

Context Aware Query Rewriting for Text Rankers using LLM

Abhijit Anand
aanand@l3s.de
L3S Research Institute
Germany

Vinay Setty
vsetty@acm.org
University of Stavanger
Norway

Venkatesh V
v.Viswanathan-1@tudelft.nl
Delft University of Technology
Netherlands

Avishek Anand
Avishek.Anand@tudelft.nl
Delft University of Technology
Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Query rewriting refers to an established family of approaches that are applied to underspecified and ambiguous queries to overcome the vocabulary mismatch problem in document ranking. Queries are typically rewritten during query processing time for better query modelling for the downstream ranker. With the advent of large-language models (LLMs), there have been initial investigations into using generative approaches to generate pseudo documents to tackle this inherent vocabulary gap. In this work, we analyze the utility of LLMs for improved query rewriting for text ranking tasks.

We find that there are two inherent limitations of using LLMs as query re-writers – concept drift when using only queries as prompts and large inference costs during query processing. We adopt a simple, yet surprisingly effective, approach called context aware query rewriting (CAR) to leverage the benefits of LLMs for query understanding. Firstly, we rewrite ambiguous training queries by context-aware prompting of LLMs, where we use only relevant documents as context. Unlike existing approaches, we use LLM-based query rewriting only during the training phase. Eventually, a ranker is fine-tuned on the rewritten queries instead of the original queries during training. In our extensive experiments, we find that fine-tuning a ranker using re-written queries offers a significant improvement of up to 33% on the passage ranking task and up to 28% on the document ranking task when compared to the baseline performance of using original queries.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Retrieval models and ranking.

KEYWORDS

query rewriting, rank fusion, ranking performance

1 INTRODUCTION

The *vocabulary mismatch* between user queries and the documents is a well known problem in the field of Information Retrieval (IR). The user information needs usually represented in the form of keyword queries can be ambiguous and may not be lexically similar to the documents. The queries could be under-specified, rendering it difficult to understand the user intent, which affects the downstream retrieval performance. For instance, the query `define sri` could refer to “sanskrit word sri” or “Socially Responsible Investment”. To disambiguate the users’ information need, many approaches have been proposed to address the vocabulary gap.

Classical approaches like pseudo-relevance feedback mechanism [10, 28] expand the original query with keywords from top-ranked results to the original query. Alternate term-based approaches represent the queries in a *continuous vector space*, followed by a KNN-search to expand query terms [18, 51]. There exist other term-based approaches that use seq2seq model [19] to generate query rewrites. However, all the above approaches are term-based approaches that improve retrieval but not necessary in document ranking.

Going beyond keywords, researchers have explored the possibility of natural language question generation for clarifying queries [35] or rephrasing original queries using deep generative models for alternative formulations of the original query [53]. More recently, document expansion approaches have been adopted to improve retrieval performance. Doc2QUERY [33] employs neural models to predict queries relevant to documents and enhances document representations. Especially with the advent of large language models or LLMs [27, 40], recent approaches have started to investigate the utility of LLMs to aid in enhancing query and document representations [17, 44]. LLMs are promising because encode world knowledge [50] from pre-training can be employed to reformulate the under-specified queries. In principle, the LLMs can be used to expand/explain/specify concise and ambiguous queries, thereby disambiguating the user information need. This bridges the gap between the latent user intent in the original queries and the retriever’s representation of the user information need. The approach query2doc [44], generates pseudo-documents by few-shot prompting LLMs and concatenates them with the original query to form a new *expanded query*. However, there are two major limitations to using LLMs for generating plausible query re-writes.

The problem of misaligned query and documents. Many queries have multiple aspects, senses, and intent granularities. When using LLM-based query expansions, the expanded query results in choosing one aspect among the many possible aspects. This entails in a problem that the chosen intent by the expansion might not align with the ground-truth intent. This lack of alignment between the actual intent and the inferred intent is problematic during training. Specifically, such intent non-alignment results in the case where the relevant document is forced to be matched with an erroneously expanded query. For instance, in Table 1, we observe that for the query `define sri`, QUERY2DOC drifts away from the intent and generates a query related to *Stanford Research Institute* instead of denoting the Sanskrit word. In a similar manner, for the query HS worms the generated output reflects multiple intents.

Method	Query Text
Original query	define sri
QUERY2DOC	SRI stands for "Stanford Research Institute," which is a nonprofit research organization that was founded in 1946 as part of Stanford University. Over the years, SRI has conducted groundbreaking research in a wide range [...]
DAVINCI-003	Sri is a Sanskrit word meaning "holy" or "auspicious." It is often used in Hinduism as an honorific title for a deity or spiritual teacher. It is also used in Buddhist and Jain contexts, and is an important concept in South Asian culture.
CHATGPT	Find the definition and meaning of the acronym SRI (Socially Responsible Investing).
CAR(DAVINCI-003)	What is the meaning of Sanskrit word "Sri" and how is it used as a title of veneration?
CAR(CHATGPT)	What is the meaning of the Sanskrit word "Sri" and how is it used in Indian subcontinent?
CAR(DAVINCI-003)(doc)	What is the origin and meaning of the term "Sri"?
CAR(CHATGPT)(doc)	What is the origin of the word "Sri" used in India and other South Asian countries?
Original query	hs worms
QUERY2DOC	HS Worms can refer to several different things depending on the context. If you are referring to HS Worms as an educational institution, then it stands for Hochschule Worms which is a university of applied sciences or it can refer to heartworms [...]
DAVINCI-003	Find information about heartworms in dogs
CHATGPT	Find information about the symptoms, causes, and treatment options for heartworm disease in dogs (also known as HS worms).
CAR(DAVINCI-003)	What are the courses offered by Hochschule Worms?
CAR(CHATGPT)	What are the programs offered by Hochschule Worms?
CAR(DAVINCI-003)(doc)	What is the country rank and world rank of HS Worms University?
CAR(CHATGPT)(doc)	What is Hochschule Worms (HS Worms) and where is it located?
Original query	ephesians 6:5-9
QUERY2DOC	Ephesians 6:5-9 is a passage from the New Testament that speaks to the relationship between slaves and masters in ancient times. It begins by instructing slaves to obey their earthly masters with respect [...]
DAVINCI-003	Find information about Ephesians 6:5-9.
CHATGPT	What is the meaning and interpretation of Ephesians 6:5-9 in the Bible?
CAR(DAVINCI-003)	7 With good will render service, as to the Lord, and not to men, 8 knowing that whatever good thing each one does, this he will receive back from the Lord
CAR(CHATGPT)	How does the passage in Ephesians 6:5-9 instruct slaves to behave towards their masters?
CAR(DAVINCI-003)(doc)	too have a Master in heaven. What does Ephesians 6:5-9 teach about the relationship between slaves and masters?
CAR(CHATGPT)(doc)	What is the meaning of Ephesians 6:5-9 in relation to submission and slavery?
Original query	price nrz
QUERY2DOC	Price NRZ stands for "Non-Return-to-Zero" and refers to a digital signal encoding technique used in telecommunications. In this technique, the voltage level of the signal remains constant during each bit interval[...]
DAVINCI-003	Find information on the Pricing of Non-Recourse Z-Bonds.
CHATGPT	Find information on the pricing strategy for non-return-to-zero (NRZ) encoding.
CAR(DAVINCI-003)	What is the pricing of New Residential Investment Corp. common stock on Jan 30, 2017 7:16 PM EST?
CAR(CHATGPT)	What is the public offering price of New Residential Investment Corp.'s common stock?
CAR(DAVINCI-003)(doc)	announced today that it has entered into definitive agreements to acquire Shellpoint Partners, LLC ("Shellpoint"), a leading mortgage servicer and originator.hat is the price of New Residential Investment Corp (NRZ) stock
CAR(CHATGPT)(doc)	What is the current share price and financial information of New Residential Investment Corp (NRZ)?

