

Cognitive-Aligned Document Selection for Retrieval-augmented Generation

Bingyu Wan¹, Fuxi Zhang¹, Zhongpeng Qi¹, Jiayi Ding¹, Jijun Li¹,
Baoshi Fan¹, Yijia Zhang¹, and Jun Zhang¹

¹Dalian Maritime University
forrestwby@dlmu.edu.cn

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) inherently display hallucinations since the precision of generated texts cannot be guaranteed purely by the parametric knowledge they include. Although retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems enhance the accuracy and reliability of generative models by incorporating external documents, these retrieved documents often fail to adequately support the model’s responses in practical applications. To address this issue, we propose GGtrieval (Fine-Grained Grounded Alignment Retrieval for verifiable generation), which leverages an LLM to dynamically update queries and filter high-quality, reliable retrieval documents. Specifically, we parse the user query into its syntactic components and perform fine-grained grounded alignment with the retrieved documents. For query components that cannot be individually aligned, we propose a dynamic semantic compensation mechanism that iteratively refines and rewrites the query while continuously updating the retrieval results. This iterative process continues until the retrieved documents sufficiently support the query’s response. Our approach introduces a novel criterion for filtering retrieved documents, closely emulating human strategies for acquiring targeted information. This ensures that the retrieved content effectively supports and verifies the generated outputs. On the ALCE benchmark, our method significantly surpasses a wide range of baselines, achieving state-of-the-art performance.

1 Introduction

Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) combines retrieval mechanisms with large language models (LLMs) to address the limitations of purely generative models (Lewis et al., 2020). By retrieving external information relevant to user queries through retrieval mechanisms, RAG enhances generated outputs (Khandelwal et al., 2019; Min et al., 2020) and mitigates the hallucination problem in LLMs




Figure 1: An example for our criterion. The example shows that for each syntactic component of the query, a corresponding grounded segment in the retrieved document can be identified that aligns with it.

(Cheng et al., 2024), allowing outputs to incorporate up-to-date real-world information (Gupta et al., 2024), often without requiring additional training (Izacard et al., 2023).

Despite these advancements, the performance of current RAG systems remains constrained by several factors, such as the quality of retrieved documents, prompt design, and the scale of the generative model. Among these, the quality of retrieved documents is pivotal in determining system performance (Li et al., 2025). High-quality retrieval is mainly dependent on the effectiveness of the retrieval mechanism. Previous research has proposed various optimization strategies to enhance retrieval mechanisms, including recursive retrieval for richer content (Li et al., 2024b; Yao et al., 2023), adjusting corpus chunk sizes for optimized outcomes (Sarathi et al.; Raina and Gales, 2024; Wang et al., 2024), fine-tuning retrievers (Yan et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024; Hei et al., 2024; Izacard et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2024), re-ranking retrieved content for diversity and quality (Saad-Falcon et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024a; Sun et al., 2023), and rephrasing retrieved text to better leverage generative models (Wang et al., 2023; Arora et al., 2023). Beyond re-

retrieval strategies, verifiable generation (Gao et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024b) has emerged as a novel paradigm that enables LLMs to generate cited text while assessing the quality of retrieved information. This paradigm provides a valuable reference for reproducing and comparing different retrieval mechanisms.

However, most existing research focuses on refining retrieval mechanisms through advanced technologies, such as clustering, retrievers, and LLMs, without addressing the need for effective selection criteria to select supportive documents. The absence of such criteria often leads to additional noisy documents, negatively affecting the reliability and verifiability of generated outputs.

To address this challenge, we propose **GGa-trieval** (Fine-grained Grounded Alignment Retrieval for Verifiable Generation), a framework that optimizes retrieval mechanisms by leveraging the verifiable generation paradigm. As part of this framework, we introduce a novel criterion for evaluating document quality. This criterion draws inspiration from the cognitive process of human document selection, where a retrieved document must contain a continuous segment that semantically aligns with each syntactic component of the query, as illustrated in Figure 1. This criterion forms the foundation for our document classification approach and guides the optimization of two key stages in the retrieval process: (1) Retrieval stage: To obtain more reliable retrieved documents, we design a Semantic Compensation Query Update (SCQU) strategy, inspired by GenRewrite (Liu and Mozafari, 2024) and Rewrite-Retrieve-Read (Ma et al., 2023). This strategy initially formulates synonymous queries to address gaps in the document relative to the query. Subsequently, it generates pseudo-documents tailored to these synonymous queries, ensuring alignment with the proposed criterion. Finally, the method concatenates the synonymous queries and their corresponding pseudo-documents to construct an updated query for retrieving additional candidate documents. This strategy effectively leverages the retriever’s ability to retrieve semantically similar information, enhancing retrieval reliability by generating queries semantically aligned with the target documents. (2) Re-ranking Stage: To obtain more verifiable retrieved documents, we propose a Fine-grained Grounded Alignment (FGA) strategy in which a LLM performs syntactic parsing on the query, extracting its grammatical components. It

then aligns these components with the document to generate grounded alignment labels, which are crucial for document re-ranking. By improving the verifiability of the retrieved supporting documents, this approach further improves the reliability of RAG systems.

