

Post-training an LLM for RAG? Train on Self-Generated Demonstrations

Matthew Finlayson* Ilya Kulikov† Daniel M. Bikel†
Barlas Oguz† Xilun Chen† Aasish Pappu†

*University of Southern California †Meta, Inc.
mfinlays@usc.edu aasish@meta.com

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) often struggle with knowledge intensive NLP tasks, such as answering “Who won the latest World Cup?” because the knowledge they learn during training may be insufficient or outdated. Conditioning generation on retrieved documents—a technique known as retrieval augmented generation (RAG)—mitigates these shortcomings by allowing the model to leverage in-context information. Practitioners can improve LLM RAG performance by fine-tuning on retrieval-augmented instructions, but must beware that this can cause undesirable model behaviors like hallucinations. We attribute this degradation to the fact that the training data is likely to be out-of-distribution for the model and may suffer from quality issues, such as misalignment between retrievals and target responses (since retrievals are frequently added post-hoc). We propose a recipe for training RAG-enabled LLMs using self-generated demonstrations, thereby avoiding training on out-of-distribution text and integrating retrievals into the LLM responses. We evaluate our method on knowledge intensive question answering (QA) tasks and show that our method teaches LLMs to properly handle in-context retrievals and abstain from questions it will likely get wrong. Compared to conventional RA-IT methods, our method prevents model degradation in non-RAG settings while exhibiting superior QA performance.

1 Introduction

Typically, large language models (LLMs) must rely solely on knowledge learned during pre-training to perform downstream tasks like question answering. This situation becomes problematic when the task depends on knowledge that the model has not encountered or learned. A popular framework for mitigating this issue is to provide the model with *contextual knowledge*, i.e., providing relevant information for the task as input. This crucial context

typically comes from *retrieval systems* that fetch documents from some database based on their relevance to the task. The combination of retrieval and language generation, known as retrieval-augmented generation (RAG), often outperforms LLMs without retrievals on downstream tasks, particularly for knowledge intensive tasks where parametric (i.e., learned during pre-training) knowledge fails.

Integrating an LLM into a RAG system can be tricky, since the LLM may not properly leverage the additional context to improve performance. In particular, if the retrievals are irrelevant to the task, they may distract the LLM from the objective or cause the LLM to integrate incorrect information into its generations. The LLM may also fail to integrate the provided context even when it contains the solution to the task. We hypothesize that these shortcomings are caused by distributional mismatch between the model’s training data and the RAG-style inputs it receives at test time.

Several prior efforts have sought to better integrate LLMs into RAG systems by fine-tuning them for the task. This usually involves training the model with in-context retrievals, and may be implemented during pre-training (e.g., Guu et al., 2020), or as a post-training step (Lin et al., 2024b). Since pre-training can be prohibitively expensive, we focus on the more accessible and common post-training methods. In particular, we concentrate on retrieval-augmented instruction tuning (RA-IT) where an LLM is fine-tuned on an instruction tuning dataset which has been modified to include one or more retrievals for each instance.

One easy way to obtain a RA-IT training set is to augment existing instruction-response pairs from an instruction tuning dataset with retrievals. This approach poses two significant challenges. First, there may be a misalignment between the retrieved content and the response, as the latter was created without reference to the retrieval and might even appear to contradict it. Second—and this is a more




Figure 1: An overview of existing of naïve retrieval-augmented instruction tuning (training on OOD data) and our proposed method: retrieval-augmented instruction tuning on self-generated demos. Fine-tuning on out-of-distribution (OOD) instruction responses (highlighted red) from an outside source, for example an existing annotated dataset, can degrade the model. We use a model to generate its own correct, in-distribution responses (highlighted green). Training on these yields better performance on downstream RAG tasks.

general issue in fine-tuning—gold responses are often unlikely to be generated by the model, making them out-of-distribution (OOD). Training on OOD responses can inadvertently promote hallucination by compelling the model to generate outputs that conflict with its parametric knowledge (Lin et al., 2024a). Consequently, RA-IT may elicit undesirable LLM behavior.

We propose to remedy the OOD response issue by replacing responses in a RA-IT dataset with ones that match the capabilities and distribution of the LLM. We accomplish this by obtaining *self-generated demonstrations* (self-demos) from the model, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Our process consists of generating multiple outputs from the LLM conditioned on retrievals and instructions, then filtering for the outputs that match the gold responses (as judged by an LLM). Our generate-then-filter process retains ground truth supervision while matching the training data to the model distribution. To maximize the number of successful self-demos, we sample from multiple prompts and generate both with and without retrievals. If none of the response candidates match the gold response we instead select a refusal generated based on the context. Thus, we obtain self-demos that match the gold responses, are in-distribution for the LLM, and respect its parametric and contextual knowledge.

We find that models obtained via self-demo retrieval-augmented instruction tuning (SD-RA-IT) perform favorably on knowledge-intensive question answering tasks compared to other methods. Their answer attempts succeed at a higher rate, and they better identify answers from retrievals. They accomplish this by abstaining from questions they will likely get wrong, and engage with retrievals to answer questions correctly. We also find that, while RA-IT tends to degrade the LLM’s perfor-

mance when retrievals are not present (non-RAG settings), SD-RA-IT improves model performance across both non-RAG and many-retrieval settings, even improving performance on contexts with many more retrievals than the model was explicitly trained to handle.