Table 1: Comparing Original ambiguous queries with their rewrites using QUERY2DOC, DAVINCI-003, CHATGPT approach with in-context and context aware rewriter(CAR) techniques. Approach with (doc) are rewrites using MS MARCO document corpus and the rest from MS MARCO passage corpus.

The problem of efficient inference. Secondly, a serious limitation (as acknowledged in [44]) is the computational overhead from both the retrieval and re-ranking phases. Expanded query terms in the re-written queries increase index lookups. More acutely, query expansions use tokenwise auto-regressive decoding during inference. However, current infrastructures just cannot support efficient LLM-based inference during query processing. Therefore,

to stay within sub-second ranking requirements without using prohibitively expensive compute, the choice of a LLM during query processing should be avoided.

Contextualized query rewriting. We make two simple yet important design decisions to overcome the problem of misalignment and efficiency. We first generate query rewrites by additionally

providing the relevant document as context during training. Consequently, the generated query rewrite is fully aligned with the context improving training of text rankers. Secondly, and unlike existing works, we fully avoid any query rewriting using LLMs **during inference**. In other words, we assume that training a ranker to match LLM-generated queries with relevant documents results in learning a generalized ranking model.

Methodologically, we propose an LLM-based context-aware query rewriting framework CAR, that replaces the traditional query rewriter with a LLM for rewriting ambiguous queries. We employ context-aware prompting to test the effectiveness of LLMs as a disambiguation engine, using the ambiguous query and the relevant document as a context in the prompts. We also include a context selection mechanism to select relevant sections when a context is long and spans multiple topics to handle *topic drift*. The outputs of our query rewriter are used to fine-tune a ranking model to transfer the knowledge of user information needs to the ranking model. At **inference time**, the ranker equipped with knowledge of query disambiguation mechanism improves the document ranking performance for subsequent ambiguous queries without the rewriter component. The proposed framework can be used with any off-the-shelf ranker. During inference, the ranking model fine-tuned on re-written queries yields much better ranking performance in comparison to the original queries. Our approach *obviates the need for the LLM prompting during inference* because we consider efficiency and latency requirements during inference *as a non-negotiable constraint*. From Table 1 we observe that the proposed context-aware query reformulation approach CAR, can generate concise rewrites that reflect the intent when compared to QUERY2DOC. We also observe that it performs better than pure in-context learning based approaches, as seen from Table 1 and also through our empirical analysis of ranking results.

We perform extensive experiments using LLMs of different parameter scales and demonstrate that the proposed approach results in better ranking performance. Specifically, we find that fine-tuning a ranker using re-written queries offers a significant improvement of up to 33% on the passage ranking task and up to 28% on the document ranking task when compared to the baseline performance of using original queries.

1.1 Research Questions

We address the following research questions:

RQ1: Can we employ LLMs to generate fluent natural language rewrites of original queries from ambiguous queries?

RQ2: How effective is a ranker fine-tuned on rewritten queries for downstream document ranking task?

Towards answering these research questions, we do extensive experiments on trec web 2012 using LLM models (Section 4.2) for evaluating quality of rewrites and on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20 passage and document dataset for re-ranking.

1.2 Contributions

In summary, here is a list of our contributions:

- (1) We propose a Context Aware Rewriter (CAR) for query reformulation, based on context-aware prompting of Large Language Models (LLMs) which generate natural language

rewrites for *ambiguous queries*. The natural language rewrites are used to fine-tune the ranker for encoding the ability to disambiguate the user information need.

- (2) We experiment with LLMs of different parameter scales and with different pre-training objectives to demonstrate the difference in quality of rewrites.
- (3) We show that the ranking model fine-tuned on generated rewrites delivers substantial performance improvement on the ambiguous user queries at inference time.

2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we discuss two aspects of related work, namely query expansion and generative capabilities of Large Language Models. We further discuss how LLMs are leveraged in addressing the vocabulary mismatch problem in information retrieval.

2.1 Query rewriting

One of the central problems in IR is bridging the lexical gap between the user specified query and the documents. This can also be seen as reconciling the difference between user intent and the intent of the system (*machine intent*). The common approaches of query reformulation involve query expansion, synonym substitution and paraphrasing.

Query expansion approaches have been adopted to bridge this gap. These approaches typically involve addition of terms to the original query based on relevance feedback [22, 37]. When user relevance feedback is unavailable, pseudo-relevance feedback mechanism is applied [10, 28]. Here, the top-ranked results to the original query are used to expand the query with additional terms. However, the performance of the rewritten query is severely limited by the quality of the top-ranked results [7] and is rarely used in dense retrieval [3]. Alternatively, researchers have proposed rephrasing the original queries to tackle the “lexical chasm” problem. In the work [58], the authors rephrase the user specified query iteratively by mining similar phrases from WordNet. Alternatively, researchers have also explored substituting terms in the input query with synonymous terms based on user query logs [21]. However, these approaches are term based and expand queries based on static sources, making it difficult to adapt to changes in the retrieval system.

The generative approaches in query rewriting involve generating paraphrases of the original queries. In the work [36], the authors employ statistical approaches to rephrase terms of the query and add the equivalent terms to the original query. However, this could lead to ill-formed queries, as the term level paraphrasing does not consider the surrounding context. It also heavily relies on user feedback to select the best paraphrased version which is cumbersome. More promising approaches in query expansion involve paraphrasing queries using a generative model [53] at once instead of phrasal level rewrites. For instance, the query “average tesla cost” is rephrased to “what is the cost of the new tesla”. Other generative approaches use chain-of-thought and relevance feedback [20] to expand query terms or use pseudo relevance feedback along with prompting or fine-tuning [45] for query reformulation. However, this approach just provides alternative formulations of query leveraging equivalent queries data from MS MARCO dataset




Figure 1: Overview of the proposed CAR framework of contextual re-writing queries

[3]. They do not focus on disambiguation of user intent in the ambiguous queries. They also do not consider performance prediction on downstream retrieval and is also susceptible to exposure bias. To enhance the performance on downstream retrieval, DRQR [46] leverages deep reinforcement learning to train recurrent models by incorporating query performance predictors as reward signals. However, the authors mention that the proposed approach does not improve downstream retrieval by a significant margin.

More recently, natural language question generation approaches have been adopted for query reformulation. [35] introduced a model to generate clarifying questions to compensate for the missing information. They used a reinforcement learning model to maximize a utility function based on the value added by the potential response to the question. [43], on the other hand, focused on identifying unclear posts in a community question answering setting that require further clarification. Query rewriting approaches have been of huge interest in the e-commerce domain and mostly require relevance feedback from the user for personalization [24, 26, 59]. While these methods are domain-specific, [52] propose a template-based weak supervised learning approach for open domain IR.