We evaluate the quality of retrieved documents and the overall system performance using the ALCE benchmark (Gao et al., 2023) and an extended Natural Questions dataset (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019). Our experiments demonstrate that GGa-trieval outperforms mainstream baselines, setting new performance standards. Notably, on the ELI5 dataset, our method improves the Claim F1 and Citation F1 scores by 22% and 28%, respectively.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- (1) To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to introduce a document selection criterion based on human judgment, enabling effective categorization and filtering of retrieved documents.
- (2) We introduce the SCQU strategy to bridge semantic gaps between queries and target documents, improving retrieval quality and efficiency.
- (3) We present the FQA strategy, enhancing verifiable document retrieval in RAG systems.
- (4) We conduct experiments on four diverse datasets and across representative baselines from distinct retrieval optimization mechanisms, achieving state-of-the-art performance.

2 Related Work

2.1 Verifiable Generation

Verifiable generation refers to the process of generating text that can be independently verified, ensuring users can trace the source of each piece of knowledge. Existing paradigms of verifiable generation can be broadly categorized into two approaches: (1) Direct generation of responses with citations: These methods aim to enhance content verifiability by augmenting the generative capabilities of language models, allowing them to incorporate citation information directly during generation. For example, Weller et al. (2024) utilizes the large language model’s intrinsic abilities to generate citations by prompting it with phrases like "according to Wikipedia". Lee et al. (2023) critically assesses the quality of generated text and provided feedback based on these evaluations, guiding the language model towards improvement. (2) Retrieval-based




Figure 2: Overview of our GGtrieval. Our approach (Section 3.4) leverages large language models for the Fine-grained Grounded Alignment strategy (Section 3.2) to obtain document labels Full Alignment, Partial Alignment, and No Alignment (Section 3.1), while implementing the Dynamic Semantic Compensation strategy (Section 3.3) for query updates to enhance the retrieval of highly aligned documents.

responses with citations: This approach enhances citation accuracy by retrieving external information, such as web pages or documents, to supplement generated content. Notable examples include WebGPT (Nakano et al., 2021) and LaMDA (Thopilan et al., 2022), which use web and Wikipedia data to construct large-scale pretraining datasets, enabling citation-inclusive responses. Moreover, Li et al. (2024b) iteratively improves the quality of citations in the generated text by continually updating the retrieval results until the retrieved information aligns with the generated answers. Our approach primarily adopts the second paradigm, facilitating a more effective comparison of various retrieval mechanisms within RAG systems.

2.2 Optimizing retrieval mechanisms for RAG

In retrieval-augmented question-answering systems, the reliability of the retrieved documents is crucial for ensuring both the accuracy and trustworthiness of the generated responses. The technologies for optimizing retrieval mechanisms can be broadly classified into two categories: (1) Model-training Retrieval Augmentation: CRAG (Yan et al., 2024) and DR-RAG (Hei et al., 2024) enhance the quality of documents by training retrievers and classifiers to evaluate and filter the retrieved

documents. Additionally, Mao et al. (2024) develops a query rewriting model that incorporates feedback from a re-ranker. Self-Retrieval (Tang et al., 2024) allows large models to conduct self-retrieval on pre-trained datasets by incorporating retrieval corpora into their training. (2) LLM-based Retrieval Augmentation: In query rewriting, Anand et al. (2023) introduces Context-Aware Query Rewriting, which leverages LLMs for query understanding in text ranking tasks, thereby improving the accuracy and relevance of the query. For document re-ranking, Neural PG-RANK (Gao et al.) optimizes decision quality metrics using the Plackett-Luce ranking strategy, incorporating LLMs into the training process. Similarly, RankGPT (Sun et al., 2023) uses ChatGPT-generated document ranking to reorder documents effectively. Furthermore, in terms of pipeline optimization, LLtrieval (Li et al., 2024b) combines query rewriting and re-ranking through an iterative updating mechanism, continuously refining the retrieval results and verifying that the documents retrieved are sufficient to support the generated answers until the validation criteria are met.

In contrast to recent related studies (Yan et al., 2024; Sun et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024b), our work focuses on the alignment criterion between re-

trieved documents and user queries, addressing the reliability of retrieved documents from the perspective of human cognition, thereby further enhancing system performance.

3 Methods

Figure 2 shows the overview of GGattribution at inference.

3.1 Document Taxonomy

The meaning of complex expressions is constructed from the meanings of their simpler components (Drozhdov et al., 2022). Analyzing syntactic structure is critical in understanding sentence meaning (Lesmo and Lombardo, 1992). Therefore, the cognitive process of human document retrieval can be conceptualized as follows: (1) decomposing the query into its grammatical components; (2) identifying the corresponding segments within the retrieved documents that align semantically with the query’s components; and (3) classifying the document as high-quality if all components of the query align with the retrieved text. Based on this cognitive process, we propose a selection criterion for evaluating retrieval documents: whether there are continuous grounded segments within the document that align with the query’s grammatical components. This criterion categorizes retrieval documents into three types:

Full Alignment: A continuous segment in the document aligns semantically with all query components.

Partial Alignment: A continuous segment in the document aligns semantically with at least one component of the query but not all.

No Alignment: No continuous segment in the document semantically aligns with any query component.

The retrieval mechanism of GGattribution prioritizes documents labeled with Full Alignment, while those labeled with Partial Alignment contribute to system robustness. Documents with No Alignment serve as exclusion criteria in the retrieval process.