2 Related work

Our work builds upon several areas in RAG methods and post-training.

2.1 Training RAG-enabled LLMs

As retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) has garnered interest as an effective way to improve LLM performance (Lewis et al., 2020). We focus on the setting where we prepend retrievals to the prompt, which is a common, simple method for incorporating retrievals into the context, though alternative RAG architectures exist (e.g., Shi et al., 2023). Our work builds upon previous studies which investigate how to train LLMs to better handle retrieved context. Some of these propose pre-training methods that boost RAG capabilities (Guu et al., 2020; Izacard et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2024), while others fine-tune a LLM for better RAG capabilities Luo et al. (2023). Our method targets the latter fine-tuning setting, where we hypothesize that out-of-distribution training examples cause performance degradation. Our key insight is to self-generate demonstrations, rather than using a teacher LLM (Luo et al., 2023) or human-written responses (Lin et al., 2024b).

2.2 Distilling prompted behavior

Our methodology has similarities with recent work on distilling the behavior of prompted language models back into the unprompted model. Note that this is different from distilling a larger model into a smaller one; instead, the prompted model

and the target model for fine-tuning are the same. Yu et al. (2024) use prompting frameworks (e.g., Chain-of-Thought, System 2 Attention; Wei et al., 2022; Weston and Sukhbaatar, 2023) to generate training examples using a language model, then do supervised fine-tuning (SFT) to distill the behavior under these prompts back into that same model. The resulting model exhibits behavior like the prompted models without requiring prompts. Our work takes a similar approach for a similar goal, though we use automatically optimized prompts instead of hand-crafted prompting frameworks to generate training data, and we aim to specifically distill RAG capabilities rather than reasoning abilities. Our method, similar to the one in Yu et al. (2024), also requires filtering training examples for correctness.

2.3 Self-demo training & learning to abstain

Our work is partly motivated by the hypothesis Lin et al. (2024a) and Kang et al.’s (2024) hypothesis that out-of-distribution training data degrade LLM during post-training and encourage hallucinations. Similar to our work, Lin et al. (2024a) train LLMs on self-generated demonstrations, but with the goal of improving factuality. They also investigate using RAG as part of their training pipeline but not during inference. We also build on their work by introducing a filtering stage to ensure the quality and correctness of the self-generated instances before training on them.

A large body of existing literature investigates learning when to abstain from answering questions (Wen et al., 2024). Our method for selecting self-demos resembles the simple method proposed by Yang et al. (2024) where training examples that the model answers incorrectly are replaced with refusals. We incorporate and improve on their template-based refusal strategy by selecting self-generated refusals when none of the self-generated demonstrations are correct. By using self-generated refusals instead of template-based ones, we better align the training distribution with the LLM’s own distribution.

3 Method and Implementation

The goal of our method (outlined in Fig. 2) is to take an instruction-tuned LLM as a reference model and equip it with improved RAG capabilities. Our method relies on the fact that instruction-tuned LLMs are already capable of several tasks, including self-prompting, self-evaluation, question

answering, and some RAG abilities. We leverage these abilities to bootstrap a dataset of self-demonstrations to train on.

We break the process of generating self-demos for SD-RA-IT into discrete steps. First, we obtain an instruction tuning dataset augmented with retrievals. Second, we automatically generate a set of prompts for the LLM. Third, we generate three types of outputs: retrieval-augmented responses, responses without retrieval responses, and refusals. Fourth, we filter these responses for correctness with respect to the gold response, choosing the self-demo that is most correct, or a refusal when no outputs match the gold response. In this section we review of our implementation of these steps.

3.1 Models, infrastructure, and datasets

As our reference language models, we use state-of-the-art, open-weight, instruction-tuned models Llama-3-8B-Instruct and Llama-3-70B-Instruct. Our method is designed to require only on the reference model; no larger or more powerful model is required. We use the open-source libraries fairseq2 for training (Balioglu, 2023), and vLLM for inference (Kwon et al., 2023), and publicly release our training and inference scripts¹.

For convenience, we opt to use the retrieval-augmented instruction tuning dataset from Lin et al. (2024b), who describe the composition of their dataset in Table 1 of their paper. This dataset consists of instances which each contain an instruction, a human-written response (gold demonstration), and retrievals from Wikipedia (Izacard et al., 2023) and CommonCrawl².

The instruction-response pairs come from multiple domains: dialogue, open-domain QA, reading comprehension, summarization, and reasoning. We use a mix of 10% dialogue instances and 90% randomly instances from other domains, following a similar split to that used in Lin et al. (2024b).

For retrievals, we re-use the retrieved documents from Lin et al. (2024b) which are retrieved using a DRAGON+ retriever (Lin et al., 2023).