Document expansion approaches have also been proposed to tackle the vocabulary mismatch issue in IR. Doc2query [34] and docTTTTquery [8], generates pseudo queries from document context using a seq2seq model and appends them to documents to enhance the ranking results. Works like InPars [5] and PromptAgator [12] focus on using large generative models to generate queries from sampled documents to increase training data for dense retrieval tasks. However, these approaches are prone to hallucination and may drift away from the original intent of the query [17]. In this paper, we take a step in the direction of rewriting ambiguous queries by incorporating relevant context to transfer the knowledge of the disambiguation mechanism to a ranker for improved re-ranker performance. Our approach also departs from the traditional approaches by employing a monolithic LLM for query rewriting than multiple components that could lead to error propagation.

2.2 Large Language Models

Recent advances in generative modeling have led to large language models that apply to a wide range of tasks [1, 6, 47]. These models

trained in a self-supervised fashion demonstrate emergent capabilities where they can extrapolate to new tasks with few demonstration samples [14, 27, 48]. These advances have also led to researchers rethinking parts of retrieval systems [57]. Generative retrieval is one such emerging paradigm [4, 23, 30, 42] where neural language models are used as indices for retrieval. The model employs conditional decoding approaches to generate document identifiers that directly map to ground truth documents. This is accomplished by training the language models on relevant data.

More recently, researchers have tested the effectiveness of LLMs for document expansion [16, 44] in a zero-shot and few-shot setting for dense retrieval. However, these approaches have serious limitations at inference time in terms of efficiency due to the autoregressive decoding of LLMs. These approaches are also prone to hallucination due to the generation of long context for ranking. Query rewriting using LLMs has also found interest in QA tasks with the new rewrite-retrieve-read paradigm [29]. In this work, the authors fine-tune a small LLM for query rewriting by employing reward signals from the reader. However, this approach is specific to QA tasks and the retriever is a frozen model, relying on the reader for fine-tuning the rewriter. The approach also requires the expensive query rewriting mechanism during inference. Researchers have also explored task-aware tuning of dense retrievers [2] by appending queries with task-specific instructions as input to the dense encoder. The instructions equip the retriever with the ability to decipher user’s information needs. However, the instructions require manual annotation and are limited to specific tasks. In this paper, we make the ranking model aware of disambiguation mechanism of under-specified queries by fine-tuning it on rewritten queries generated by a LLM.

3 METHOD

In this section, we describe the proposed Context Aware Rewriter (CAR) framework for ambiguous query reformulation. Figure 1 shows the working of the proposed framework during the training and inference stages. During training, the framework is composed of a query reformulation phase and a document ranking phase. In the query reformulation phase, we employ a context-aware prompting of a LLM (Section 3.1). During inference, the ranker which was fine-tuned on disambiguated queries is directly employed to rank




Figure 2: An example of prompting LLM for query rewriting using CAR.

documents for new queries without rewriting them, as shown in Figure 1.

3.1 Query Rewriter

Algorithm 1 details the query reformulation process. Given an ambiguous query q , our goal is to generate a rewrite q^* that helps disambiguate the intent of the original query. We generate query rewrites by conditioning the LLM (RE) through few-shot prompting on the relevant document for the query d^+ to avoid topic drift. An example of the few-shot prompting employed is shown in Figure 2.

$$q^* = RE(q, d^+)$$

We first instruct the LLM (Figure 2) to perform the task of query reformulation in the context of the given document. We then provide an ambiguous query (q) concatenated with the corresponding relevant document as a part of the prompt. This *context-aware prompting* of LLMs results in better rewrites without topic drifts, as the LLM is conditioned on intents conveyed in the document. We also introduce a constraint on the maximum length of the output sequence generated. This constraint coupled with grounding of the generation on the relevant document context through prompting to prevent hallucination and topic drift.

Note that the intent conveyed for the rewrite can be controlled by using a different document context in the prompt. We experiment with different prompting approaches by varying the document context. We discuss the different variations of few-shot prompting and the corresponding results in Section 4.2 and Section 5 respectively.

3.1.1 Hyperparameters. We use a temperature of 0.5 to balance exploration and deterministic generation. We set presence penalty and frequency penalty to 0.6 and 0.8 respectively to minimize redundancy in generated reformulations of the original query.

The resulting rewritten query is used as an input to fine-tune the ranker. Note that we only rely on LLMs to rewrite ambiguous queries for fine-tuning the ranker. During inference, the ranker

Algorithm 1: Query Rewriting, Fine-tuning and Ranking

```

// Training Phase
Input: training batch  $D$ 
Output: training batch with rewritten queries  $D'$ 
1  $D' \leftarrow$  empty list
2 foreach  $(q, d^+)$  in  $D$  do
   | // create rewritten query
3   |  $q^* \leftarrow RE(q, d^+)$ 
4   | append  $(q^*, d^+)$  to  $D'$ 
5   | Fine-tune ranker on  $D'$ 
6 end
7 return  $D'$ 
// Inference Phase
Input: test set  $D_t$ 
Output: Ranked documents
8 foreach  $(q_t, d)$  in  $D_t$  do
9   |  $\hat{y} \leftarrow (q_t, d)$ 
10 end

```

directly ranks relevant documents for the new queries without the LLM based rewriting component.

3.2 Ranking Phase

Our goal is to train a model for *re-ranking* documents on the query rewrites for under-specified queries. Given a query-document pair (q^*, d) as input, the ranking models output a relevance score. This score can then be used to rank documents based on their relevance to the given query.

Formally, the training set comprises pairs q_i^*, d_i , where q_i^* is a rewritten (disambiguated) query using an LLM and d_i is a relevant or irrelevant document to the query. The aim is to fine-tune a ranker R that predicts a relevance score $\hat{y} \in [0; 1]$ given a reformulated query q^* and a document d :

$$R : (q^*, d) \mapsto \hat{y} \quad (1)$$

The fine-tuned ranking model (R) can be employed to re-rank a set of documents obtained from a first-stage lightweight frequency-based retriever. Recent studies have indicated that pre-trained language models which jointly model queries and documents tasks [11, 32, 39] have demonstrated significant performance on ranking tasks. In this work, we employ the BERT[13] model for ranking. The input to the ranker is of format:

$$[\text{CLS}] q [\text{SEP}] d [\text{SEP}]. \quad (2)$$

We employ the pointwise loss to train the ranker. Let us assume of a mini batch of N training examples $\{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1, \dots, N}$. The ranking task is cast as a binary classification problem, where each training instance $x_i = (q_i^*, d_i)$ is a query-document pair and $y_i \in 0, 1$ is a relevance label. The predicted score of x_i is denoted as \hat{y}_i . The cross-entropy loss function is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Point}} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i \cdot \log \hat{y}_i + (1 - y_i) \cdot \log(1 - \hat{y}_i)) \quad (3)$$

Note that we only fine-tune the ranker on query reformulations of ambiguous or under-specified queries. At inference time, the

ranker equipped with the knowledge of user information needs is directly deployed to rank relevant documents for new queries as shown in **Algorithm 1**.

3.2.1 Passage selector for Documents. : The phenomenon of *topic drift* has been identified in the context of utilizing the CAR (Conversational Response Ranking) approach with documents. **Topic drift** is characterized by the divergence of a rewritten query’s specificity when applying the CAR approach to documents. This occurs due to documents encompassing multiple topics, potentially relating to one or more aspects of the query. To mitigate this occurrence of *topic drift*, we employ supervised passage selection techniques (Attention, Linear) as proposed in [25]. These techniques aid in selecting the most relevant passage from a document, aligning it more closely with a given query.