3.2 Fine-grained Grounded Alignment

In GGattribution, filtering reliable and verifiable documents requires the acquisition of alignment labels for the retrieved documents. To achieve this, we design the FGA strategy. Given the strong performance of LLMs in tasks like syntactic analysis and natural language understanding (Tian et al., 2024;

Zhou et al., 2024; Li et al., 2023), we utilize LLMs to implement this strategy. The procedure is outlined as follows:

Query Syntactic Analysis: The system processes the user’s query Q and decomposes it into key syntactic components, including the subject, predicate, and object, among others, as described in Equation (1):

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \{C_s, C_v, C_o, C_c, C_{attr}, C_{adv}, C_{supp}, C_{app}\} \\ &= f_{LLM}(Q) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here, C represents the set of syntactic components extracted from the query Q , where $C_s, C_v, C_o, C_c, C_{attr}, C_{adv}, C_{supp}$ and C_{app} represent the subject, predicate, object, predicative, attributive, adverbial, complement, and apposition, respectively.

Fine-grained Grounded Alignment: The system compares each syntactic component of the query with the candidate document D , producing a list of query components that can be semantically aligned with the document. This alignment is mathematically represented as:

$$M(Q, D) = \{C_i \mid C_i \in C, f_{LLM}(C_i, D) = 1\} \quad (2)$$

In this expression, $f_{LLM}(C_i, D)$ denotes the alignment function computed by the LLM, which outputs 1 if alignment is found or 0 if no alignment is detected. The set $M(Q, D)$ contains the query components that align semantically with the document. The greater the number of aligned components, the higher the probability that the candidate document answers the user’s query, making this list vital for filtering candidate documents.

Reflection and Query Optimization: As highlighted by Liu et al. (2024), the self-reflection abilities of LLMs can enhance their performance. Accordingly, we incorporate a reflection step where the LLM generates a reflective list of aligned components $M'(Q, D)$. For any unaligned components $C_i \in C$, the LLM generates synonymous descriptions C'_i and updates the query Q' as follows:

$$Q' = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} C'_i = \text{Synonym}(C_i) & \\ \text{if } f_{LLM}(C_i, P) = 0 & \text{else } C_i \end{array} \right\} \quad (3)$$

where C'_i represents the synonymous description of the component C_i . The updated query Q' , now incorporating these synonymous descriptions, forms the foundation for the subsequent phase of the SCQU (Section 3.3).

Algorithm 1 GGatrieval

Input: Question q , document pool D_c , reranked document pool D_o , the large language model LLM, the Retriever R , the maximum iteration T , each iteration’s document candidates quantity N

Output: Supporting Documents D

```
1:  $Q \leftarrow q$ 
2:  $D \leftarrow \{\}$ 
3:  $C \leftarrow \{C_s, C_v, C_o, C_c, C_{attr}, C_{adv}, C_{supp}, C_{app}\}$ 
4:    $= f_{LLM}(Q)$ 
5: for  $i \in (1, T)$  do
6:   if  $D \neq \{\}$  then
7:      $Q \leftarrow$  SCQU strategy
8:   end if
9:    $D_c \leftarrow R(Q, N)$ 
10:  for  $D_c^* \in D_c$  do
11:     $D_c^* \leftarrow$  FGA strategy
12:  end for
13:   $D_o \leftarrow$  Rerank  $D_c$  with alignment label
14:  for  $D_o^* \in \text{SlidingWindow}(D_o)$  do
15:     $D \leftarrow$  Use the LLM to select  $k$  docs from  $D \cup D_o^*$ 
16:  end for
17:  if  $\text{Verify}(q, D) \rightarrow \text{Yes}$  then
18:    break
19:  end if
20: end for
21: Return  $D$ 
```

3.3 Semantic Compensation Query Update

Dense retrieval models effectively retrieve documents semantically related to a given query (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Lewis et al., 2020). Building on this property, we design the SCQU strategy as follows:

Categorizing candidate documents: Candidate documents are classified based on r , the proportion of syntactic components in the query aligned by the document. Documents are categorized into two types: high-alignment documents (where $r \geq \tau$) and low-alignment documents (where $r < \tau$), with τ being a user-defined threshold.

Updating query: For high-alignment documents D , the system concatenates the current query Q with the document D to generate an updated query Q'' . This operation is based on the premise that documents with high alignment are likely to yield even better results when the semantic content of the query is enriched. For low-alignment documents, the system generates a pseudo-document D_{pseudo} semantically aligned with the suggested query Q' (Section 3.2). This pseudo-document is then concatenated with Q' , thereby enriching the query with relevant semantic information. As a result, the updated query facilitates the retrieval of documents that are more closely aligned with the original query. The final query update strategy is

expressed as follows:

$$Q'' = \begin{cases} Q + D, & \text{if } \frac{|M'(Q,D)|}{|C|} \geq \tau \\ Q' + D_{pseudo}, & \text{if } \frac{|M'(Q,D)|}{|C|} < \tau \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

This approach dynamically updates the query Q in each retrieval cycle based on alignment conditions. Compared to LLatrieval (Li et al., 2024b), Our method reduces document retrieval by 95% on the ASQA dataset and 67% on the QAMPARI dataset, significantly enhancing retrieval efficiency. The number of documents retrieved by the two methods is provided in Appendix B.

3.4 Align-update Iteration

Algorithm 1 outlines the workflow of our system. The process begins with parsing the user query into syntactic components $C = \{C_s, C_v, C_o, C_c, C_{attr}, C_{adv}, C_{supp}, C_{app}\}$ (Line 3~4), initiating the iterative process. In each iteration, the system applies the SCQU strategy to retrieve a refined set of candidate documents D_c (Lines 6~9), ensuring that the retrieved documents are increasingly semantically aligned with the query. Next, the FGA strategy is employed to assign alignment labels to each document in D_c (Lines 10~11). These documents are then re-ordered based on the alignment labels and relevance, resulting in a prioritized set D_o (Line 13), which includes documents that meet the verifiability criteria. Finally, the system employs the Progressive Selection and Document Verification methods proposed by Li et al. (2024b) to select and validate the final supporting documents (Lines 14~18). GGatrieval defines a robust selection criterion to establish clear retrieval objectives. Through the align-update iteration, the retrieval results are progressively refined to yield documents that better align with the retrieval goal, thereby enabling the LLM to generate both accurate and verifiable answers.