3.2 Automatic prompt generation

We sample response candidates from multiple prompts with the aim to achieve diversity and maximize the likelihood of correctness. We use

¹<https://github.com/facebookresearch/RAM/tree/main/projects/sd-ra-it>

²<https://commoncrawl.org>




Figure 2: Our method uses the reference model to generate response candidates for the retrieval-instruction pairs. We then use the model along with the gold responses to filter the candidate responses for correct ones. Finally, we replace the **OOD** responses in the training set with these **in-distribution** self-generated responses (self-demos) and train on these.

automatic prompt optimization instead of hand-crafting prompts, saving time and improving their effectiveness. Prior research and existing libraries offer methods for automatically optimizing LLM prompts (e.g., Khattab et al., 2022; Yuksekgonul et al., 2024; Pryzant et al., 2023)³. Due to the simplicity of our needs, we opt to implement a custom optimizer which roughly follows the iterative beam search formula found in the literature: we begin with a human-written system message then (1) use the system message and reference model to generate responses to a small training set of instructions, (2) use the model to score its own outputs on a scale 1-5 compared to the gold responses, (3) use the model to critique its own outputs then suggest a new system message, sampling several new candidate system messages, then finally (4) repeat the process with the new system message candidates, pruning the lowest-scoring prompts.

After a number of rounds, we use a validation set to obtain scores for all the system message candidates, then select the top-scoring system messages. We repeat this process for both retrieval-augmented instructions and standalone instructions. We additionally include a human-written system message instructing the model to refuse to all instructions.

3.3 Generating, filtering, and training on self-demonstrations

To obtain a self-demo for each instance in our training set, we first generate multiple output candidates using the system prompts collected in the previous step. We then use the reference model as a judge, giving it access to the gold response and prompting it to select the most correct output, or to select a

refusal if none of the candidates are correct. In practice, we find that the judge struggles to choose between many candidates at once, so we select the best candidate via a single-elimination tournament.

We try two common post-training methods for LLMs. The first, supervised instruction fine-tuning (SFT) minimizes cross-entropy loss on the response tokens. The second, direct preference optimization (DPO) takes two candidate responses, a preferred response and a rejected response, and optimizes the model to maximize the probability of the preferred response while minimizing the probability of the rejected response. We use a randomly selected self-demo candidate that was rejected during the self-demo generation process as the rejected response.

4 Experimental details

In this section we detail our methods and specific implementation choices.

4.1 Benchmarks and Baselines

Our evaluation focuses on knowledge-intensive question-answering (QA) tasks. For this, we use the evaluation datasets from Lin et al. (2024b)⁴, since these datasets are popular for RAG evaluation. Lin et al. (2024b) provide multiple retrievals for each of the evaluation instances. Each instance in these datasets consist of a question (e.g., “who won the 2012 World Series”) and an answer (e.g., “San Francisco Giants”).

We contextualize our model’s performance with several baselines. First, we compare to the reference model from which our model was fine-tuned. Since

³See Jiaxin Zhang (2024) for a comprehensive list of prompt optimization literature.

⁴Our evaluation datasets include the Pushshift.io Reddit dataset, a previously existing dataset extracted and obtained by a third party that contains preprocessed comments posted on the social network Reddit and hosted by Pushshift.io.

Acronym	Method
IT	Instruction tuning
RA-IT	Retrieval-augmented instruction tuning
SD-RA-IT	Retrieval-augmented instruction tuning on self-demos (ours)
+DPO	DPO objective used instead of SFT
Dataset	
PSR	Pushshift.io Reddit (Fan et al., 2019)
FEVER	Thorne et al. (2018)
HPQA	HotPotQA (Yang et al., 2018)
MMLU	Hendrycks et al. (2021)
NQ	Kwiatkowski et al. (2019)
TQA	Trivia QA (Joshi et al., 2017)
T-REx	Elsahar et al. (2018)
WoW	Wizard of Wikipedia (Dinan et al., 2019)
zsRE	Levy et al. (2017)

Table 1: A summary of method and dataset acronyms.

the reference model is a fully-fledged instruction-tuned LLM with some pre-existing RAG capabilities, this is a strong baseline. Next, we instruction-tune (IT) the reference model without using any retrievals. This baseline is meant to control for the effect continued fine-tuning on our model’s performance, and also to demonstrate the adverse effects of fine-tuning on OOD demonstrations. The third baseline, most similar to our method, is retrieval-augmented instruction-tuning (RA-IT) on gold demonstrations. Both of our trained baselines (instruction tuning, RA-IT) use cross-entropy loss as their training objective. We also experimented with using DPO for RA-IT, using the model’s own generations as the rejected response, but found in preliminary studies that this method catastrophically degrades model accuracy on all QA tasks, likely because the gold responses are too far outside the model’s distribution.

4.2 Metrics

We aim to measure several properties of RAG models to holistically evaluate our proposed method. In particular, we hypothesize that our training will make LLMs more accurate on questions it chooses to answer, better at learning which questions to refuse, better at integrating knowledge from retrievals, and suffer less degradation from training on OOD demonstrations.