- **Linear Selection:** This method involves the transformation of both the query and the passage into their average embedding representations. These representations are then processed through a singular feed-forward layer, followed by a calculation of their similarity through dot product operation. The sentence score, denoted as s_{ij} with respect to the query q , is computed as follows:

$$\text{score}_{\text{Lin}}(q, s_{ij}) = \langle \text{Enc}(q), \text{Enc}(s_{ij}) \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the dot product.

- **Attention selection** : The Attention-based selector operates by deriving passage-level representations through the utilization of the QA-LSTM model [41]. Initially, both the query and the document undergo contextualization by being subjected to shared bi-directional Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) processing of their token embeddings. Subsequently, the query representation \hat{q} is derived through the application of element-wise max-pooling over these contextualized embeddings.

$$\hat{q} = \text{Max-Pool}(\text{Bi-LSTM}(q)), \quad (5)$$

$$d^{\text{LSTM}} = \text{Bi-LSTM}(d). \quad (6)$$

For each hidden representation d_i^{LSTM} , attention to the query is computed as

$$m_i = W_1 h_1 + W_2 \hat{q}, \quad (7)$$

$$h_i = d_i^{\text{LSTM}} \exp(W_3 \tanh(m_i)), \quad (8)$$

where W_1 , W_2 and W_3 are trainable parameters. For s_{ij} , let h_{ij} denote the corresponding attention outputs. The sentence representation is computed similarly to the query representation, i.e.,

$$\hat{s}_{ij} = \text{Max-Pool}(h_{ij}). \quad (9)$$

The final score of a sentence is computed as the cosine similarity of its representation and the query representation:

$$\text{score}_{\text{Att}}(q, s_{ij}) = \cos(\hat{q}, \hat{s}_{ij}). \quad (10)$$

4 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section, we describe the setup we used to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Can we employ LLMs to generate fluent natural language rewrites of ambiguous and under-specified queries?

RQ2: How effective is a ranker fine-tuned on rewritten queries using LLMs for downstream document ranking task?

Towards answering these research questions we employ the following datasets, rankers and training settings

4.1 Datasets

Our goal is to have natural language expansions of the query for downstream ranking. Since there are no existing datasets explicitly tackling this problem, we curate queries and their descriptions from several sources, as detailed below.

4.1.1 Datasets for checking effectiveness of the LLM-based re-writer. To tackle **RQ1**, we collect several datasets from TREC web track [9]. Particularly, we collect topics and corresponding descriptions from TREC web tracks from 2009 to 2011 to be used as dataset for fine-tuning the generative model. We sourced the (topic, topic description) pairs to train a generative model. We obtain 1143 samples for training, 126 samples for validation. Finally, we use 103 samples of the TREC Web 2012 topics, subtopics, and their descriptions for testing the rewriter.

4.1.2 Google People Also Asked (PAA) Data. Since the TREC topics/queries do not disambiguate the multiple intents a query could have, we propose to collect questions from the Google *people also ask* (PAA) section as external knowledge for each query. These texts from Google PAA could serve as expanded versions of the ambiguous query that convey different intents. For instance, for a topic *403b*, the proposed pipeline provides different questions like “What are the withdrawal limitations for a 403b retirement plan?” and “What is the difference between a 401k and 403b?”. We augment the query topics in the dataset with the corresponding Google PAA questions. We fine-tune the rewriters like BART and GPT-2 with topics concatenated with the corresponding Google PAA question. However, on the test set (TREC web 2012) we leverage only the topics as access to an external knowledge base cannot be assumed during real-world deployments.

4.1.3 Datasets for Ranking Experiments. :

MS MARCO (Passage dataset): We consider the passage dataset from the TREC Deep Learning track (2019) [31]. We evaluate our model on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20 passage dataset, each containing 200 queries. For training, we select 1200 ambiguous/under-specified queries from TREC-DL-19 passage training dataset, then we rewrite these query using our query rewrite models (Subsection 4.2). The ambiguous queries are selected based on heuristics like query length, acronyms and entities with varied semantics. Each of these rewrites correspond to one dataset. So we end up with 13 rewrite training dataset and one baseline dataset (original queries).

MS MARCO (Document dataset): Similar to above passage dataset, we evaluate on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20 document collection. For training we select 1200 ambiguous/under-specified queries from TREC-DL-19 document training dataset and use exactly the same method as above to create training datasets using different approaches.

Model	# parameters
text-ada-001 (ADA-001)	350M
text-babbage-001 (BABBAGE-001)	3B
text-curie-001 (CURIE-001)	13B
text-davinci-002 (DAVINCI-002)	175B
text-davinci-003 (DAVINCI-003)	175B
gpt-3.5-turbo (CHATGPT)	154B

Table 2: LLM (GPT3 models) of different parameter scales

4.2 Rewriter Models

We employ several generative models as the backbone for query rewriting to compare and contrast the quality of query rewrites. We employ two settings where the rewrites are smaller language models fine-tuned on TREC web dataset for generating rewrites or are LLMs which are prompted to generate rewrites.

GPT-2. We fine-tune GPT-2 a transformer decoder based generative model with 117M parameters and 12 layers to generate topic descriptions from topics on the TREC web dataset. We use a learning rate of $3.2e-5$, weight decay of 0.01, batch size of 16 and train the model for 6 epochs.

BART. We employ BART (base version) a denoising autoencoder pre-trained using the objective for reconstructing the corrupted text. As a result, BART is able to generate robust fluent natural language queries from under-specified and ambiguous queries. We fine-tune BART to generate topic descriptions from given input topics on TREC web dataset. We use a learning rate of $2e-5$, batch size of 16 and train the model for 8 epochs

BART (topic+PAA). We also propose a variation BART (topic+PAA) where we concatenate the topics with external knowledge in the form of related Google PAA questions (c.f. Section 4.1.2) for fine-tuning the BART base model on the TREC web dataset collected. However, when generating rewrites for new ambiguous queries in the MS MARCO dataset, using the fine-tuned model, we provide only topics as input. We propose this approach to test if augmentation of Google PAA questions as context to topic names during fine-tuning aid in disambiguation of the user information need for smaller models. This variant also categorizes to context-aware rewriting class of approaches CAR proposed in this work, where Google PAA acts as context. We use similar hyperparameters for BART as discussed. This is slightly different from the proposed prompting based CAR approaches and is proposed as an alternative to test the capabilities of smaller models.

DAVINCI-003 (prompting). Since prompting LLMs like GPT-3 have proven to yield more stable outputs with less factual errors, we employ two variants of prompts to DAVINCI-003. We feed the prompts “Generate short sentence expanding:” or “Generate short sentence question:” followed by the topic name to DAVINCI-003. We call these two variants DAVINCI-003 (prompt1) and DAVINCI-003 (prompt2) respectively. We use a temperature of 0.5, max token length of 35 to generate short natural language rewrites of the original query. For frequency penalty and presence penalty, we use values of 0.8 and 0.6 to avoid redundancy in generated outputs.

DAVINCI-003 + in-context examples. Since, plain prompting might result in topic drifts of generated text and the model might misinterpret the intended task, we also adopt in-context learning [27]. In-context learning treats the LM as a black-box and instructs the model of the task without gradient descent through examples. We provide examples in form of

< query₁, desc₁ >, < query₂, desc₂ > ... query_{test}, [insert]

and instruct the model to fill the description in the placeholder provided. We use the same hyperparameters as discussed for DAVINCI-003 (prompting).

