
RARE: Retrieval-Augmented Reasoning Modeling

Zhengren Wang^{†1,5}, Jiayang Yu^{†3}, Dongsheng Ma^{†4}

Zhe Chen^{2,8}, Yu Wang^{2,8}, Zhiyu Li^{*5,7}, Feiyu Xiong^{5,7}

Yanfeng Wang^{2,8}, Weinan E^{1,2,5}, Linpeng Tang^{5,6}, Wentao Zhang^{*1,5,6}

¹Peking University ²Shanghai Jiao Tong University ³Northeastern University ⁴Nankai University

⁵Institute for Advanced Algorithms Research, Shanghai ⁶OriginHub Technology ⁷MemTensor

⁸Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory

wzr@stu.pku.edu.cn, {lizy,xiongyf}@iaar.ac.cn, wangyanfeng622@sjtu.edu.cn

weinan@math.pku.edu.cn, linpengt@originhub.tech, wentao.zhang@pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Domain-specific intelligence demands specialized knowledge and sophisticated reasoning for problem-solving, posing significant challenges for large language models (LLMs) that struggle with knowledge hallucination and inadequate reasoning capabilities under constrained parameter budgets. Inspired by Bloom’s Taxonomy in educational theory, we propose Retrieval-Augmented Reasoning Modeling (RARE), a novel paradigm that decouples knowledge storage from reasoning optimization. RARE externalizes domain knowledge to retrievable sources and internalizes domain-specific reasoning patterns during training. Specifically, by injecting retrieved knowledge into training prompts, RARE transforms learning objectives from rote memorization to contextualized reasoning application. It enables models to bypass parameter-intensive memorization and prioritize the development of higher-order cognitive processes. Our experiments demonstrate that lightweight RARE-trained models (e.g., Llama-3.1-8B) could achieve state-of-the-art performance, surpassing retrieval-augmented GPT-4 and Deepseek-R1 distilled counterparts. RARE establishes a paradigm shift where maintainable external knowledge bases synergize with compact, reasoning-optimized models, collectively driving more scalable domain-specific intelligence.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs), trained on vast corpora with billion-scale parameters, have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across diverse general-domain knowledge and reasoning tasks [7, 45]. These models have revolutionized multiple application domains, such as mathematical reasoning [45, 7] and task automation [33, 49, 41]. However, there is an increasing need for *domain-specific intelligence*, to tackle tasks involving specialized knowledge and reasoning capabilities. These tasks are prevalent in both specialized applications like medical specialist LLMs [34, 32, 29], and general-purpose systems like open-domain generalist LLMs [31, 16] for diverse user scenarios.

As illustrated in Fig. 1, the limitations and challenges of vanilla LLMs in domain-specific contexts primarily stem from two key dimensions. *Domain knowledge*: Although billion-scale parameters counts to memorize, due to the long-tail distribution and parametric representation of domain knowledge, the hallucination phenomenon is still notoriously serious (LLMs as knowledge stores); *Domain thinking*: Beyond knowledge hallucination, vanilla LLMs also struggle with domain-specific reasoning, which requires the sophisticated application of both domain-specific knowledge and thinking skills (LLMs as reasoning engines). Both challenges highlight the critical research problem:

† Equal contribution; * Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Motivation of RARE. Left: A pyramid-shaped Bloom’s Taxonomy, illustrating the cognitive hierarchy from basic “Remember” to advanced “Evaluate” and “Create” levels. Right: The correspondence between Domain Knowledge and Domain Thinking with Bloom’s cognitive hierarchy (example related to government bond yields). In contrast to domain knowledge, domain thinking corresponds to the higher-order cognitive process—although relatively *rare*, it plays a crucial role.

the effective integration of domain-specific knowledge and reasoning capabilities, particularly under limited parameter scale.

From the perspective of knowledge and reasoning acquisition, existing approaches can be intuitively categorized into three distinct paradigms:

- P1. **Closed-book naked examination:** Directly invoking general-purpose models without domain adaptation. These approaches suffer from poor performance due to the absence of both domain-specific knowledge and reasoning capabilities.
- P2. **Closed-book prepared examination:** Conventional pre-training and post-training methods like continual training and supervised fine-tuning (SFT) under standard settings, these approaches incur high training costs for memorization, while knowledge is untraceable and prone to hallucinations.
- P3. **Open-book naked examination:** Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) methods that address knowledge limitations through external information retrieval. However, these approaches primarily focus on knowledge supplementation and neglect the systematic learning of domain-specific reasoning patterns and thinking skills.