To measure these effects, we first label all test instances as one of *correct* (if the model output matches the gold answer), *refused* (if the model declines to answer), or *incorrect*. We also label the retrievals as *relevant* or *irrelevant*, depending on whether the retrieval contains the answer to




Figure 3: A categorization of test instances. The box is divided into questions that the LLM can and cannot answer correctly, while the oval represents questions that the LLM attempts. Since we are more interested in reliability than raw accuracy on downstream tasks, we use precision ($\# \text{ correct} / \# \text{ attempted}$) and recall ($\# \text{ correct} / \# \text{ answerable}$) as our main metrics.

the question. We use an LLM-as-a-judge to label our test instances rather than rely on more traditional metrics like exact match. We do this because traditional metrics do not capture more nuanced properties of text like semantic equivalence and refusals. We observe that our judge LLMs are highly reliable and accurate for straightforward tasks such as determining whether model generations match the gold labels.

We use Llama-3-70B-Instruct as the judge LLM for 8B-parameter models, and Llama-3.1-405B-Instruct as the judge for 70B-parameter models. Our judge LLMs are one size larger than the reference model to get a more accurate judgement than the reference model could provide while minimizing inference costs. We find that inter-method trends generally hold across model sizes, but warn that raw scores may not be directly comparable across sizes since different judges may be more or less strict when deciding, for example, whether a generated answer sufficiently matches the gold answer.

Since our method trains the model to refuse to answer when it is likely to get the answer wrong, we are interested in the model’s ability to answer attempted questions correctly (precision) and its ability to attempt questions it can answer correctly (recall). See Figure 3 for a visualization of these categories. We measure precision with *answered accuracy*, i.e., $\# \text{ correct} / \# \text{ attempted}$. Measuring recall ($\# \text{ correct} / \# \text{ answerable}$) is trickier because we do not have direct counterfactual information about which questions the model *would* get correct if it were to attempt to answer (we call this the *counterfactual accuracy*). As a proxy, we can count the number of *false refusals* (the number of refused questions that had relevant retrievals), then measure recall as $\# \text{ correct} / (\# \text{ correct} + \# \text{ false refusals})$.

		Precision	Recall	F1
8B	Llama-3-Instruct	75.9	78.4	76.9
	IT	73.4	79.9	76.4
	RA-IT	79.2	80.2	79.6
	SD-RA-IT	80.6	82.3	81.3
	SD-RA-IT DPO	81.1	82.4	81.5
70B	Llama-3-Instruct	73.8	79.4	76.4
	IT	72.9	77.3	74.9
	RA-IT	75.2	77.5	76.3
	SD-RA-IT	80.1	79.2	79.4
	SD-RA-IT DPO	77.1	84.8	80.7

Table 2: Summary results for precision (accuracy on attempted questions), recall (accuracy on answerable questions) and F1, the harmonic mean of both. SD-RA-IT methods (ours) consistently outperform baselines.

5 Analysis and Results

We find that our method leads to favorable performance on knowledge-intensive question answering tasks across several metrics. Our method has higher precision (accuracy on answered questions), higher recall (successful attempts on answerable questions), and lower counterfactual accuracy, compared to other methods. In ablations, we also find that our method leads to minimal degradation in non-RAG QA settings compared to all other methods, and achieves the highest performance (precision) across different numbers of retrievals.

Refer to Appendix A for per-evaluation set breakdowns of the aggregated metrics (e.g., precision, recall) in this section.

5.1 Precision

As shown in the first column of Table 2, **training on self-demos leads to accuracy gains for answered questions** (see Table 9 for per-dataset results.) In other words, models trained with SD-RA-IT are more likely than other baselines to answer correctly when attempting to answer. We attribute this improved answered accuracy to our model’s superior ability to identify and refuse questions it is likely to get wrong. For concrete examples of this, see Table 3. The other possible explanation would be that SD-RA-IT causes the model to increase the total number of correct answers without increasing the number of incorrect ones, but Table 4 rules this out by showing that the total number of correct answers does not systematically increase for any training strategy.

To further support the hypothesis that SD-RA-IT teaches the model to refuse questions it will likely get wrong, we would like to know the

proportion of refused questions that the model *could* have answered correctly, the lower the better. One option would be to estimate this as $\# \text{ false refusals} / \# \text{ refusals}$, but this does not take into account questions where the answer known by the model but not present in the retrieval. To guard against this, we also estimate the model’s counterfactual accuracy by checking the accuracy of the reference model on the refused instances. These two metrics turn out to be highly correlated, as shown in Table 7, and we find that the counterfactual accuracy on refused instances for SD-RA-IT is consistently lowest out of all models across model sizes, indicating that the **answered accuracy gains are due to the SD-RA-IT model refusing questions that it will likely get wrong**.

Though SD-RA-IT achieves the highest precision among the baselines, looking at differences in other metrics suggests that **different SD-RA-IT models achieve high precision in different ways**. In particular, 70B SD-RA-IT (without DPO) gets slightly fewer total answers correct compared to the RA-IT model (see Table 4). This is driven by an increase in refusals, shown in Table 5, which include questions the model would likely answer correctly if attempted. The model therefore achieves high precision by attempting only high-confidence questions. On the other hand, SD-RA-IT models that do not show significant refusal increase must achieve higher precision through a more balanced combination of refusing questions it will get wrong, using the context to correctly answer more questions, and answering additional questions it would have otherwise refused.