Other GPT-3 models. We also test with models which are variants of GPT-3 of different parameter scales. These models include ADA-001, DAVINCI-002, CURIE-001 and BABBAGE-001. The models and the number of parameters are shown in Table 2. We employ in-context learning by providing demonstration samples. The prompt is as follows:

Generate short sentence as expansion for the given test query like the following examples,

< input : query₁, output : desc₁ >, ... input : query_{test}, output :

Note that the prompt is a bit different from DAVINCI-003 as we observed that smaller models need detailed instructions for better generation capabilities. This maybe due to the difference in instruction fine-tuning approaches. We employ the same hyperparameters, queries and their descriptions as discussed earlier.

CHATGPT + in-context examples. We also test the in-context learning capabilities of gpt-3.5-turbo (CHATGPT) for query reformulation. We employ the same prompt as DAVINCI-003. We only prepend the task instruction to set the role of the system. The task description is : “You are a system that gives an expansion for queries, expanding abbreviations and acronyms when applicable. Some examples are” followed by the demonstration samples as discussed earlier. We employ the same values for hyperparameters as discussed for other LLM prompting approaches.

QUERY2DOC: We also use the recently proposed document expansion approach, QUERY2DOC which generates pseudo documents to aid in document ranking, as a baseline. We use the gpt-3.5-turbo model with max tokens of 128 for generation and follow the original hyperparameters used in the work [44] for reproducibility.

4.3 Ranking Models

For experiments on TREC-DL we use BERT-base [13], a pre-trained contextual model based on the transformer architecture. In principle, one can use different transformer architectures but focus on BERT as a representative model in our experiments. We use the base version with 12 encoder layers, 12 attention heads and 768-dimensional output representations. The input length is restricted to a maximum of 512 tokens. We use cross-attention BERT architecture for ranking, sometimes also referred to as MONOBER. The baseline model is trained on the original set of ambiguous queries using a pointwise ranking loss objective. The improved ranking models are also BERT base models but trained on re-written queries using LLMs such as GPT-3 variants, BART, CHATGPT, etc. In the experiments, we refer to these improved ranking models after the

Method	BERTScore			Rouge-L
	P	R	F1	
GPT2 (topic) [†]	0.457	0.447	0.451	7.47
BART (topic) [†]	0.792	0.791	0.792	28.89
QUERY2DOC	0.672	0.749	0.708	6.76
ADA-001 (in-context)	0.734	0.776	0.754	17.43
BABBAGE-001 (in-context)	0.804	0.802	0.802	32.16
CURIE-001 (in-context)	0.812	0.800	0.805	34.25
DAVINCI-002 (in-context)	0.818	0.823	0.820	33.81
DAVINCI-003 (prompt1)	0.727	0.743	0.734	14.38
DAVINCI-003 (prompt2)	0.811	0.792	0.801	32.07
DAVINCI-003 (in-context)	0.817	0.818	0.817	34.68
CHATGPT	0.768	0.812	0.789	25.77
CAR				
BART (topic+PAA) [†]	0.777	0.783	0.779	25.85
DAVINCI-003	<u>0.821</u>	<u>0.834</u>	<u>0.827</u>	38.57
CHATGPT	0.825	0.847	0.836	40.51

Table 3: BERTScore and ROUGEL scores for different rewrites on TREC web 2012. The best results for each dataset and each model is in bold and second is underlined. [†] indicates that the model has been fine-tuned with topic or topic + PAA data.

LLM query re-writer model that used to generate the training data for them.

4.4 Metrics

To evaluate the quality of re-writes we use the TREC topic descriptions as targets and compute ROUGE-L [38] scores and BERTSCORE [54–56] which are commonly used automated evaluation metrics used in text several generation tasks. While ROUGE-L is an n-gram overlap metric, BERTScore correlates with human judgments by employing contextualized embeddings to compute word-level matches between the reference sentence and the generated sentence [54].

The metrics serve as a proxy to measure the ability of the generative models to expand the query to disambiguate various intents to aid in downstream retrieval tasks. They also measure if the queries are plausible. To evaluate the ranking approach, we employ standard ranking metrics such as MRR and nDCG@10 and evaluate on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20 test sets for passage and document collection.

5 RESULTS

We begin by first answering if the re-writer component is able to generate plausible natural language expansions of queries. Then we conclude by analyzing the impact of the rewritten queries on the document ranking performance.

5.1 Query Rewriter Evaluation

To answer **RQ1**, we evaluate the proposed rewriting approaches using metrics like BERTScore and ROUGEL. The results are reported in Table 3. We report the mean values of precision, recall and F1 scores across all the test samples from TREC web 2012 to report the final scores. We observe that, CAR variants, specifically, DAVINCI-003 and CHATGPT approaches with context-aware prompting have

the highest BERTScores and ROUGE-L scores. We attribute this performance to the **scale of the GPT-3** language model, instruction fine-tuning and the **quality of context** provided that enable the rewriter to generate natural language queries. We observe that CAR provides more fluent and relevant rewrites when compared to vanilla prompt based methods. The in-context learning based approaches also yield fluent rewrites. However, on analysis, we observe that they sometimes have topic drifts due to lack of relevant context needed to disambiguate the queries. We also observe that LLMs of smaller scales like ADA-001, BABBAGE-001 and CURIE-001 generate rewrites which are factually inconsistent and drift away from the relevant topic. This is evident from the downstream document ranking performance (Table 4) and the qualitative analysis of samples (Table 1). This demonstrates that CAR rewrites are consistent, fluent and help improve downstream ranking performance.

Among the fine-tuned approaches in Table 3, BART (topic), BART (topic + PAA) and GPT-2 (topic), we observe that BART (topic) generates fluent query rewrites when compared to, GPT-2 (topic), as evident from BERTScore and ROUGEL scores. After performing a manual analysis of samples, and we observed that the query rewrites generated by GPT-2 were not relevant due to hallucination and in certain cases they were also grammatically incorrect. Therefore, we omit the GPT-2 (topic) model for the rest of the experiments. The CAR (BART (topic + PAA)) further improves the fluency of generated queries, but still falls short compared to GPT-3 variants and CHATGPT approaches, even though they are not fine-tuned.

Since the metrics proposed above are not true indicators of quality, we assess their quality through their impact on downstream ranking performance.

Insight 1: LLMs can produce good rewrites for under-specified and ambiguous queries. Among our methods CAR with context-aware few-shot prompting has the best rewrites.

5.2 Ranking Evaluation

To answer **RQ2** we first train rankers on data from MS MARCO passage dataset (Section 4.3) with rewrites from different LLMs (Section 4.2), and evaluate on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20 test sets. Then we choose the best rewriter models and train document ranking models on MS MARCO document dataset and evaluate on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20. All results are shown in Table 4.

In case of passage dataset, CAR models perform better than their counterparts with CHATGPT CAR showing improvements of **30%** and **33%** on nDCG@10 and **22%** and **25%** on MRR over baseline for TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20 respectively. Apart from CAR, DAVINCI-003 in-context and CHATGPT in-context model outperform the baseline across test sets.