4 Experiment

4.1 Experimental Setting

Datasets. We evaluate our approach using the ALCE benchmark (Gao et al., 2023). ASQA (Stelmakh et al., 2022) is a long-form factoid question answering (QA) dataset in which each query requires multiple short answers to address its multifaceted nature. QAMPARI (Amouyal et al., 2023)

| Dataset | | ASQA | | | | QAMPARI | | | | ELI5 | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Correct | | Citation | | Correct | | Citation | | Correct | | Citation | |
| | | EM-R | Rec | Prec | F1 | F1 | Rec | Prec | F1 | Claim | Rec | Prec | F1 |
| Meta-Llama3-8B-Instruct | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vanilla | BM25 | 31.03 | 23.5 | 24.58 | 24.02 | 5.97 | 7.34 | 8.25 | 7.76 | 10.88 | 23.93 | 26.56 | 25.18 |
| | BGE-E-large | 40.59 | 33.83 | 37.79 | 35.7 | 6.55 | 11.62 | 13.88 | 12.62 | - | - | - | - |
| Model training | CRAG | 33.92 | 33.86 | 36.28 | 35.05 | 5.91 | 7.0 | 8.34 | 7.6 | 11.19 | 29.19 | 32.16 | 30.61 |
| LLM-based | RankGPT | 40.17 | 36.59 | 38.68 | 37.61 | 9.24 | 16.8 | 19.7 | 18.13 | 11.2 | 24.89 | 28.52 | 26.58 |
| | LLattribution | 40.58 | 40.13 | 42.94 | 41.5 | 6.93 | 13.7 | 14.52 | 14.09 | 11.23 | 27.96 | 32.9 | 30.2 |
| Ours | GGattribution | 41.37 | 39.7 | 42.92 | 41.22 | 9.5 | 18.06 | 21.13 | 19.47 | 11.64 | 30.41 | 33.7 | 32.0 |
| gpt-3.5-turbo | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vanilla | BM25 | 36.57 | 36.79 | 38.98 | 37.86 | 10.21 | 18.95 | 19.67 | 19.3 | 11.65 | 41.28 | 41.4 | 23.47 |
| | BGE-E-large | 51.57 | 53.63 | 55.95 | 54.73 | 12.06 | 26.42 | 27.48 | 26.93 | - | - | - | - |
| Model training | CRAG | 46.29 | 47.15 | 50.19 | 48.59 | 11.9 | 20.1 | 20.73 | 20.41 | 12.79 | 48.07 | 48.96 | 48.49 |
| LLM-based | RankGPT | 49.76 | 51.48 | 54.71 | 53.04 | 16.4 | 33.1 | 34.24 | 33.66 | 11.6 | 42.38 | 43.12 | 42.74 |
| | LLattribution | 50.8 | 53.54 | 55.75 | 54.58 | 16.86 | 34.09 | 34.9 | 34.46 | 11.62 | 43.47 | 44.85 | 43.88 |
| Ours | GGattribution | 52.86 | 56.93 | 58.19 | 57.51 | 17.85 | 35.44 | 36.58 | 35.98 | 14.21 | 56.16 | 56.26 | 56.17 |

Table 1: The performance comparison on ALCE (Gao et al., 2023). The results are categorized according to different types of retrieval technologies, with the bolded numbers indicating the best performance among all methods.

is also a fact-based QA dataset where answers consist of entity lists extracted from multiple documents. ELI5 (Fan et al., 2019) is a long-form QA dataset requiring detailed, comprehensive answers with evidence from multiple documents. We also include the Natural Questions (NQ) dataset (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) to provide a more comprehensive assessment. NQ is a widely used benchmark for open-domain QA proposed by Google Research.

Baselines. We first compare it with two representative retrieval methods. Given that our focus is optimizing retrieval mechanisms within the verifiable generation framework, we select three representative methods from two primary technologies to highlight GGattribution’s advantage in enhancing retrieval efficiency and accuracy. Specifically, the Vanilla Retrievers include BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009) and BGE-large (Liu et al., 2023), while the model-training retrieval augmentation method includes CRAG (Yan et al., 2024). We use the CRAG model to filter all documents retrieved using the GGattribution approach to ensure a fair comparison. Additionally, we consider LLM-based retrieval augmentation methods, represented by RankGPT (Sun et al., 2023) and LLattribution (Li et al., 2024b).

Evaluation Metrics. We evaluate GGattribution’s performance across the four datasets following the evaluation guidelines from ALCE (Gao et al., 2023). (1) For ASQA, we use Exact Match Recall (EM-R) to assess the correctness of the answers. (2) For QAMPARI and NQ, we calculate the F1 score by identifying exact matches to the gold answer list. (3) For ELI5, we measure whether the model’s predictions entail the sub-claims in the gold answers,

as described in Gao et al. (2023). Additionally, we assess the verifiability of the answers by measuring citation quality, for more details about citation quality, please refer to Appendix A.