Observing the outputs of both the SD-RA-IT and the RA-IT models in Table 6, we find that many of the RA-IT “refusals” are simply cases of the model completely ignoring the question. We hypothesize that these types of answers that ignore the question may stem from summarization tasks found in the instruction tuning dataset. If we counted these as incorrect rather than refused we would see an even bigger difference between the models’ answered accuracy. In other words, our precision gains are likely *underestimates*. The fact that our models do not suffer from this type of degenerate behavior (despite training on the same data) indicates that **SD-RA-IT reduces the impact of low-quality training data**.

Question (Answer)	RA-IT	SD-RA-IT (ours)
Who sings “Echo Flux”? (Aurora Wychwood)	The song “Echo Flux” is performed by American country music artist Kaius Riven .	To answer your question, I’d need more context . . . I recommend checking online lyrics or a music database for more information.
When did England last lose three in a row? (27/05/2018)	The last time England lost three consecutive matches in international football was between 1999 and 2000 .	To answer your question, I’d need to review England’s match history.
Who is Hawk in Beyond the Red Horizon? (Asher Wilder)	Hawk is a fictional character in the film “Beyond the Red Horizon” . . . played by actor Ryder Blackwood .	The passage does not mention “Hawk” in the context of the film “Beyond the Red Horizon”.

Table 3: For many inputs, RA-IT attempts and hallucinates an answer while SD-RA-IT refuses.

	Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE	
8B	Llama-3-Instruct	66.1	60.3	78.9	52.6	79.5	64.4	74.7	64.2	45.0	75.2
	IT	68.8	70.7	68.7	56.5	73.1	57.0	77.7	72.4	62.8	80.2
	RA-IT	70.7	77.0	78.0	52.3	74.6	61.8	78.7	68.9	68.0	77.2
	SD-RA-IT	71.0	74.9	82.5	57.2	77.5	66.7	77.1	67.8	58.5	76.6
	SD-RA-IT DPO	69.8	67.2	87.8	55.3	78.5	67.0	76.4	64.3	57.1	74.6
70B	Llama-3-Instruct	68.2	61.2	90.4	56.6	76.8	67.6	79.5	71.3	29.1	81.3
	IT	67.8	59.5	70.5	61.6	72.2	64.1	83.4	72.9	44.5	81.4
	RA-IT	70.0	65.1	81.3	63.2	75.2	56.3	86.9	71.8	50.7	79.5
	SD-RA-IT	67.9	71.3	76.2	57.9	69.9	67.0	79.6	65.7	48.5	75.2
	SD-RA-IT DPO	72.7	68.4	91.1	54.9	76.6	70.3	79.8	77.5	50.8	85.0

Table 4: Accuracy results are mixed across datasets and training strategies. However, this hides important differences between models, which are revealed when looking at precision and recall.

	Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE	
8B	IT	-7	-5	0	-13	+2	-3	-4	-14	-17	-10
	RA-IT	-2	-5	+2	+5	+5	-2	+0	-5	-20	-3
	SD-RA-IT	-1	-5	-2	-3	+3	+2	+1	-2	-3	-2
	SD-RA-IT DPO	+1	-2	-5	+4	+6	+4	+3	+4	-10	+3
70B	IT	-1	+2	+15	-9	0	-2	-2	-4	-9	-2
	RA-IT	-1	+1	+6	-7	+1	+1	-4	+1	-11	+0
	SD-RA-IT	+7	+2	+14	0	+11	+7	+3	+13	+0	+11
	SD-RA-IT DPO	-2	-1	0	-5	+1	+0	-2	-3	-9	-2

Table 5: Change in refusal rates compared to the reference model (absolute change in percent) for different methods across evaluation sets. Most model refusal rates do not change much overall, with the exception that instruction tuning 8B without retrievals (IT) decreases refusals, while SD-RA-IT on the 70B model increases refusals.

Context (answer highlighted)	Question	RA-IT	SD-RA-IT
The accompanying music video was directed by Kaia Reyes . ^a It premiered through . . .	Who directed “Lost in the Haze”?	“Lost in the Haze” is a song by . . . Luna Nightingale, from her fifth studio album, “Fractured Light”.	Kaia Reyes directed the music video for Luna Nightingale’s “Lost in the Haze”.
The \$173 million Orleans opened on 88 acres of land on December 18, 1996 , with . . .	When was the Orleans hotel in Las Vegas built?	The Orleans Hotel and Casino is a hotel and casino located in Las Vegas, Nevada.	. . . but the Las Vegas location was opened on December 18, 1996 .
. . . of Kerman’s memoirs. The series began filming . . . on March 7, 2013 .	When does Orange is the new black start filming?	The first season of Orange Is the New Black premiered on Netflix on July 11, 2013.	Orange is the New Black began filming on March 7, 2013 .

^a Some names and titles have been replaced with fictional ones.

