite their widespread application, these RAG systems rely on basic methods with fixed-size chunks and lack attention to the completeness and higher-level background information of the retrieved contexts.

2.3 Chunking Optimization

Focusing on the quality of retrieved chunks and effectively capturing background information, many chunking strategies have been proposed for optimization. Common approaches include fixed-size chunking, recursive chunking, sliding window chunking, paragraph-based chunking, and semantic chunking. While longer text chunks preserve more semantic coherence, they can also introduce noise, dilute the model’s attention, and lead to the “lost in the middle” phenomenon [Liu *et al.*, 2024]. Advanced methods address these challenges by dynamically determining the appropriate level of detail and selecting chunks with optimal granularity [Sarathi *et al.*, 2024; Zhong *et al.*, 2024; Chen *et al.*, 2024]. Other approaches refine text into smaller, information-rich segments to maintain high completeness [Wu *et al.*, 2021; Angelidis and Lapata, 2018; Chen *et al.*, 2023]. For instance, Gao *et al.* [Gao *et al.*, 2023] showed that summarizing passages into shorter text improves accuracy, while Zhao *et al.* [Zhao *et al.*, 2024] proposed LongRAG, which condenses retrieved contexts into summaries that balance informativeness and conciseness. Similarly, Edge *et al.* [Edge *et al.*, 2024] used LLMs to construct graph representations of corpora, creating detailed nodes and summaries for retrieval. Although these strategies achieve state-of-the-art performance, many rely on model predictions or clustering to group chunks, generating higher-level abstractions or summaries. In practice, chunks sequentially sourced from the same section or document, especially when following the intrinsic structure




Figure 2: **MAL-RAG Pipeline.** The MAL-RAG pipeline is composed of two primary stages: indexing and inference. In the indexing stage, articles are divided into multiple levels of granularity, such as document-level, section-level, paragraph-level, and multi-sentence-level text. A map-reduce approach is then used to extract key information from paragraph-level chunks, which are summarized into section-level chunks. These section-level chunks are further processed to generate document-level chunks in a similar manner. In the inference stage, a search engine retrieves relevant chunks based on similarity scores, which are computed using the Linq-Embed-Mistral open-source embedding model. These retrieved chunks, along with the input question and prompts, are fed into GPT-4o-mini to generate the final response.

of scientific documents, often align better with human summarization tendencies than those produced by models. To address this issue, our MAL-RAG leverages the intrinsic structure of documents to group chunks in a manner that more naturally aligns with human reasoning, constructing higher-level abstractions that improve both coherence and retrieval accuracy.

3 Multiple Abstraction Level Retrieval-Augmented Generation Framework

Our MAL-RAG framework aims to utilize the native structures of articles to answer questions that require information at different levels of abstraction. When building indexes, we preprocess each reference document $d \in \mathcal{D}$ into four level chunks: document-level \mathcal{D}_c , section-level \mathcal{S}_c , paragraph-level \mathcal{P}_c , and multi-sentence-level \mathcal{M}_c . During the inference time, we apply a retriever \mathcal{R} to utilize different abstraction-level chunks. To balance information richness and retrieval efficiency, the method dynamically adjusts the number of chunks extracted until the length of the accumulated text reaches a predefined range r . Subsequently, the probability of each chunk is calculated using a similarity-based softmax approach. Chunks are iteratively accepted until the accumulated probability reaches a pre-specified threshold p . After the relevant chunks are retrieved, the question and chunks are fed into an Answer Generator to generate the answer. The technical details are explained in the following subsections.

3.1 MAL-RAG Chunks Generation

As illustrated in Figure 2, chunks are designed at four levels of abstraction, corresponding to varying granularities of the original documents, which are document-level chunks \mathcal{D}_c , section-level chunks \mathcal{S}_c , paragraph-level chunks \mathcal{P}_c , and multi-sentence-level chunks \mathcal{M}_c . During the generation process, the articles are split into these four levels based on their inherent structure.