Implementation Details. We utilize the verifiable generation (Gao et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024b) paradigm for both answer generation and evaluation, aiming to assess the verifiability and accuracy of the generated responses and compare the effectiveness of various retrieval mechanisms. The APIs of OpenAI’s "gpt-3.5-turbo" language model and the open-source "Meta-Llama3-8B-Instruct" model are used for grounded alignment, query updates, and generation, with the temperature set to 0 to minimize random variation. The number of supporting documents is set to 5, and the maximum number of iterations is 4. For ASQA, QAMPARI, and NQ datasets, the retrieval corpus is based on the Wikipedia dataset used in ALCE (Gao et al., 2023), with the dense embedding model BGE-large (Xiao et al., 2024) as the retriever. For the ELI5 dataset, we use the Sphere (Piktus et al., 2021) corpus and followed ALCE (Gao et al., 2023), employing BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009) for document retrieval due to the higher cost and slower speed of dense retrievers on large-scale web corpora. For more details about the experimental setting, please refer to Appendix A.

4.2 Main Results

Table 1 presents experimental results across three datasets, using two LLMs—"gpt-3.5-turbo" and "Meta-Llama3-8B-Instruct"—as base models. The choice of these two distinct models, along with representative baselines from distinct technologies, is

designed to assess the generalization ability and effectiveness of GGattribution across diverse scenarios. **GGattribution consistently outperforms baseline methods on all three datasets.** Specifically, the substantial improvement in Citation F1 underscores GGattribution’s ability to retrieve high-quality documents, while the increase in Correctness highlights its positive impact on the overall performance of the RAG system. Notably, on the ELI5 dataset, GGattribution achieves improvements of 22% and 28% in these two metrics, respectively. A key strength of GGattribution over the baseline methods is its ability to evaluate and filter documents based on specific criteria, validating both the necessity and effectiveness of robust selection criteria.

GGattribution consistently outperforms baseline methods across distinct base models. Further analysis reveals that the "gpt-3.5-turbo" model consistently outperforms the "Meta-Llama3-8B-Instruct" model across all methods, confirming the scaling laws principle (Kaplan et al., 2020). Moreover, GGattribution performs best on both base models, demonstrating its superior generalization ability. This capability can be attributed to the optimized retrieval mechanism of GGattribution, which leverages the characteristics of the retriever to design query update strategies and simulates the human thought process in selecting retrieved documents, thereby enhancing overall system performance.

| Dataset | | NQ | | | |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Correct F1 | Rec | Prec | Citation F1 |
| Vanilla | BM25 | 20.08 | 31.28 | 33.61 | 32.41 |
| | BGE-E-large | 26.06 | 31.5 | 34.95 | 33.13 |
| Model training | CRAG | 23.98 | 23.7 | 26.19 | 24.88 |
| LLM-based | RankGPT | 27.83 | 33.45 | 36.76 | 35.03 |
| | LLattribution | 27.3 | 32.64 | 36.03 | 34.25 |
| Ours | GGattribution | 28.68 | 34.51 | 37.58 | 35.98 |

Table 2: Performance comparison on NQ with gpt-3.5-turbo. The bolded numbers indicate the best performance.

GGattribution consistently outperforms baseline methods on the extended dataset. To thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of GGattribution, compared to LLattribution (Li et al., 2024b), we extend our assessment to its retrieval capabilities using the NQ dataset. The results, presented in Table 2, show that retrieval-augmented systems perform consistently well on the single-hop NQ dataset, which involves relatively low reasoning complexity. GGattribution outperforms baseline models across all evaluation

| | ASQA | | QAMPARI | |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | EM-R | Cite | F1 | Cite |
| Final Result | 58.30 | 61.30 | 17.90 | 35.42 |
| — Full Alignment | 46.79 | 53.43 | 13.43 | 28.52 |
| — Partial Alignment | 48.38 | 53.13 | 15.04 | 33.65 |
| — No Alignment | 50.14 | 56.14 | 16.60 | 34.88 |

Table 3: Ablation study for excluding documents with different labels. "—" signifies that a specific category of document has been eliminated. The bolded numbers indicate the worst performance.

metrics, further validating its robustness and effectiveness across diverse tasks.

4.3 Ablation Study

Impact of each alignment label: This study evaluates the effectiveness of the proposed alignment labels through ablation experiments. As shown in Table 3, we systematically remove documents labeled as Full Alignment, Partial Alignment, and No Alignment from the final selection and assessed model performance on the ASQA and QAMPARI datasets. To ensure a fair comparison, the remaining documents are re-ranked based on alignment and relevance, with the highest-ranked documents filling any gaps. The results reveal that removing more aligned documents leads to a significant decline in Correctness and Citation F1 scores, underscoring the critical role of the FGA strategy. Notably, removing Full Alignment documents have the most pronounced impact on system performance, emphasizing the importance of our selection criterion.