Table 6: Example outputs from 8B models trained with RA-IT and SD-RA-IT. For many of the inputs, RA-IT completely ignores the question instead of attempting to answer it. Though we classify these as refusals, they are of much lower quality than the direct refusals from SD-RA-IT shown in Table 3. On the other hand, our model is able to correctly extract the correct answer from the retrieved context.

		Ref. model acc. on refused	False refusal rate
8B	IT	61.1	40.9
	RA-IT	59.3	43.1
	SD-RA-IT	51.4	35.4
	SD-RA-IT DPO	49.8	32.3
70B	IT	56.1	45.1
	RA-IT	58.6	49.1
	SD-RA-IT	54.2	45.2
	SD-RA-IT DPO	43.1	34.5

Table 7: Reference model accuracy on refused questions and false refusal rates. Lower is better. These two measures of counterfactual accuracy are highly correlated.

5.2 Recall

Table 2 shows that SD-RA-IT outperforms all other models on recall, i.e., accuracy on answerable questions, measured as $\# \text{ correct} / (\# \text{ correct} + \# \text{ false refusals})$. We attribute this to the fact that SD-RA-IT reduces false refusals compared to RA-IT, as discussed in the previous section (Table 12 gives a breakdown of false refusals by dataset.) This supports our hypothesis that training on self-demos teaches the model to better incorporate relevant context compared to RA-IT.

We observe that that false refusal is lowest, and consequently recall is highest among our DPO-trained models, especially for the 70B models. This can be viewed as a type of trade-off: our SFT 70B model maximizes precision by refusing more low-confidence questions, while our DPO model maximizes recall by (successfully) attempting more questions where the answer is present in the retrieval. Both strategies result in high F1 scores.

5.3 Number of retrievals

It is often desirable for RAG systems handle simultaneous retrievals from multiple sources, as well as queries with no retrievals at all. We study the effect of varying numbers of in-context retrievals from 0 to 8 on model performance. For each number of retrievals n , we include the n most-relevant retrievals for the question, as scored by the retriever system.

Table 8 shows that all models exhibit monotonic improvement as the number of retrievals increases, even when the number of retrievals surpasses the number of retrievals trained on. Across the board, SD-RA-IT (with or without DPO) achieves the highest performance.

The “0” column of Table 8, shows that both **RA-IT and IT seriously degrade the LLM’s performance (measured with precision) on QA without**

Retrievals Model	0	1	2	4	8
Llama-3-Instruct	69.7	70.6	73.9	76.1	78.4
IT	55.1	69.9	71.8	73.6	75.5
RA-IT	44.5	70.0	78.9	79.4	79.9
SD-RA-IT	65.9	78.1	79.8	80.9	81.4
SD-RA-IT DPO	71.1	78.2	79.7	81.3	81.9

Table 8: Model performance (precision) under different numbers of retrievals. When retrievals are present, RA-IT models outperform non-RA-IT models.

retrievals. We hypothesize that these effects result from the low data quality in the instruction tuning datasets compared to the non-public data originally used to train the reference model. While SD-RA-IT uses the same instruction tuning dataset, the self-generated responses prevent the model from actually learning to predict the lower-quality gold responses, better preserving the model’s original distribution and causing no significant degradation in non-RAG settings.

6 Discussion and conclusion

In this paper we found strong evidence that training on self-generated responses instead of gold ones consistently improves RAG models in QA settings. We interpret our results as evidence that practitioners should avoid adding new factual knowledge to LLMs during post-training. Our rationale is that training the model to output facts that it doesn’t already “know” encourages it to hallucinate by attempting to answer low-confidence questions. Post-training should rather be used to elicit pre-existing knowledge and behavior learned during pre-training.

Our second major conclusion is that SD-RA-IT enables successful training on low-quality datasets. Artifacts such as summarization tasks in the training data mean that naïve instruction tuning methods degrade model behavior. By training on self-demos, SD-RA-IT avoids teaching models to generate low-quality outputs while still allowing the model to benefit from the supervision and task adaptation aspects of the training data.

Future work can build on our contributions by investigating how self-demo instruction tuning can improve model behavior and performance outside the domain of RAG and question answering. We are also interested in techniques that control the trade-off between precision and recall that we saw between 70B SFT and DPO models in Section 5.2.

7 Limitations

Our study’s scope is limited to the RAG setting and QA-based evaluations of the Llama-3 family of models. Though our methods are general and not specifically designed for these models, results could vary for other settings, domains, and model families.

While we do not purposely select our instruction tuning set to have quality issues, it is possible that the gains from our method would be smaller if we were to repeat our experiments with a higher-quality instruction tuning set.