For document-level and section-level chunks, directly using the original content extracted from the document can result in excessive length and dilute the LLM’s attention. To address this, we employ a map-reduce approach to generate summarized information. In this approach, we first produce summaries for each paragraph. These paragraph summaries are then used to generate the section-level summary, which serves as the content for the section-level chunks. Finally, we aggregate these section summaries to create document summaries, which serve as the content for the document-level chunks.

For all summary tasks in the generation of document-level and section-level chunks, we instantiated \mathcal{E} as the pre-trained large language model Vicuna-13B-v1.3 [Zheng *et al.*, 2023b] with customized prompts designed to summarize the key information from the provided contexts. Discussion of the prompt details is included in supplementary material section A.

For paragraph-level and multi-sentence-level chunks, we retain the original content and store it directly in the chunk database to provide detailed information during inference.

Given a document $d_i \in \mathcal{D}$, which contains N_i sections $s_{i,1}, s_{i,2}, \dots, s_{i,N_i}$. Consider an arbitrary section $s_{i,n} \in d$

that consists of K paragraphs $p_{i,n,1}, p_{i,n,2}, \dots, p_{i,n,K}$. The key information of $s_{i,n}$, denoted as $\tau_{i,n}$ is defined as:

$$\tau_i = \mathcal{E} \left(\sum_{j=1}^k \mathcal{E}(p_{i,j}) \right) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\cdot)$ is the key information extractor applied to each paragraph in s_i and the subsequent aggregation over all paragraphs in the section.

Similarly, the key information of the document d is defined as:

$$d = \mathcal{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n s_{c_i} \right), \quad i \in 1, \dots, n, \quad (2)$$

where the aggregation is performed over the key information of all n sections in the document. Finally, we construct the chunk database, which contains all chunks from four abstraction levels.

3.2 Chunk Retrieval

Given a question and a chunk, the retriever applies the embedding model Linq-Embed-Mistral [Kim *et al.*, 2024] to generate the embedding vector q for the question and c for the chunk. The similarity between the question q and the chunk c is computed by the cosine similarity:

$$\text{Sim}(q, c) = \frac{q \cdot c}{\|q\| \|c\|}, \quad c \in D_c \cup S_c \cup P_c \cup M_c \quad (3)$$

This process is repeated until the similarity scores are calculated with all chunks. The retriever selects the most relevant chunks while adhering to a length constraint C , which specifies the maximum total length of the selected chunks. To further optimize the retrieval process and minimize noise, we employ a softmax equation to convert similarity scores into probabilities. Suppose k chunks are selected. For an arbitrary chunk c_i , the probability is defined as:

$$P(c_i | q) = \frac{\exp(\text{Sim}(q, c_i))}{\sum_{j=1}^k \exp(\text{Sim}(q, c_j))},$$

The chunks are sorted in descending order based on their probabilities. Top chunks, whose cumulative probability does not exceed a pre-defined threshold τ , are selected for generating an answer.

3.3 Answer Generation

The retrieved chunks are concatenated and represented as C_s . We carefully prompt with the open-source LLM, Vicuna-13B-v1.3 [Zheng *et al.*, 2023b], to generate an answer:

$$a = \text{LLM}(\text{prompt}(C_s, q)), \quad (4)$$

where $\text{prompt}(C_s, q)$ encapsulates the context (i.e., C_s) and the question (q), ensuring the LLM can produce a coherent and accurate response. In this prompt, we applied the ICL method to further guide the LLM in generating the desired data. The details about this prompt can be found in Section B of the supplementary material.

Chunks Level	Num of chunk	Avg. Length of chunk
Document	7652	347
Section	138259	375
Paragraph	494613	876
Multi-sentence	1176259	338

Table 1: Statistics of chunks for different levels. "Avg. Length" refers to the average word count.