The poor performance of models such as ADA-001, BABBAGE-001, etc are evident from our observation that they are not able to disambiguate the query, but rather just rewrite it. For example, the query “define sri” is generally rewritten as “Definition of sri” while DAVINCI-003 and CHATGPT are able to convey the intent better as shown in Table 1. Our CAR models perform better than non CAR models, proving that localized context is important along with global knowledge. We also observe that BART base model performs the worst among all models but variation of BART, with context

Ranking Models	TREC-DL Passage				TREC-DL Document			
	TREC-DL-19		TREC-DL-20		TREC-DL-19		TREC-DL-20	
	RR	nDCG ₁₀	RR	nDCG ₁₀	RR	nDCG ₁₀	RR	nDCG ₁₀
Baseline								
BERT Baseline	0.653	0.381	0.523	0.288	0.750	0.453	0.735	0.393
QUERY2Doc [44]	0.578(▼11.6%) [#]	0.321(▼15.7%)	0.608(▲16.2%)	0.323(▲12.3%)	0.82 (▲9.7%)	0.467(▲3.1%) [*]	0.749(▲2%)	0.415(▲5.6%) [*]
Query expansion								
BART (topic)	0.500(▼23.5%) [*]	0.254(▼33.3%) [*]	0.380(▼27.3%) [*]	0.202(▼29.9%) [*]	-	-	-	-
ADA-001	0.634(▼2.9%)	0.370(▼2.9%)	0.479(▼8.4%)	0.278(▼3.6%)	-	-	-	-
BABBAGE-001	0.697(▲6.7%)	0.370(▼3.0%)	0.580(▲10.9%)	0.327(▲13.5%)	-	-	-	-
CURIE-001	0.563(▼13.9%)	0.328(▼13.9%)	0.498(▼4.8%)	0.248(▼13.8%)	-	-	-	-
DAVINCI-002	0.795(▲21.7%) [*]	0.391(▲2.6%)	0.507(▼3.1%)	0.284(▼1.3%)	-	-	-	-
DAVINCI-003 (prompt1)	0.714(▲9.4%)	0.386(▲1.3%)	0.493(▼5.7%)	0.289(▲0.4%)	-	-	-	-
DAVINCI-003 (prompt2)	0.717(▲9.9%)	0.397(▲4.1%)	0.574(▲9.7%)	0.338(▲17.3%)	-	-	-	-
DAVINCI-003	0.766(▲17.3%) [#]	0.411(▲7.9%)	0.552(▲5.6%)	0.308(▲7.1%)	<u>0.818</u> (▲9.1%)	0.490(▲8.2%) [#]	0.764(▲4.0%)	0.465(▲18.5%) [#]
CHATGPT	0.689(▲5.5%)	0.396(▲4.0%)	<u>0.623</u> (▲19.2%) [#]	0.348(▲20.7%) [#]	-	-	-	-
CAR								
BART (topic+PAA)	0.745(▲14.2%)	0.391(▲2.6%)	0.614(▲17.4%) [*]	<u>0.363</u> (▲26.0%)	0.762(▲1.6%)	0.504(▲11.3%) [#]	<u>0.819</u> (▲11.5%)	<u>0.485</u> (▲23.4%) [#]
DAVINCI-003	0.798 (▲22.2%) [*]	<u>0.417</u> (▲9.5%)	0.533(▲2.0%)	0.316(▲9.9%)	0.774(▲3.3%)	0.507(▲12.0%) [*]	0.777(▲5.8%)	0.447(▲13.7%) [*]
CHATGPT	<u>0.794</u> (▲21.6%) [*]	0.494 (▲29.7%) [*]	0.653 (▲24.8%) [*]	0.383 (▲33.1%) [*]	0.769(▲2.6%)	<u>0.509</u> (▲12.3%) [#]	0.782(▲6.5%)	0.430(▲9.4%) [*]
DAVINCI-003 (Attention)	-	-	-	-	0.81(▲8.1%)	0.517 (▲14.1%) [*]	0.785(▲6.9%)	0.459(▲17%) [#]
DAVINCI-003 (Linear)	-	-	-	-	0.782(▲4.3%)	0.497(▲9.7%) [*]	0.848 (▲15.5%)	0.504 (▲28.4%) [*]
CHATGPT (Attention)	-	-	-	-	0.759(▲1.3%)	0.465(▲2.6%)	0.773(▲5.3%)	0.417(▲6.2%) [*]
CHATGPT (Linear)	-	-	-	-	0.778(▲3.8%)	0.517 (▲14.1%) [*]	0.799(▲8.8%)	0.461(▲17.5%) [*]

Table 4: Ranking performance of BERT model trained using query expansions from different query generative models on TREC-DL '19 and TREC-DL '20. We show the relative improvement of our approaches against a baseline (fine-tuned on original queries without query expansion) in parentheses. Statistically significant improvements at a level of 95% and 90% are indicated by * and # respectively [15]. The best results for each dataset and each model is in bold and second is underlined.

awareness BART(topic+PAA) does better than baseline model in all evaluations. We posit that the external knowledge provided in the form of *Google PAA* questions when fine-tuning BART(topic+PAA) helps disambiguate the intent of the query. For instance, the query "403b" in TREC web track 2012 is ambiguous without context. However, one of the corresponding Google PAA questions, "What are the withdrawal limitations of a 430b retirement plan?" helps indicate that the query refers to a retirement plan. We posit that the BART (topic+PAA) approach encodes this knowledge through fine-tuning. Hence, it has better document ranking performance compared to other approaches. This proves that context matters when it comes to rewriting ambiguous queries.

We also test our CAR approach on MS MARCO document collection. We consider the baselines and the best-performing approaches on the passage dataset to test on MS MARCO document collection. Table 4 shows the performance of different rankers trained using ambiguous queries from MS MARCO document collection on TREC-DL-19 and TREC-DL-20. In the case of TREC-DL-19 CHATGPT CAR methods perform better than in-context models and for TREC-DL-20 BART(topic+PAA) performs better. CAR models perform about 12% and 23% better than baseline model on nDCG@10. In the case of the passage dataset for a given query and a relevant passage, the context is specific, whereas this is not true in the case of document collection. There can be context drift in the case of a document,

where a document can have generic contexts, which can result in LLM generating queries of generic intents using the CAR approach. In Table 1 we can see examples where in case of CAR rewrites from different models are more specific compared to their document counterparts for the same queries.

If we look at model performance using MS MARCO passage collection (Table 4) and document collection (Table 4) combined, we can see that CAR approach performs better overall. This is due to the reason that the LLMs employed to expand ambiguous/ill formed queries encode world knowledge, which when enriched with relevant passage/document context helps ground the generation. The context serves as grounding, which prevents hallucination and topic drift. In Table 1 we can see how CAR model rewrites are more specific and factual compared to their non-CAR counterparts.

Insight 2: The quality of context employed in few-shot prompting of LLMs is crucial when expanding ambiguous/ill formed queries. The proposed approach CAR, is able to form concise and relevant query reformulations based on the given context.

How do we deal with context drift for long documents?

We previously discussed the phenomenon of *topic drift* within the scope of document context. To mitigate this phenomenon, we employ techniques involving supervised selection techniques, namely Attention and Linear selectors (Subsection 3.2.1), as proposed in [25]. In both instances, the primary objective of the selector is

to identify and select the most pertinent passage based on a given query.

In our methodology, given a query and a relevant document to the query, we segment the document into passages, each comprising approximately four sentences. Subsequently, we employ *Attention* and *Linear* selectors to identify the passage that bears the highest similarity to the given query within the document. This selected passage, along with the original query, is used to rewrite the query using LLM and then subsequently use it for model training.