Motivation As Confucius stated, “Learning without thought is labor lost; thought without learning is perilous.” This world-renowned axiom reveals the synergistic relationship between knowledge acquisition and higher-order cognitive processes. Notably, the fields of education and deep learning exhibit profound parallels: domain model optimization mirrors subject mastery, training strategies align with pedagogical methodologies, curated datasets correspond to curricular materials, and loss functions reflect educational objectives. Through the lens of Bloom’s Taxonomy [6, 21, 2], the fundamental model of educational objectives, the development of problem-solving abilities requires the harmonious integration of knowledge and cognitive processes. The cognitive processes also form a hierarchical structure: from basic knowledge recall to advanced skills like analysis, evaluation, and creation (Fig. 1). The critical insight is: the memorization of massive domain knowledge happens before, competes and even hinders the learning of higher-order thinking skills, particular within constrained parameter budgets. Thus, the natural research question is: “*Is it possible to decouple and bypass the memorization of domain knowledge, thereby prioritizing and accelerating reasoning modeling?*”

To bridge this crucial gap, this paper introduces Retrieval-Augmented Reasoning Modeling (**RARE**), as the fourth paradigm for domain-specific intelligence:

- P4. **Open-book prepared examination:** RARE skips the parameter-intensive process of knowledge memorization, instead prioritizing the cultivation of domain-specific reasoning capabilities during training. At inference time, it dynamically retrieves necessary domain knowledge through RAG from external knowledge stores. This paradigm reallocates model capacity from rote memorization to reasoning-focused parameters, achieving efficiency gains under practical constraints while maintaining knowledge accuracy and updatability.

RARE’s core philosophy centers on the dual principles of *externalizing domain knowledge* and *internalizing domain thinking*. While LLMs exhibit the potential as strong reasoning engines, their limitations in factual precision and interpretability render them unsuitable as standalone knowledge stores. By decoupling knowledge storage (handled via specialized AI databases) from reasoning (optimized through RARE’s training strategy), RARE enable models to bypass explicit domain knowledge learning. Specifically, retrieved knowledge is injected into training prompts, reframing the learning objective from knowledge memorization to contextual application. This shift transforms knowledge-related losses from memorization errors into application-focused losses, allowing models to allocate computational and parametric resources toward optimizing reasoning pathways rather than static factual storage.

Empirical evaluations validate RARE’s efficacy across lightweight models (e.g., Llama-3.1-8B, Qwen-2.5-7B) on medical benchmarks. For instance, RARE-trained Qwen-2.5-7B achieved 78.63% and 74.14% accuracy on PubMedQA and CoVERT, respectively—surpassing retrieval-augmented GPT-4 (75.20% and 65.67%). Besides merely scaling-up model capacity or incorporating explicit scaffolding algorithms, RARE reveals another novel dimension for advanced reasoning modeling.

Contributions The main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- **Problem Formulation:** We conceptualize and formalize the knowledge-reasoning capacity trade-off for domain-specific intelligence under constrained resources. By drawing parallels with Bloom’s Taxonomy in educational theory and conducting formal mathematical analysis of optimization objectives, we establish theoretical foundations through computational-educational interdisciplinary analysis.
- **Method Innovation:** We propose the RARE training framework, a novel paradigm that decouples knowledge storage from reasoning modeling. This framework enables models to learn domain-specific reasoning patterns directly while bypassing lower-level knowledge memorization. At inference time, the RARE-trained reasoning engine is integrated with external knowledge store for complete domain-specific intelligence.
- **Experimental Validation:** Extensive experiments on medical benchmarks and open-domain multi-modal benchmarks show that, lightweight models trained with RARE (e.g., Llama-3.1-8B, Qwen-2.5-7B) outperform large-scale generic models like GPT-4 (with trillion parameters), achieving up to a 20% increase in accuracy. Furthermore, these models beat retrieval-augmented GPT-4 and Deepseek-R1 distilled counterparts, highlighting the effectiveness of RARE paradigm.

This work advances a paradigm shift of large reasoning models, where knowledge is outsourced to maintainable databases, and models specialize in sophisticated, contextualized inference. The repository is available at <https://github.com/Open-DataFlow/RARE>.

2 Related Work

Retrieval-Augmented Generation Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems enhance LLMs by incorporating external knowledge during inference [52]. Modern RAG systems advance in knowledge indexing [36, 22, 44], query rewriting [27, 43], document compression [47], retrieval denoising [25, 11], iterative retrieval [3, 19] and so on, achieving increasingly high retrieval accuracy. However, RAG methods focus on knowledge supplementation rather than reasoning capacity acquisition—retrieved information serves as input augmentation rather than scaffolding for cognitive process development. RARE redefines RAG’s role in the training paradigm: by injecting retrieved knowledge into training prompts, it transforms retrieval contexts into reasoning skill incubators, enabling models to directly learn cognitive patterns from knowledge-anchored examples. This shifts RAG from a post-hoc patch to an integral component of reasoning capability formation.

Notably, our most relevant work is Retrieval-Augmented Fine-Tuning (RAFT) [51]. For the imperfect retrieval issue [40, 24], RAFT solely focuses on identifying helpful information from retrieved documents. It learns to mimic the structured output format of teacher models that extract and directly quote sentences, rather than fostering domain thinking—deep reasoning capabilities involving higher-order cognitive processes. Additionally, RAFT introduces two hyperparameters related to the

proportion of golden and distract documents during training, which is reported to cause training instability issues [51, 13].