Interactions between components during iterations: To explore the relationships between query updates, document retrieval, and system performance, we conduct four rounds of iterative testing using the ASQA and QAMPARI datasets. Figure 3 illustrates the evolution of system performance, the number of updated queries, and the distribution of Full Alignment documents across iterations. The most significant improvement in system performance occurs in the second iteration, which coincides with the greatest decrease in samples containing zero Full Alignment documents and the largest increase in those containing five Full Alignment documents. As the iterations progress, system performance gradually stabilizes. Notably, the performance improvements are closely correlated with the increasing density of Full Alignment documents, underscoring the critical role of the pro-




Figure 3: Impact of interactions among components. The solid line represents the evaluation metric, while the dashed line indicates the distribution of Full Alignment labels within the sample.

posed alignment standard in enhancing system performance. Interestingly, no clear pattern emerges in the variation of updated queries, suggesting that the SCQU strategy primarily enhances performance by facilitating the retrieval of a higher number of highly aligned documents. Moreover, within each dataset’s set of 1,000 samples, fewer than 30 contained enough Full Alignment documents, while over 600 have none. Based on these observations, we hypothesize that further performance improvements could be achieved by retrieving more Full Alignment documents.

| | ASQA | QAMPARI | ELI5 |
|--------------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| NA in all docs | 10100 | 25736 | 58128 |
| NA in final docs | 1712 | 1915 | 1153 |
| PA in all docs | 6081 | 10715 | 53438 |
| PA in final docs | 1663 | 1594 | 2571 |
| FA in all docs | 2596 | 3386 | 12418 |
| FA in final docs | 1305 | 1337 | 1239 |
| NA conversion rate | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.02 |
| PA conversion rate | 0.27 | 0.15 | 0.05 |
| FA conversion rate | 0.5 | 0.38 | 0.1 |

Table 4: Number and conversion rate of different alignment labels. where "NA" represents "No Alignment", PA represents "Partial Alignment", and FA represents "Full Alignment".

4.4 Analysis of Proportions for Different Alignment Labels

We analyze the proportion of alignment labels in the final selection of documents, as shown in Table 4. In the ASQA, QAMPARI, and ELI5 datasets, Full Alignment and Partial Alignment documents have not dominated the final selection. This observation could be primarily due to variations in label distributions across samples and the relatively low




Figure 4: Cross-dataset analysis of label proportions. The bars above the dashed line represent system performance, while the bars below the dashed line indicate the proportion of documents with different labels.

number of Full Alignment documents. However, Full Alignment documents consistently exhibit the highest conversion rates across all three datasets. Additionally, as shown in Figure 4, the proportion of Partial Alignment documents has been notably higher in the ELI5 dataset compared to the ASQA and QAMPARI datasets, while the proportion of No Alignment documents has highly decreased. These results further emphasize the critical role of Full Alignment labels. Moreover, Partial Alignment labels are found to improve the system’s robustness, while No Alignment labels effectively serve as a key criterion for document exclusion.

5 Conclusion

We introduce GGatrieval to enhance the retrieval process within the context of verifiable generation. Unlike traditional methods, our approach simulates the human cognitive process of document retrieval and proposes novel criteria for selecting retrieved documents. The criterion is then used to categorize the documents, and based on this categorization, we present two strategies: the SCQU and the FGA. Together, these strategies optimize the retrieval mechanism, ensuring retrieved documents satisfy verifiability standards and improve overall system performance. Experimental results show that GGatrieval outperforms existing methods, achieving state-of-the-art results.

Limitations

Our approach semantically aligns retrieved documents with the syntactic components of the query

but does not model the logical relationships between these components. Moreover, leveraging large language models for semantic alignment introduces significant computational and time costs. Future work could explore applying reinforcement learning or deep learning techniques to address these challenges. Additionally, further investigation is required to understand why a few Full Alignment documents do not contribute to the final set of supporting documents and the factors that underpin the robustness of Partial Alignment documents.

References

- Samuel Amouyal, Tomer Wolfson, Ohad Rubin, Ori Yoran, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. [QAMPARI: A benchmark for open-domain questions with many answers](#). pages 97–110, Singapore.
- Abhijit Anand, V Venkatesh, Vinay Setty, and Avishek Anand. 2023. Context aware query rewriting for text rankers using llm. *CoRR*.
- Daman Arora, Anush Kini, Sayak Ray Chowdhury, Nagarajan Natarajan, Gaurav Sinha, and Amit Sharma. 2023. Gar-meets-rag paradigm for zero-shot information retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20158*.
- Xin Cheng, Di Luo, Xiuying Chen, Lemao Liu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2024. Lift yourself up: Retrieval-augmented text generation with self-memory. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Andrew Drozdov, Nathanael Schärli, Ekin Akyürek, Nathan Scales, Xinying Song, Xinyun Chen, Olivier Bousquet, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Compositional semantic parsing with large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. [ELI5: Long form question answering](#). pages 3558–3567, Florence, Italy.
- Ge Gao, Jonathan Daniel Chang, Claire Cardie, Kianté Brantley, and Thorsten Joachims. Policy-gradient training of language models for ranking. In *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*.
- Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Enabling large language models to generate text with citations](#). pages 6465–6488, Singapore.
- Shailja Gupta, Rajesh Ranjan, and Surya Narayan Singh. 2024. A comprehensive survey of retrieval-augmented generation (rag): Evolution, current landscape and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12837*.
- Zijian Hei, Weiling Liu, Wenjie Ou, Juyi Qiao, Junming Jiao, Guowen Song, Ting Tian, and Yi Lin. 2024. Dr-rag: Applying dynamic document relevance to retrieval-augmented generation for question-answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07348*.
- 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.
- Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). pages 6769–6781, Online.
- Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2019. Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- 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.
- Dongyub Lee, Taesun Whang, Chanhee Lee, and Heuseok Lim. 2023. Towards reliable and fluent large language models: Incorporating feedback learning loops in qa systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06384*.
- Leonardo Lesmo and Vincenzo Lombardo. 1992. [The assignment of grammatical relations in natural language processing](#).
- 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.
- Chaofan Li, Zheng Liu, Shitao Xiao, and Yingxia Shao. 2023. Making large language models a better foundation for dense retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15503*.
- Jiarui Li, Ye Yuan, and Zehua Zhang. 2024a. Enhancing llm factual accuracy with rag to counter hallucinations: A case study on domain-specific