The final four models detailed in Table 4 exemplify the application of *Attention* and *Linear* selectors on DAVINCI-003 and CHATGPT, resulting in improved performance as compared to their CAR counterparts. Just comparing CAR models, we can clearly see CAR CHATGPT (*Linear*) does 2% and 8% better than CAR CHATGPT for nDCG₁₀ on TREC-DL '19 and TREC-DL '20 respectively. We can see a similar trend in case of DAVINCI-003 and DAVINCI-003 (*Attention*) models. Empirical observations demonstrate that models employing the CAR selector exhibit a performance enhancement ranging from 2% to 15% when compared to their CAR-only counterparts. Hence, proving that if we reduce *topic drift* for documents we can improve query rewriting quality, in turn improving downstream task performance. From Table 4 we can concur that for query rewriting using documents CAR based models perform the best, specifically CHATGPT (*Linear*) and DAVINCI-003 (*Attention*) are the two best performing models overall.

Insight 3: Emphasizes that the utilization of *Attention* and *Linear* selectors to mitigate document topic drift not only enhances the quality of the rewritten query using the CAR methodology, but also leads to an overall improvement in the ranking model’s performance.

How does performance vary based on LLM of different parameter scales?: We experiment with models of different parameter scales (Table 2). The results are shown in Table 4. We observe that as we scale up the rewriter LLM from 350 million parameters to 175 billion or 154 billion parameters, the performance improves significantly as observed during evaluation (Table 4). This is because they are able to characterize the world knowledge better from the instruction based training regime and the scale of the models [49]. We observe that smaller models like ADA-001, BABBAGE-001 and CURIE-001 generate factually inconsistent rewrites of the original query and rewrites with significant topic drift from the original query.

Insight 4: We observe that when we scale up LLMs it results in better quality rewrites as they encode more world knowledge. This is evident from the significant improvement in ranking performance.

5.3 Qualitative Analysis

We analyze examples of ambiguous queries and their corresponding rewrites obtained from the generative models. Some of these examples are in Table 1. We observe that the generated queries are close to actual intents in the CAR (CHATGPT or DAVINCI-003) approach. For instance, for the query *hs worms*, the corpus only contains documents pertaining to the educational institution. But it has multiple contexts, such as the *educational institution* or *heartworms*. This renders the query and underlying intent ambiguous without being

contextualized by the documents in the corpus. However, among the other rewriting approaches, CAR is able to decipher the correct intent with fine granularity by also providing an expansion for the query. The advantage of the proposed framework is more evident from the fourth example *urodeum function*. This query is also of ambiguous nature, as it could refer to any anatomy. However, we observe that CAR with document context-aware prompting is able to decipher the correct intent. We attribute this to the large scale pre-training data and the ability of over-parameterized models to serve as knowledge bases [49].

Insight 5: CAR with context-aware prompting, is better at generating plausible rewrites with intents that are relevant to the search domain and improve downstream ranking.