3.4 Metrics for Evaluating Answers

We assess the quality of the answers generated by the LLM using a set of metrics implemented in the Ragas package³, including Faithfulness, Answer Relevancy, Answer Similarity, Answer Correctness, Context Precision, Context Utilization, Context Recall, and Context Entity Recall. When calculating the metrics, we split both the ground truth and the generated answers into sentences. Each sentence is treated as a statement, and an LLM model is introduced to assess whether two statements match. In this research, we used GPT-4o-mini for this task. The primary evaluation metric is Answer Correctness, which is measured by the F1 score:

$$F1 \text{ score} = \frac{|TP|}{|TP| + 0.5 \times (|FP| + |FN|)} \quad (5)$$

where TP refers to the statements that are present in both the ground truth and the generated answer, FP represents the statements that are present in the generated answer but not in the ground truth, FN denotes the statements that are present in the ground truth but missing in the generated answer.

4 Experiment Results

4.1 Experimental Setup

Dataset We constructed a set of 7,652 academic articles in English that are closely relevant to Glycoscience or Glycomaterials. After preprocessing, the chunk database contains 7,652 document-level chunks, 138,259 section-level chunks, 494,613 paragraph-level chunks, and 1,176,259 multi-sentence-level chunks (see Table 1).

Evaluation Questions/Answer Dataset To evaluate the effectiveness of the RAG system for a customized database lacking human-curated Q/A datasets, we generated a dataset of 1,118 Q/A pairs using GPT-4o-mini and selected 200 pairs from each level, totaling 800 pairs for the evaluation dataset. Each question in this dataset is a short phrase-answer query, where the task of the large language model (LLM) is to provide an answer based on the given question and the retrieved context. These Q/A pairs were derived from randomly selected articles, with 200 Q/A pairs assigned to each granularity level, employing distinct generation strategies for each level. At the document-level, three questions were generated for each selected document chunk.

At the section-level, we identified seven types of sections, including the titles 'Introduction', 'Discussion', 'Conclusions', 'Conclusion', 'Statistical Analysis', 'Results and

³<https://docs.ragas.io/en/v0.1.21/concepts/metrics/index.html>

Approaches	Faithfulness	Answer Relevancy	Answer Similarity	Answer Correctness	Context Precision	Context Utilization	Context Recall	Context Entity Recall	
RAG w. c	86.317	90.15	95.21	82.04	94.978	95.426	92.481	68.379	
Vanilla RAG	71.982	83.557	88.707	43.049	59.246	80.252	27.734	9.721	
Document RAG	$\tau = 0.5$	47.401	59.942	84.998	40.925	43.853	53.779	23.435	14.353
	without τ	50.934	85.487	41.773	41.360	48.648	26.755	15.544	15.377
Section RAG	$\tau = 0.5$	73.313	84.234	91.183	57.245	71.512	80.367	55.128	33.936
	without τ	77.115	87.776	91.540	57.489	65.302	74.785	63.602	35.226
Paragraph RAG	$\tau = 0.5$	80.497	88.023	91.838	59.090	67.191	78.804	64.934	32.758
	without τ	85.653	91.780	92.374	59.450	62.797	72.184	73.491	33.577
Multi RAG	$\tau = 0.5$	81.366	90.339	92.451	63.046	82.414	63.946	35.907	36.494
	without τ	86.226	92.911	92.729	61.674	64.498	75.103	73.751	37.301
MAL-RAG	$\tau = 0.5$	86.246	91.235	93.438	68.788	80.553	87.552	79.100	51.560
	without τ	89.228	93.802	93.630	66.661	75.483	81.794	86.061	51.232

Table 2: Performance evaluation of different RAG strategies. The table presents the scores across various metrics, including faithfulness, answer relevancy, similarity, correctness, and context-related factors (precision, utilization, recall, and entity recall). These metrics are computed using the Ragas framework.