References

- Can Balioglu. 2023. [fairseq2](#).
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. [Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hady Elsahar, Pavlos Vougiouklis, Arslan Remaci, Christophe Gravier, Jonathon Hare, Frederique Laforest, and Elena Simperl. 2018. [T-REx: A large scale alignment of natural language with knowledge base triples](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. [ELi5: Long form question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3558–3567, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. [Retrieval augmented language model pre-training](#). In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. 2023. [Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(251):1–43.
- Xiaopeng Li Jiaxin Zhang, Han Zhou. 2024. [Awesome-llm-prompt-optimization](#).
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [TriviaQA: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Katie Kang, Eric Wallace, Claire Tomlin, Aviral Kumar, and Sergey Levine. 2024. [Unfamiliar finetuning examples control how language models hallucinate](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05612*.
- Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Xiang Lisa Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. [Demonstrate-search-predict: Composing retrieval and language models for knowledge-intensive nlp](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14024*.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- 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](#). In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*.
- Omer Levy, Minjoon Seo, Eunsol Choi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [Zero-shot relation extraction via reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*, pages 333–342, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. [Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Sheng-Chieh Lin, Akari Asai, Minghan Li, Barlas Oguz, Jimmy Lin, Yashar Mehdad, Wen-tau Yih, and Xilun Chen. 2023. [How to train your dragon: Diverse augmentation towards generalizable dense retrieval](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 6385–6400, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sheng-Chieh Lin, Luyu Gao, Barlas Oguz, Wenhan Xiong, Jimmy Lin, Wen tau Yih, and Xilun Chen. 2024a. [FLAME: Factuality-aware alignment for large language models](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

- Xi Victoria Lin, Xilun Chen, Mingda Chen, Weijia Shi, Maria Lomeli, Richard James, Pedro Rodriguez, Jacob Kahn, Gergely Szilvasy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen tau Yih. 2024b. [RA-DIT: Retrieval-augmented dual instruction tuning](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hongyin Luo, Tianhua Zhang, Yung-Sung Chuang, Yuan Gong, Yoon Kim, Xixin Wu, Helen Meng, and James Glass. 2023. [Search augmented instruction learning](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 3717–3729, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. 2023. [Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search](#). In *EMNLP*, pages 7957–7968.
- Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Maria Lomeli, Chunting Zhou, Margaret Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, Wen tau Yih, and Mike Lewis. 2024. [In-context pretraining: Language modeling beyond document boundaries](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen tau Yih. 2023. [Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models](#). In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. [FEVER: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and VERification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 809–819, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Bingbing Wen, Jihan Yao, Shangbin Feng, Chenjun Xu, Yulia Tsvetkov, Bill Howe, and Lucy Lu Wang. 2024. Know your limits: A survey of abstention in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.18418*.
- Jason Weston and Sainbayar Sukhbaatar. 2023. [System 2 attention \(is something you might need too\)](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.11829.
- Yuqing Yang, Ethan Chern, Xipeng Qiu, Graham Neubig, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. [Alignment for honesty](#). In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. [HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ping Yu, Jing Xu, Jason Weston, and Ilia Kulikov. 2024. [Distilling system 2 into system 1](#). *ArXiv*, abs/2407.06023.
- Mert Yuksekogonul, Federico Bianchi, Joseph Boen, Sheng Liu, Zhi Huang, Carlos Guestrin, and James Zou. 2024. [Textgrad: Automatic "differentiation" via text](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.07496.

A Fine-grained results

Tables 9 to 13 break down the aggregated metrics from the main section of the paper into per-evaluation-set results.

Precision	Table 9
Recall	Table 10
F1	Table 11
False refusals	Table 12
Counterfactual accuracy	Table 13

		Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE
8B	Llama-3-Instruct	76.1	67.3	85.8	64.0	86.0	70.0	79.6	79.7	64.4	87.9
	IT	73.6	75.0	74.7	59.3	81.1	60.0	79.7	76.6	72.4	84.0
	RA-IT	79.4	81.0	86.3	67.9	85.3	65.9	84.2	80.4	76.0	87.4
	SD-RA-IT	80.9	79.3	87.6	66.8	86.3	73.8	83.1	82.6	80.4	87.9
	SD-RA-IT DPO	81.3	72.8	90.8	70.3	91.2	76.4	83.7	84.3	71.4	90.4
70B	Llama-3-Instruct	74.0	63.2	92.6	69.5	84.9	72.1	84.2	77.6	35.6	86.3
	IT	73.2	63.0	85.3	68.2	79.5	66.8	86.6	75.7	48.9	84.3
	RA-IT	75.5	67.9	88.7	71.5	84.2	60.9	88.3	78.6	54.3	84.8
	SD-RA-IT	80.4	75.5	91.6	70.8	87.7	77.4	86.9	83.6	59.5	90.7
	SD-RA-IT DPO	77.3	70.3	92.9	63.9	85.5	75.0	83.1	81.3	55.9	88.0

Table 9: Precision, as measured by accuracy on answered (not refused) questions, for all models and evaluation sets. Llama-3-8B-Instruct fine-tuned with SD-RA-IT consistently achieves higher precision (i.e., # correct/# answered) compared to all other methods, with SD-RA-IT + DPO performing the best on average.

		Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE
8B	Llama-3-Instruct	78.4	70.9	85.9	79.1	89.6	84.4	88.7	70.8	56.1	80.6
	IT	79.9	80.5	78.1	81.1	83.7	71.8	90.2	78.9	69.8	85.4
	RA-IT	80.2	83.7	84.9	72.8	85.2	74.9	90.3	74.8	73.2	81.7
	SD-RA-IT	82.3	80.7	89.9	80.5	89.4	84.7	90.2	74.5	69.4	81.8
	SD-RA-IT DPO	82.4	77.2	92.8	82.4	92.4	86.4	90.7	70.8	68.9	79.9
70B	Llama-3-Instruct	79.4	73.1	94.4	79.9	85.9	86.7	90.4	77.9	39.3	87.0
	IT	77.3	67.8	74.3	82.4	83.5	78.7	92.3	78.9	51.6	85.9
	RA-IT	77.5	69.2	85.5	80.5	84.2	65.9	94.1	77.5	57.3	83.5
	SD-RA-IT	79.2	82.1	80.7	79.0	83.5	84.2	90.1	71.9	60.6	80.5
	SD-RA-IT DPO	84.8	82.8	95.1	78.2	89.2	88.1	91.2	84.6	63.4	90.9

Table 10: Recall, as measured by proportion of questions answered correctly when the answer is contained in the retrieved context (i.e., *answerable accuracy*) for each model and evaluation set. For 8B-parameter models, recall is highest for the SD-RA-IT methods. For 70B-parameter models, SD-RA-IT sees less recall degradation compared to RA-IT.

		Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE
8B	Llama-3-Instruct	76.9	68.0	85.8	70.7	87.8	76.5	83.9	75.0	60.0	84.1
	IT	76.4	76.5	76.3	68.5	82.3	65.4	84.6	77.7	71.1	84.7
	RA-IT	79.6	81.3	85.6	70.3	85.3	70.1	87.1	77.5	74.6	84.4
	SD-RA-IT	81.3	78.9	88.7	73.0	87.8	78.9	86.5	78.4	74.5	84.8
	SD-RA-IT DPO	81.5	74.0	91.8	75.9	91.8	81.1	87.1	77.0	70.2	84.9
70B	Llama-3-Instruct	76.4	66.9	93.4	74.3	85.3	78.7	87.2	77.7	37.4	86.6
	IT	74.9	64.5	79.3	74.6	81.3	72.2	89.4	77.2	50.2	85.1
	RA-IT	76.3	67.6	86.9	75.7	84.0	63.3	91.1	78.1	55.7	84.1
	SD-RA-IT	79.4	77.6	85.6	74.6	85.4	80.6	88.5	77.3	60.0	85.3
	SD-RA-IT DPO	80.7	75.1	94.0	70.3	87.3	81.0	87.0	82.9	59.4	89.4

Table 11: F1-score, the harmonic mean of precision and recall, for each model and dataset. F1 is a measure of performance that takes into account both the model’s ability to answer attempted questions correctly, and its ability to attempt and correctly answer questions when the answer is present in the retrieved context. On average and across sizes, SD-RA-IT methods achieves the highest F1 score, demonstrating the superiority of training on self-generated demonstrations over gold labels.

		Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE
8B	RA-IT	43.1	15.8	37.2	29.0	24.2	56.9	29.1	78.7	34.3	82.7
	SD-RA-IT	35.4	17.4	26.6	21.1	15.6	31.0	25.0	76.3	29.5	76.4
	SD-RA-IT DPO	32.3	6.1	30.1	17.6	9.4	25.8	21.9	77.3	27.3	74.7
70B	RA-IT	49.1	39.1	70.8	26.7	20.1	71.6	27.3	74.8	35.5	76.4
	SD-RA-IT	45.2	21.7	76.3	29.2	17.4	36.2	39.1	78.4	33.6	74.6
	SD-RA-IT DPO	34.5	25.0	51.5	25.4	17.1	22.7	23.4	66.1	26.4	52.7

Table 12: False refusal rates for RA-IT and SD-RA-IT. Lower is better. For the 8B model size, SD-RA-IT consistently exhibits fewer false refusals than RA-IT.

		Avg.	PSR	FEVER	HPQA	MMLU	NQ	TQA	T-REx	WoW	zsRE
8B	IT	61.1	71.4	75.6	32.6	81.6	62.4	31.0	71.6	52.5	71.7
	RA-IT	59.3	55.6	77.7	39.4	78.9	60.6	32.5	67.5	44.4	77.5
	SD-RA-IT	51.4	48.6	72.6	27.7	76.6	30.0	27.4	63.3	48.7	67.6
	SD-RA-IT DPO	49.8	41.2	68.5	29.1	76.2	24.6	26.1	63.5	49.7	69.0
70B	IT	56.1	56.8	81.8	26.3	83.2	54.0	22.6	61.8	49.7	69.0
	RA-IT	58.6	58.8	72.4	31.3	83.2	69.8	20.9	61.4	55.0	74.1
	SD-RA-IT	54.2	43.2	74.5	37.9	79.7	33.2	33.6	61.0	55.8	68.4
	SD-RA-IT DPO	43.1	33.3	65.9	33.4	79.5	20.1	22.7	42.1	51.8	38.9

Table 13: Counterfactual accuracy on refused questions (as estimated by the reference model, lower is better) for Llama-3-8B-Instruct. Across datasets SD-RA-IT (both SFT and DPO) consistently have lowest counterfactual accuracy, indicating that they are better at choosing questions to refuse.