5.4 Limitations

In our current approach, we choose ambiguous queries based on heuristics like the query length and specific types of queries like acronyms, entities with multiple meanings based on context. Though these heuristics reflect the nature of ambiguous queries, a more principled approach would help identify and filter ambiguous queries.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a framework for redefining query rewriting approaches using context-aware prompting of LLMs for improving document ranking. Our framework reformulates ambiguous queries to interpretable natural language queries that disambiguate user information needs. Our experiments demonstrate that generating plausible rewrites which disambiguate user intent is possible, which further enhances downstream ranking performance. We posit that the joint training of the rewriter and ranker in our framework with feedback signals would yield better rewrites and ranking performance. We also propose several challenges associated with the development of the framework.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. 2022. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.14198* (2022).
- [2] Akari Asai, Timo Schick, Patrick Lewis, Xilun Chen, Gautier Izacard, Sebastian Riedel, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Wen tau Yih. 2022. Task-aware Retrieval with Instructions. (2022). [arXiv:cs.CL/2211.09260](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09260)
- [3] Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Alina Stoica, Saurabh Tiwary, and Tong Wang. 2018. MS MARCO: A Human Generated Machine Reading Comprehension Dataset. (2018). [arXiv:cs.CL/1611.09268](https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.09268)
- [4] Michele Bevilacqua, Giuseppe Ottaviano, Patrick Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Sebastian Riedel, and Fabio Petroni. 2022. Autoregressive Search Engines: Generating Substrings as Document Identifiers. (2022). [arXiv:cs.CL/2204.10628](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.10628)
- [5] Luiz Bonifacio, Hugo Abonizio, Marzieh Fadaee, and Rodrigo Nogueira. 2022. InPars: Data Augmentation for Information Retrieval using Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.05144* (2022).
- [6] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [7] Claudio Carpineto and Giovanni Romano. 2012. A Survey of Automatic Query Expansion in Information Retrieval. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 44, 1, Article 1 (jan 2012), 50 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2071389.2071390>
- [8] David R. Cheriton. 2019. From doc2query to docTTTTTquery.
- [9] Charles LA Clarke, Nick Craswell, and Ian Soboroff. [n. d.]. Overview of the TREC 2009 Web Track. ([n. d.]).
- [10] Bruce Croft, Donald Metzler, and Trevor Strohman. 2009. *Search Engines: Information Retrieval in Practice* (1st ed.). Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, USA.
- [11] Zhuyun Dai and Jamie Callan. 2019. Deeper Text Understanding for IR with Contextual Neural Language Modeling. In *ACM SIGIR '19*. 985–988.
- [12] Zhuyun Dai, Vincent Y Zhao, Ji Ma, Yi Luan, Jianmo Ni, Jing Lu, Anton Bakalov, Kelvin Guu, Keith B Hall, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. Promptagator: Few-shot dense retrieval from 8 examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.11755* (2022).
- [13] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *CoRR* abs/1810.04805 (2018). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>
- [14] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. 2023. A Survey on In-context Learning. (2023). [arXiv:cs.CL/2301.00234](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.00234)
- [15] Luke Gallagher. 2019. Pairwise t-test on TREC Run Files. <https://github.com/lgrz/pairwise-ttest/>. (2019).
- [16] Luyu Gao, Xueguang Ma, Jimmy Lin, and Jamie Callan. 2022. Precise Zero-Shot Dense Retrieval without Relevance Labels. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2212.10496>
- [17] Mitko Gospodinov, Sean MacAvaney, and Craig Macdonald. 2023. Doc2Query--: When Less is More. (2023). [arXiv:cs.IR/2301.03266](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.03266)
- [18] Mihajlo Grbovic, Nemanja Djuric, Vladan Radosavljevic, Fabrizio Silvestri, and Narayan Bhamidipati. 2015. Context- and content-aware embeddings for query rewriting in sponsored search. In *Proceedings of the 38th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 383–392.
- [19] Yunlong He, Jiliang Tang, Hua Ouyang, Changsung Kang, Dawei Yin, and Yi Chang. 2016. Learning to rewrite queries. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1443–1452.
- [20] Rolf Jagerman, Honglei Zhuang, Zhen Qin, Xuanhui Wang, and Michael Bendersky. 2023. Query Expansion by Prompting Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03653* (2023).
- [21] Rosie Jones, Benjamin Rey, Omid Madani, and Wiley Greiner. 2006. Generating Query Substitutions. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW '06)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 387–396. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1135777.1135835>
- [22] Victor Lavrenko and W. Bruce Croft. 2001. Relevance Based Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '01)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 120–127. <https://doi.org/10.1145/383952.383972>
- [23] Hyunji Lee, Sohee Yang, Hanseok Oh, and Minjoon Seo. 2022. Generative Multi-hop Retrieval. (2022). [arXiv:cs.IR/2204.13596](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.13596)
- [24] Mu-Chu Lee, Bin Gao, and Ruofei Zhang. 2018. Rare Query Expansion Through Generative Adversarial Networks in Search Advertising. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 500–508. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219850>
- [25] Jurek Leonhardt, Koustav Rudra, and Avishek Anand. 2022. Extractive Explanations for Interpretable Text Ranking. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* (dec 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576924>
- [26] Sen Li, Fuyu Lv, Taiwei Jin, Guiyang Li, Yukun Zheng, Tao Zhuang, Qingwen Liu, Xiaoyi Zeng, James Kwok, and Qianli Ma. 2022. Query Rewriting in TaoBao Search. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3262–3271. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3511808.3557068>
- [27] Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. What Makes Good In-Context Examples for GPT-3?. In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out (DeeLIO 2022): The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland and Online, 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.deelio-1.10>
- [28] Yuanhua Lv and ChengXiang Zhai. 2009. A comparative study of methods for estimating query language models with pseudo feedback. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Information and knowledge management*. 1895–1898.
- [29] Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. Query Rewriting for Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models. (2023). [arXiv:cs.CL/2305.14283](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14283)
- [30] Donald Metzler, Yi Tay, Dara Bahri, and Marc Najork. 2021. Rethinking search. *ACM SIGIR Forum* 55, 1 (jun 2021), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3476415.3476428>
- [31] Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. MS MARCO: A Human Generated Machine Reading Comprehension Dataset. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Computation: Integrating neural and symbolic approaches 2016 co-located with the 30th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2016), Barcelona, Spain, December 9, 2016 (CEUR Workshop Proceedings)*, Tarek Richard Besold, Antoine Bordes, Artur S. d'Avila Garcez, and Greg Wayne (Eds.), Vol. 1773. CEUR-WS.org. [http://ceur-ws.org. http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1773/CoCoNIPS_2016_paper9.pdf](http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-1773/CoCoNIPS_2016_paper9.pdf)
- [32] Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Passage Re-ranking with BERT. *CoRR* abs/1901.04085 (2019). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1901.04085>
- [33] Rodrigo Nogueira, Wei Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Document Expansion by Query Prediction. (2019). [arXiv:cs.IR/1904.08375](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.08375)
- [34] Rodrigo Nogueira, Wei Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Document Expansion by Query Prediction. (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1904.08375>
- [35] Sudha Rao and Hal Daumé III. 2018. Learning to ask good questions: Ranking clarification questions using neural expected value of perfect information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.04655* (2018).
- [36] Stefan Riezler, Alexander Vasserman, Ioannis Tsochantaridis, Vibhu Mittal, and Yi Liu. 2007. Statistical Machine Translation for Query Expansion in Answer Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association of Computational Linguistics*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Prague, Czech Republic, 464–471. <https://aclanthology.org/P07-1059>
- [37] J. J. Rocchio. 1971. Relevance feedback in information retrieval. In *The Smart retrieval system - experiments in automatic document processing*, G. Salton (Ed.), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 313–323.
- [38] Lin CY ROUGE. 2004. A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Proceedings of Workshop on Text Summarization of ACL, Spain*.
- [39] Koustav Rudra and Avishek Anand. 2020. Distant supervision in BERT-based adhoc document retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 2197–2200.
- [40] Chenglei Si, Zhe Gan, Zhengyuan Yang, Shuohang Wang, Jianfeng Wang, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Lijuan Wang. 2022. Prompting GPT-3 To Be Reliable. (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2210.09150>
- [41] Ming Tan, Cicero dos Santos, Bing Xiang, and Bowen Zhou. 2016. Improved Representation Learning for Question Answer Matching. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin, Germany, 464–473. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P16-1044>
- [42] Yi Tay, Vinh Q Tran, Mostafa Dehghani, Jianmo Ni, Dara Bahri, Harsh Mehta, Zhen Qin, Kai Hui, Zhe Zhao, Jai Gupta, et al. 2022. Transformer memory as a differentiable search index. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.06991* (2022).
- [43] Jan Trienes and Kriszian Balog. 2019. Identifying unclear questions in community question answering websites. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 41st European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2019, Cologne, Germany, April 14–18, 2019, Proceedings, Part I 41*. Springer, 276–289.
- [44] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, and Furu Wei. 2023. Query2doc: Query Expansion with Large Language Models. (2023). [arXiv:cs.IR/2303.07678](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.07678)
- [45] Xiao Wang, Sean MacAvaney, Craig Macdonald, and Iadh Ounis. 2023. Generative Query Reformulation for Effective Adhoc Search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00415* (2023).
- [46] Xiao Wang, Craig Macdonald, and Iadh Ounis. 2020. Deep Reinforced Query Reformulation for Information Retrieval. (2020). [arXiv:cs.IR/2007.07987](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.07987)
- [47] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2021. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652* (2021).
- [48] Jerry Wei, Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Dustin Tran, Albert Webson, Yifeng Lu, Xinyun Chen, Hanxiao Liu, Da Huang, Denny Zhou, and Tengyu Ma. 2023. Larger language models do in-context learning differently. (2023). [arXiv:cs.CL/2303.03846](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.03846)

- [49] Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Yumao Lu, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. 2021. An Empirical Study of GPT-3 for Few-Shot Knowledge-Based VQA. (2021). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2109.05014>
- [50] Wenhao Yu, Dan Iter, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Mingxuan Ju, Soumya Sanyal, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Generate rather than Retrieve: Large Language Models are Strong Context Generators. (2023). arXiv:cs.CL/2209.10063
- [51] Hamed Zamani and W. Bruce Croft. 2017. Relevance-based Word Embedding. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan, August 7-11, 2017*, Noriko Kando, Tetsuya Sakai, Hideo Joho, Hang Li, Arjen P. de Vries, and Ryen W. White (Eds.). ACM, 505–514. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080831>
- [52] Hamed Zamani, Susan Dumais, Nick Craswell, Paul Bennett, and Gord Lueck. 2020. Generating clarifying questions for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the web conference 2020*. 418–428.
- [53] George Zerveas, Ruochen Zhang, Leila Kim, and Carsten Eickhoff. 2020. Brown University at TREC Deep Learning 2019. (2020). arXiv:cs.IR/2009.04016
- [54] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. BERTScore: Evaluating Text Generation with BERT. (2019). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1904.09675>
- [55] Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Sumit Agarwal, and Graham Neubig. 2023. CodeBERTScore: Evaluating Code Generation with Pretrained Models of Code. (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2302.05527>
- [56] Yunqi Zhu, Xuebing Yang, Yuanyuan Wu, and Wensheng Zhang. 2023. Leveraging Summary Guidance on Medical Report Summarization. (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2302.04001>
- [57] Yutao Zhu, Huaying Yuan, Shuting Wang, Jiongnan Liu, Wenhan Liu, Chenlong Deng, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. Large Language Models for Information Retrieval: A Survey. (2023). arXiv:cs.CL/2308.07107
- [58] Ingrid Zukerman and Bhavani Raskutti. 2002. Lexical Query Paraphrasing for Document Retrieval. In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. <https://aclanthology.org/C02-1161>
- [59] Simiao Zuo, Qingyu Yin, Haoming Jiang, Shaohui Xi, Bing Yin, Chao Zhang, and Tuo Zhao. 2022. Context-Aware Query Rewriting for Improving Users' Search Experience on E-commerce Websites. (2022). arXiv:cs.IR/2209.07584