Discussion’, and ‘Results’. These sections provide comprehensive and crucial information, are commonly found in research papers, and can be easily used to generate higher-level abstract questions that are more representative of the content in scientific literature. For the paragraph-level and multi-sentence-level, since different chunks contain varying levels of specialized knowledge in glycoscience, we aim to ensure that our questions more accurately reflect those posed by experts in the glyco field, rather than general questions that might arise from other domains. To achieve this, we employed a fine-tuned model based on GIST-small-Embedding-v0 [Solatorio, 2024] to predict the relevance of content to the Glyco-related corpus. The model was trained using the SciRepEval dataset [Singh *et al.*, 2022] and our own Glyco-related abstracts. Specifically, we utilized the Fields of Study (FoS) task⁴ from the SciRepEval dataset, which is designed for scientific document representation. To adapt the model for Glyco-related content, we re-labeled the dataset used. Labels from our collected abstracts were assigned a value of 1 to indicate relevance to the Glyco domain, while labels from the FoS dataset abstracts were assigned a value of 0. This transformed the task into a binary sequence classification problem. We trained the model using the first 7,000 tokens of the abstracts. The model, GIST-small-Embedding-v0, was fine-tuned, and the softmax layer output was then used as the final probability for each paper’s relevance to the Glyco domain. Based on these relevance scores, we selected the top 5 chunks with the highest scores from each granularity level, considering them the most representative examples. These selected chunks were then used to generate QA pairs with GPT-4o-mini.

RAG approaches We compare the performance of MAL-RAG with several other RAG approaches, each utilizing the GPT-4o-mini model to generate answers:

- i. **Vanilla RAG:** This approach implements a basic Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) setup using

⁴The Fields of Study task in the SciRepEval dataset: <https://huggingface.co/datasets/allenai/scirepeval/viewer/fos>

the sentence-splitter retriever and generator from the Llama-Index package. Unlike sentence-level chunking methods, in which documents are divided into smaller semantic units such as sections and paragraphs, the sentence-splitter in this configuration solely focuses on splitting the document into individual sentences. These sentences are then merged iteratively until they approximate a pre-defined chunk size. Different from multi-sentence-level RAG, this method does not consider the semantic coherence between sentences, which can result in the grouping of sentences from different paragraphs or sections and can lead to incoherent or contextually fragmented chunks.

- ii. **RAG with Corresponding Chunks:** This method uses ground truth as the retrieved chunks to evaluate the performance of GPT-4o-mini when provided with correctly retrieved information for the questions. This serves as a benchmark to compare the effectiveness of other retrieval strategies.
- iii. **Single-Abstraction-Level RAG:** We sequentially use chunks from a single level as the retrieval source to evaluate the effectiveness of chunks at different levels in the questions. These levels are the document-level, section-level, paragraph-level, and multi-sentence-level, which are shown in Table 2.

To ensure comparable information is used by different RAG approaches to answer questions, we set the retrieval context length C to a maximum of 10,000 words. In addition, we explored two settings in retrieving chunks: one sets the probability threshold $\tau = 0.5$, and the other does not have this constraint.

4.2 Performance

The experimental results (see Table 2) demonstrate the effectiveness of our MAL-RAG approach on the Question-Answering dataset derived from scientific papers in the Glyco-domain. The comparison results indicate that

the MAL-RAG strategy outperforms single-perspective approaches in multiple metrics, showing either the best performance or competing closely with the best results. When compared to vanilla RAG, it is evident that MAL provides more accurate and complementary information that is relevant to the required answers.

Furthermore, in the ablation experiments, to more clearly analyze the advantages of multiple levels in the retrieval process, we isolated individual levels for retrieval. The comparison shows that as the content becomes more detailed (from document-level to multi-sentence-level), the evaluation scores improve. However, MAL-RAG still shows a significant performance boost of 1% to 7% compared to other single-level retrieval methods. This demonstrates that multiple-dimensional perspectives provide information that other levels cannot, making MAL-RAG more effective than other strategies.

Additionally, considering that MAL-RAG is more likely to be affected by noise when using a larger number of chunks compared to other strategies, we employed similarity measures to assess the effectiveness of chunks in relation to the query. Softmax normalization was applied to mitigate the impact of different chunks. To further reduce noise in the retrieval process that could affect the quality of the LLM’s answers, we introduced a threshold for accumulating probability, p . By comparing the performance with and without a threshold (set at 0.5), we observed that this strategy improved answer correctness by approximately 2% and enhanced relevance. However, it also led to a slight decrease in context recall.