- queries in private knowledge-bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10446*.
- Siran Li, Linus Stenzel, Carsten Eickhoff, and Seyed Ali Bahrainian. 2025. Enhancing retrieval-augmented generation: A study of best practices. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6705–6717.
- Xiaonan Li, Changtai Zhu, Linyang Li, Zhangyue Yin, Tianxiang Sun, and Xipeng Qiu. 2024b. [LLa-trieval: LLM-verified retrieval for verifiable generation](#). pages 5453–5471, Mexico City, Mexico.
- Fengyuan Liu, Nouar AlDahoul, Gregory Eady, Yasir Zaki, Bedoor AlShebli, and Talal Rahwan. 2024. Self-reflection outcome is sensitive to prompt construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10400*.
- Jie Liu and Barzan Mozafari. 2024. Query rewriting via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09060*.
- Xiao Liu, Hanyu Lai, Hao Yu, Yifan Xu, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. Webglm: Towards an efficient web-enhanced question answering system with human preferences. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 4549–4560.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. [Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models](#). pages 5303–5315, Singapore.
- Shengyu Mao, Yong Jiang, Boli Chen, Xiao Li, Peng Wang, Xinyu Wang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2024. Rafe: Ranking feedback improves query rewriting for rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14431*.
- Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions](#). pages 5783–5797, Online.
- Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. 2021. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*.
- Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Dmytro Okhonko, Samuel Broscheit, Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oğuz, Edouard Grave, Wen-tau Yih, et al. 2021. The web is your oyster-knowledge-intensive nlp against a very large web corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09924*.
- Vatsal Raina and Mark Gales. 2024. [Question-based retrieval using atomic units for enterprise RAG](#). pages 219–233, Miami, Florida, USA.
- Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- Jon Saad-Falcon, Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Radu Florian, Martin Franz, Salim Roukos, Avirup Sil, Md Sultan, and Christopher Potts. 2023. [UDAPDR: Unsupervised domain adaptation via LLM prompting and distillation of rerankers](#). pages 11265–11279, Singapore.
- Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D Manning. Raptor: Recursive abstractive processing for tree-organized retrieval. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ivan Stelmakh, Yi Luan, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. [ASQA: Factoid questions meet long-form answers](#). pages 8273–8288, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.
- Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. [Is ChatGPT good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agents](#). pages 14918–14937, Singapore.
- Qiaoyu Tang, Jiawei Chen, Bowen Yu, Yaojie Lu, Cheng Fu, Haiyang Yu, Hongyu Lin, Fei Huang, Ben He, Xianpei Han, et al. 2024. Self-retrieval: Building an information retrieval system with one large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00801*.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. Lambda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*.
- Yuanhe Tian, Fei Xia, and Yan Song. 2024. [Large language models are no longer shallow parsers](#). pages 7131–7142, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Zheng Wang, Shu Teo, Jieer Ouyang, Yongjun Xu, and Wei Shi. 2024. [M-RAG: Reinforcing large language model performance through retrieval-augmented generation with multiple partitions](#). pages 1966–1978, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Zhiruo Wang, Jun Araki, Zhengbao Jiang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Learning to filter context for retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08377*.
- Orion Weller, Marc Marone, Nathaniel Weir, Dawn Lawrie, Daniel Khashabi, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2024. [“according to . . .”: Prompting language models improves quoting from pre-training data](#). pages 2288–2301, St. Julian’s, Malta.
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, Niklas Muenighoff, Defu Lian, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2024. C-pack: Packed resources for general chinese embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 47th international ACM SIGIR*

conference on research and development in information retrieval, pages 641–649.

Shi-Qi Yan, Jia-Chen Gu, Yun Zhu, and Zhen-Hua Ling. 2024. Corrective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15884*.

Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

LingXi Zhang, Yue Yu, Kuan Wang, and Chao Zhang. 2024. [ARL2: Aligning retrievers with black-box large language models via self-guided adaptive relevance labeling](#). pages 3708–3719, Bangkok, Thailand.

Sizhe Zhou, Yu Meng, Bowen Jin, and Jiawei Han. 2024. [Grasping the essentials: Tailoring large language models for zero-shot relation extraction](#). pages 13462–13486, Miami, Florida, USA.

References

Samuel Amouyal, Tomer Wolfson, Ohad Rubinfeld, Ori Yoran, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. [QAMPARI: A benchmark for open-domain questions with many answers](#). pages 97–110, Singapore.

Abhijit Anand, V Venkatesh, Vinay Setty, and Avishek Anand. 2023. Context aware query rewriting for text rankers using llm. *CoRR*.

Daman Arora, Anush Kini, Sayak Ray Chowdhury, Nagarajan Natarajan, Gaurav Sinha, and Amit Sharma. 2023. Gar-meets-rag paradigm for zero-shot information retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20158*.

Xin Cheng, Di Luo, Xiuying Chen, Lema Liu, Dongyan Zhao, and Rui Yan. 2024. Lift yourself up: Retrieval-augmented text generation with self-memory. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Andrew Drozdov, Nathanael Schärli, Ekin Akyürek, Nathan Scales, Xinying Song, Xinyun Chen, Olivier Bousquet, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Compositional semantic parsing with large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. [ELI5: Long form question answering](#). pages 3558–3567, Florence, Italy.

Ge Gao, Jonathan Daniel Chang, Claire Cardie, Kianté Brantley, and Thorsten Joachims. Policy-gradient training of language models for ranking. In *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*.

Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Enabling large language models to generate text with citations](#). pages 6465–6488, Singapore.

Shailja Gupta, Rajesh Ranjan, and Surya Narayan Singh. 2024. A comprehensive survey of retrieval-augmented generation (rag): Evolution, current landscape and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.12837*.

Zijian Hei, Weiling Liu, Wenjie Ou, Juyi Qiao, Junming Jiao, Guowen Song, Ting Tian, and Yi Lin. 2024. Dr-rag: Applying dynamic document relevance to retrieval-augmented generation for question-answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07348*.

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.

Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.

Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). pages 6769–6781, Online.

Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. 2019. Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

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.

Dongyub Lee, Taesun Whang, Chanhee Lee, and Heulseok Lim. 2023. Towards reliable and fluent large language models: Incorporating feedback learning loops in qa systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06384*.

Leonardo Lesmo and Vincenzo Lombardo. 1992. [The assignment of grammatical relations in natural language processing](#).

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.

- Chaofan Li, Zheng Liu, Shitao Xiao, and Yingxia Shao. 2023. Making large language models a better foundation for dense retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15503*.
- Jiarui Li, Ye Yuan, and Zehua Zhang. 2024a. Enhancing llm factual accuracy with rag to counter hallucinations: A case study on domain-specific queries in private knowledge-bases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10446*.
- Siran Li, Linus Stenzel, Carsten Eickhoff, and Seyed Ali Bahrainian. 2025. Enhancing retrieval-augmented generation: A study of best practices. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6705–6717.
- Xiaonan Li, Changtai Zhu, Linyang Li, Zhangyue Yin, Tianxiang Sun, and Xipeng Qiu. 2024b. [LLa-trieval: LLM-verified retrieval for verifiable generation](#). pages 5453–5471, Mexico City, Mexico.
- Fengyuan Liu, Nouar AlDahoul, Gregory Eady, Yasir Zaki, Bedoor AlShebli, and Talal Rahwan. 2024. Self-reflection outcome is sensitive to prompt construction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10400*.
- Jie Liu and Barzan Mozafari. 2024. Query rewriting via large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09060*.
- Xiao Liu, Hanyu Lai, Hao Yu, Yifan Xu, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Peng Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. Webglm: Towards an efficient web-enhanced question answering system with human preferences. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 4549–4560.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. [Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models](#). pages 5303–5315, Singapore.
- Shengyu Mao, Yong Jiang, Boli Chen, Xiao Li, Peng Wang, Xinyu Wang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2024. Rafe: Ranking feedback improves query rewriting for rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14431*.
- Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions](#). pages 5783–5797, Online.
- Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. 2021. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09332*.
- Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Dmytro Okhonko, Samuel Broscheit, Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oğuz, Edouard Grave, Wen-tau Yih, et al. 2021. The web is your oyster-knowledge-intensive nlp against a very large web corpus. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09924*.
- Vatsal Raina and Mark Gales. 2024. [Question-based retrieval using atomic units for enterprise RAG](#). pages 219–233, Miami, Florida, USA.
- Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- Jon Saad-Falcon, Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Radu Florian, Martin Franz, Salim Roukos, Avirup Sil, Md Sultan, and Christopher Potts. 2023. [UDAPDR: Unsupervised domain adaptation via LLM prompting and distillation of rerankers](#). pages 11265–11279, Singapore.
- Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D Manning. Raptor: Recursive abstractive processing for tree-organized retrieval. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ivan Stelmakh, Yi Luan, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. [ASQA: Factoid questions meet long-form answers](#). pages 8273–8288, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.
- Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. [Is ChatGPT good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agents](#). pages 14918–14937, Singapore.
- Qiaoyu Tang, Jiawei Chen, Bowen Yu, Yaojie Lu, Cheng Fu, Haiyang Yu, Hongyu Lin, Fei Huang, Ben He, Xianpei Han, et al. 2024. Self-retrieval: Building an information retrieval system with one large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00801*.
- Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. 2022. Lambda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*.
- Yuanhe Tian, Fei Xia, and Yan Song. 2024. [Large language models are no longer shallow parsers](#). pages 7131–7142, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Zheng Wang, Shu Teo, Jieer Ouyang, Yongjun Xu, and Wei Shi. 2024. [M-RAG: Reinforcing large language model performance through retrieval-augmented generation with multiple partitions](#). pages 1966–1978, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Zhiruo Wang, Jun Araki, Zhengbao Jiang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Learning to filter context for retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08377*.

- Orion Weller, Marc Marone, Nathaniel Weir, Dawn Lawrie, Daniel Khashabi, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2024. [“according to . . . ”: Prompting language models improves quoting from pre-training data](#). pages 2288–2301, St. Julian’s, Malta.
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, Niklas Muenighoff, Defu Lian, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2024. C-pack: Packed resources for general chinese embeddings. In *Proceedings of the 47th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 641–649.
- Shi-Qi Yan, Jia-Chen Gu, Yun Zhu, and Zhen-Hua Ling. 2024. Corrective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15884*.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- LingXi Zhang, Yue Yu, Kuan Wang, and Chao Zhang. 2024. [ARL2: Aligning retrievers with black-box large language models via self-guided adaptive relevance labeling](#). pages 3708–3719, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Sizhe Zhou, Yu Meng, Bowen Jin, and Jiawei Han. 2024. [Grasping the essentials: Tailoring large language models for zero-shot relation extraction](#). pages 13462–13486, Miami, Florida, USA.