5 Limitation

In this research, the document-level summaries and section-level summaries were derived by the open source LLM model Vicuna-13B-v1.3 [Zheng *et al.*, 2023b]. Hence, their quality entirely depends on the summarization capability of Vicuna-13B-v1.3. Document-level summaries, in particular, are more susceptible to the model’s limitations as they are generated by aggregating the summaries of sections within each document.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced a novel RAG approach that leverages MAL chunking to enhance information retrieval and Q/A performance. Our approach addresses the limitations of traditional single-level chunking methods by incorporating multiple levels of abstraction, ranging from multi-sentence-level to document-level, which allows LLMs to generate more accurate and coherent responses while mitigating the challenges associated with token limitations and the ‘lost in the middle’ problem. We demonstrated the effectiveness of our MAL-RAG framework in the under-explored scientific Glyco-domain, where it achieved a significant 25.739% improvement in answer correctness compared to conventional single-level RAG methods. These results highlight the potential of our approach to enhance knowledge retrieval and adaptation in specialized domains where nuanced information processing is critical. We constructed a domain-specific Q/A dataset, which includes 800 curated Q/A pairs and can

be used as a RAG-based Q/A benchmark. Future work will focus on further optimizing chunking strategies to better balance information density and relevance, exploring the applicability of our approach across broader scientific domains, and integrating advanced summarization techniques to further improve response accuracy and efficiency.

References

- [Abburi *et al.*, 2023] Harika Abburi, Michael Suesserman, Nirmala Pudota, Balaji Veeramani, Edward Bowen, and Sanmitra Bhattacharya. Generative ai text classification using ensemble llm approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07755*, 2023.
- [Ahn *et al.*, 2024] Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00157*, 2024.
- [Angelidis and Lapata, 2018] Stefanos Angelidis and Mirella Lapata. Summarizing opinions: Aspect extraction meets sentiment prediction and they are both weakly supervised. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.08858*, 2018.
- [Bai *et al.*, 2024] Yushi Bai, Xin Lv, Jiajie Zhang, Yuze He, Ji Qi, Lei Hou, Jie Tang, Yuxiao Dong, and Juanzi Li. Longalign: A recipe for long context alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.18058*, 2024.
- [Borgeaud *et al.*, 2022] Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, et al. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2206–2240. PMLR, 2022.
- [Brown, 2020] Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [Chan *et al.*, 2024] Chi-Min Chan, Chunpu Xu, Ruibin Yuan, Hongyin Luo, Wei Xue, Yike Guo, and Jie Fu. Rq-rag: Learning to refine queries for retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00610*, 2024.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2023] Tong Chen, Hongwei Wang, Sihao Chen, Wenhao Yu, Kaixin Ma, Xinran Zhao, Hongming Zhang, and Dong Yu. Dense x retrieval: What retrieval granularity should we use? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06648*, 2023.
- [Chen *et al.*, 2024] Xinyue Chen, Pengyu Gao, Jiangjiang Song, and Xiaoyang Tan. Hiqa: A hierarchical contextual augmentation rag for massive documents qa. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01767*, 2024.
- [Chiang *et al.*, 2024] Chun-Wei Chiang, Zhuoran Lu, Zhuoyan Li, and Ming Yin. Enhancing ai-assisted group decision making through llm-powered devil’s advocate. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pages 103–119, 2024.
- [Ding *et al.*, 2024] Junhua Ding, Huyen Nguyen, and Haihua Chen. Evaluation of question-answering based text summarization using llm invited paper. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Testing (AITest)*, pages 142–149. IEEE, 2024.

- [Donthi *et al.*, 2024] Sundesh Donthi, Maximilian Spencer, Om Patel, Joon Doh, and Eid Rodan. Improving llm abilities in idiomatic translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.03518*, 2024.
- [Edge *et al.*, 2024] Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, and Jonathan Larson. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130*, 2024.
- [Eigner and Händler, 2024] Eva Eigner and Thorsten Händler. Determinants of llm-assisted decision-making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17385*, 2024.
- [Elshin *et al.*, 2024] Denis Elshin, Nikolay Karpachev, Boris Gruzdev, Ilya Golovanov, Georgy Ivanov, Alexander Antonov, Nickolay Skachkov, Ekaterina Latypova, Vladimir Layner, Ekaterina Enikeeva, et al. From general llm to translation: How we dramatically improve translation quality using human evaluation data for llm finetuning. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 247–252, 2024.
- [Ettinger *et al.*, 2023] Allyson Ettinger, Jena D Hwang, Valentina Pyatkin, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. ” you are an expert linguistic annotator”: Limits of llms as analyzers of abstract meaning representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17793*, 2023.
- [Feng *et al.*, 2024] Shangbin Feng, Weijia Shi, Yike Wang, Wenxuan Ding, Vidhisha Balachandran, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Don’t hallucinate, abstain: Identifying llm knowledge gaps via multi-llm collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00367*, 2024.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2022] Luyu Gao, Xueguang Ma, Jimmy Lin, and Jamie Callan. Precise zero-shot dense retrieval without relevance labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10496*, 2022.
- [Gao *et al.*, 2023] Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. Enabling large language models to generate text with citations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14627*, 2023.
- [Ghasemi and Shakery, 2024] Shima Ghasemi and Azadeh Shakery. Harnessing the power of metadata for enhanced question retrieval in community question answering. *IEEE Access*, 12:65768–65779, 2024.
- [Glass *et al.*, 2022] Michael Glass, Gaetano Rossiello, Md Faisal Mahbub Chowdhury, Ankita Rajaram Naik, Pengshan Cai, and Alfio Gliozzo. Re2g: Retrieve, rerank, generate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.06300*, 2022.
- [Guu *et al.*, 2020] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR, 2020.
- [Hayashi *et al.*, 2024] Teruaki Hayashi, Hiroki Sakaji, Jiayi Dai, and Randy Goebel. Metadata-based data exploration with retrieval-augmented generation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04231*, 2024.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2023] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 2023.
- [Huang *et al.*, 2024] Yining Huang, Keke Tang, Meilian Chen, and Boyuan Wang. A comprehensive survey on evaluating large language model applications in the medical industry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.15777*, 2024.
- [Hwang *et al.*, 2024] Taeho Hwang, Soyeong Jeong, Sukmin Cho, SeungYoon Han, and Jong C Park. Dslr: Document refinement with sentence-level re-ranking and reconstruction to enhance retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.03627*, 2024.
- [Izacard and Grave, 2020] Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01282*, 2020.
- [Jiang *et al.*, 2024] Xinke Jiang, Yue Fang, Rihong Qiu, Haoyu Zhang, Yongxin Xu, Hao Chen, Wentao Zhang, Ruizhe Zhang, Yuchen Fang, Xu Chu, et al. Tc-rag: Turing-complete rag’s case study on medical llm systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09199*, 2024.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2024a] Bowen Jin, Jinsung Yoon, Jiawei Han, and Sercan O Arik. Long-context llms meet rag: Overcoming challenges for long inputs in rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05983*, 2024.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2024b] Hanlei Jin, Yang Zhang, Dan Meng, Jun Wang, and Jinghua Tan. A comprehensive survey on process-oriented automatic text summarization with exploration of llm-based methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.02901*, 2024.
- [Jin *et al.*, 2024c] Hongye Jin, Xiaotian Han, Jingfeng Yang, Zhimeng Jiang, Zirui Liu, Chia-Yuan Chang, Huiyuan Chen, and Xia Hu. Llm maybe longlm: Self-extend llm context window without tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01325*, 2024.
- [Khandelwal *et al.*, 2019] Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00172*, 2019.
- [Kim *et al.*, 2024] Junseong Kim, Seolhwa Lee, Jihoon Kwon, Sangmo Gu, Yejin Kim, Minkyung Cho, Jy yong Sohn, and Chanyeol Choi. Linq-embed-mistral: elevating text retrieval with improved gpt data through task-specific control and quality refinement. Linq AI Research Blog, 2024.
- [Koshkin *et al.*, 2024] Roman Koshkin, Katsuhito Sudoh, and Satoshi Nakamura. Transllama: Llm-based simultaneous translation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04636*, 2024.
- [Lewis *et al.*, 2020] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim

- Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [Li *et al.*, 2024a] Jiatong Li, Yunqing Liu, Wenqi Fan, Xiao-Yong Wei, Hui Liu, Jiliang Tang, and Qing Li. Empowering molecule discovery for molecule-caption translation with large language models: A chatgpt perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024.
- [Li *et al.*, 2024b] Zhicong Li, Jiahao Wang, Zhishu Jiang, Hangyu Mao, Zhongxia Chen, Jiazhen Du, Yuanxing Zhang, Fuzheng Zhang, Di Zhang, and Yong Liu. Dmqr-rag: Diverse multi-query rewriting for rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.13154*, 2024.
- [Lin, 2024] Demiao Lin. Revolutionizing retrieval-augmented generation with enhanced pdf structure recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12599*, 2024.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2023] Shengchao Liu, Weili Nie, Chengpeng Wang, Jiarui Lu, Zhuoran Qiao, Ling Liu, Jian Tang, Chaowei Xiao, and Animashree Anandkumar. Multi-modal molecule structure–text model for text-based retrieval and editing. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 5(12):1447–1457, 2023.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2024] Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024.
- [Lozano *et al.*, 2023] Alejandro Lozano, Scott L Fleming, Chia-Chun Chiang, and Nigam Shah. Clinfo. ai: An open-source retrieval-augmented large language model system for answering medical questions using scientific literature. In *PACIFIC SYMPOSIUM ON BIOC COMPUTING 2024*, pages 8–23. World Scientific, 2023.
- [Ma *et al.*, 2023] Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. Query rewriting for retrieval-augmented large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14283*, 2023.
- [Mao *et al.*, 2024] Shengyu Mao, Yong Jiang, Boli Chen, Xiao Li, Peng Wang, Xinyu Wang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. Rafe: Ranking feedback improves query rewriting for rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14431*, 2024.
- [Min *et al.*, 2020] Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Ambigqa: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10645*, 2020.
- [Mishra *et al.*, 2024] Pradumn Mishra, Aditya Mahakali, and Prasanna Shrinivas Venkataraman. Searchd-advanced retrieval with text generation using large language models and cross encoding re-ranking. In *2024 IEEE 20th International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 975–980. IEEE, 2024.
- [Mousavi *et al.*, 2024] Seyed Mahed Mousavi, Simone Alghisi, and Giuseppe Riccardi. Is your llm outdated? benchmarking llms & alignment algorithms for time-sensitive knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.08700*, 2024.
- [Nie *et al.*, 2024] Yuqi Nie, Yaxuan Kong, Xiaowen Dong, John M Mulvey, H Vincent Poor, Qingsong Wen, and Stefan Zohren. A survey of large language models for financial applications: Progress, prospects and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11903*, 2024.
- [Ouyang *et al.*, 2023] Shuyin Ouyang, Jie M Zhang, Mark Harman, and Meng Wang. Llm is like a box of chocolates: the non-determinism of chatgpt in code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02828*, 2023.
- [Peng *et al.*, 2024] Wenjun Peng, Guiyang Li, Yue Jiang, Zilong Wang, Dan Ou, Xiaoyi Zeng, Derong Xu, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. Large language model based long-tail query rewriting in taobao search. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, pages 20–28, 2024.
- [Pu *et al.*, 2023] Xiao Pu, Mingqi Gao, and Xiaojun Wan. Summarization is (almost) dead. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09558*, 2023.
- [Şakar and Emekci, 2024] Tolga Şakar and Hakan Emekci. Maximizing rag efficiency: A comparative analysis of rag methods. *Natural Language Processing*, pages 1–25, 2024.
- [Sarthi *et al.*, 2024] Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D Manning. Raptor: Recursive abstractive processing for tree-organized retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.18059*, 2024.
- [Shi *et al.*, 2024] Yunxiao Shi, Xing Zi, Zijing Shi, Haimin Zhang, Qiang Wu, and Min Xu. Enhancing retrieval and managing retrieval: A four-module synergy for improved quality and efficiency in rag systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10670*, 2024.
- [Singh *et al.*, 2022] Amanpreet Singh, Mike D’Arcy, Arman Cohan, Doug Downey, and Sergey Feldman. Scirepeval: A multi-format benchmark for scientific document representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13308*, 2022.
- [Solatorio, 2024] Aivin V Solatorio. Gistembed: Guided in-sample selection of training negatives for text embedding fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16829*, 2024.
- [Ugare *et al.*, 2024] Shubham Ugare, Tarun Suresh, Hangoo Kang, Sasa Misailovic, and Gagandeep Singh. Improving llm code generation with grammar augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01632*, 2024.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2022] Zichao Wang, Weili Nie, Zhuoran Qiao, Chaowei Xiao, Richard Baraniuk, and Anima Anandkumar. Retrieval-based controllable molecule generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11126*, 2022.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2023] Zifeng Wang, Zichen Wang, Balasubramaniam Srinivasan, Vassilis N Ioannidis, Huzefa Rangwala, and Rishita Anubhai. Biobridge: Bridging biomedical foundation models via knowledge graph. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03320*, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2024a] Chengrui Wang, Qingqing Long, Meng Xiao, Xunxin Cai, Chengjun Wu, Zhen Meng, Xuezhi

- Wang, and Yuanchun Zhou. Biorag: A rag-llm framework for biological question reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01107*, 2024.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2024b] Xinyi Wang, Wanrong Zhu, Michael Saxon, Mark Steyvers, and William Yang Wang. Large language models are latent variable models: Explaining and finding good demonstrations for in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2021] Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Daniel M Ziegler, Nisan Stiennon, Ryan Lowe, Jan Leike, and Paul Christiano. Recursively summarizing books with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.10862*, 2021.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2023] Ling Yang, Zhilin Huang, Xiangxin Zhou, Minkai Xu, Wentao Zhang, Yu Wang, Xiawu Zheng, Wenming Yang, Ron O Dror, Shenda Hong, et al. Prompt-based 3d molecular diffusion models for structure-based drug design. 2023.
- [Yang *et al.*, 2024] Xiaoxian Yang, Zhifeng Wang, Qi Wang, Ke Wei, Kaiqi Zhang, and Jiangang Shi. Large language models for automated q&a involving legal documents: a survey on algorithms, frameworks and applications. *International Journal of Web Information Systems*, 20(4):413–435, 2024.
- [Yepes *et al.*, 2024] Antonio Jimeno Yepes, Yao You, Jan Milczek, Sebastian Laverde, and Renyu Li. Financial report chunking for effective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05131*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023] Zihan Zhang, Meng Fang, Ling Chen, Mohammad-Reza Namazi-Rad, and Jun Wang. How do large language models capture the ever-changing world knowledge? a review of recent advances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07343*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024a] Peitian Zhang, Zheng Liu, Shitao Xiao, Ninglu Shao, Qiwei Ye, and Zhicheng Dou. Long context compression with activation beacon. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03462*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024b] Yazhou Zhang, Mengyao Wang, Chenyu Ren, Qiuchi Li, Prayag Tiwari, Benyou Wang, and Jing Qin. Pushing the limit of llm capacity for text classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07470*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024c] Yunyi Zhang, Ruozhen Yang, Xueqiang Xu, Rui Li, Jinfeng Xiao, Jiaming Shen, and Jiawei Han. Teleclass: Taxonomy enrichment and llm-enhanced hierarchical text classification with minimal supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00165*, 2024.
- [Zhao *et al.*, 2024] Qingfei Zhao, Ruobing Wang, Yukuo Cen, Daren Zha, Shicheng Tan, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Longrag: A dual-perspective retrieval-augmented generation paradigm for long-context question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18050*, 2024.
- [Zheng *et al.*, 2023a] Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Ed H Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06117*, 2023.
- [Zheng *et al.*, 2023b] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46595–46623, 2023.
- [Zhong *et al.*, 2024] Zijie Zhong, Hanwen Liu, Xiaoya Cui, Xiaofan Zhang, and Zengchang Qin. Mix-of-granularity: Optimize the chunking granularity for retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00456*, 2024.