Domain LLMs Domain-specific LLMs have emerged as critical tools for addressing specialized tasks. Prior work primarily focuses on knowledge internalization through specialized pretraining [32] or fine-tuning [34] to incorporate relevant expertise. Models like Med-PaLM [34], Med-PaLM 2 [32], ClinicalBERT [17] and BioGPT [26] leverage domain-specific corpora to embed medical knowledge into parameters, while financial LLMs such as BloombergGPT [46] and FinBERT [1] adopt similar strategies for economic nuances. However, these approaches face inherent limitations: domain knowledge becomes entangled with model parameters, leading to challenges in updating facts [29] and persistent hallucination risks [52]. Recent efforts like retrieval-augmented domain models [48] partially address these issues but retain limited reasoning capabilities. In contrast, RARE fundamentally externalizes domain knowledge, enabling models to focus on reasoning optimization with minimal memorization overhead.

Reasoning LLMs Large reasoning models (LRMs) such as OpenAI-o1 [30], DeepSeek-R1 [10], and Qwen-QwQ [38], exhibit a paradigm shift toward test-time scaling through long reasoning steps, which enables smaller models to tackle complex tasks by decomposing problems into cognitive chains [45, 12]. For reasoning modeling, previous methods introduce diverse strategies: Monte Carlo Tree Search enhances decision-making through simulation [18], deliberate error injection improves error correction [50], knowledge distillation of reasoning paths [28], etc. For knowledge retrieval, the reasoning capability is often utilized to empower more advanced or agentic RAG systems [15, 42, 39]. For example, Self-RAG [4] integrates agentic search workflows into its reasoning process. It learns when and how to retrieve through curated SFT datasets with special tokens. Following this, Search-o1 [23] and Search-R1 [20] advance with RL training. While these approaches empower retrieval through reasoning, RARE inversely optimizes reasoning modeling via retrieval integration.

3 RARE: Retrieval-Augmented Reasoning Modeling

In this section, we introduce the RARE framework, elaborating on how RARE bypasses knowledge memorization and cultivates higher-order think skills. Due to space reason, here we present RARE in the SFT scenario; however, the principles of RARE apply to RL training seamlessly.

3.1 Problem Formulation

For the comprehensive evaluation of domain-specific intelligence, we consider tasks that necessitates both domain-specific knowledge and reasoning capabilities. Given the input instruction x such as user query, the objective is to generate chain-of-thoughts response y , consisting of interleaved domain knowledge k and domain thinking (or reasoning steps) r . For retrieval mechanism, we consider an non-parametric retrieval engine $R(\cdot)$ (e.g., BM25, DPR), which returns retrieved knowledge $R(x)$ for each user query x . Given any training sample $(x, R(x), y)$, our goal is to prioritize and accelerate the learning of domain thinking r , rather than domain knowledge k .

3.2 The Theory of RARE

As a starting point, we first consider the simplest case, which can be extended to the general scenarios without loss of generality. Specifically, the chain-of-thoughts response y is modeled as, $y = k \oplus r$, the concatenation of knowledge and reasoning; its generation is also divided into three discrete processes:

1. **Knowledge Retrieval:** Given the input x , an external retrieval system extracts relevant knowledge $R(x)$ from a vast knowledge base.
2. **Knowledge Integration:** Given x and $R(x)$, LLMs synthesize domain knowledge k by integrating their intrinsic parametric knowledge with external inputs, following the conditional distribution $k \sim p(k|x, R(x))$. As the retrieved knowledge contributes to k much more than intrinsic one, this integration mainly involves *knowledge extraction, or understanding and application, rather than remembering*.

3. **Contextualized Reasoning:** Within the domain-specific context, LLMs generate reasoning steps r conditioned on x , $R(x)$, and the integrated knowledge k , adhering to the reasoning distribution $r \sim p(r|x, R(x), k)$.

Learning Objectives Here we formally analyze and discuss the learning objectives of both vanilla models and RARE-trained models.

- For the vanilla setting, the joint generation distribution is:

$$p_{\text{Vanilla}}(y|x) = p_{\text{Vanilla}}(k \oplus r|x) = \underbrace{p_{\theta}(k|x)}_{\text{Knowledge Remembering}} \cdot \underbrace{p_{\theta}(r|x, k)}_{\text{Contextualized Reasoning}}$$

The vanilla loss function optimizes both knowledge remembering and contextualized reasoning:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{Vanilla}} &= -\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(k|x)p_{\theta}(r|x, k)] \\ &= \underbrace{-\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(k|x)]}_{\text{Loss of Remembering}} + \underbrace{-\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(r|x, k)]}_{\text{Loss of Reasoning}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

- For the RARE paradigm, the joint generation distribution is:

$$p_{\text{RARE}}(y|x, R(x)) = p_{\text{RARE}}(k \oplus r|x, R(x)) = \underbrace{p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x))}_{\text{Knowledge Integration}} \cdot \underbrace{p_{\theta}(r|x, R(x), k)}_{\text{Contextualized Reasoning}}$$

The loss function of RARE optimizes both knowledge integration and contextualized reasoning:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{RARE}} &= -\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x))p_{\theta}(r|x, R(x), k)] \\ &= \underbrace{-\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x))]}_{\text{Loss of Understanding and Application}} + \underbrace{-\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(r|x, R(x), k)]}_{\text{Loss of Reasoning}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Through the lens of multi-task learning, we compare equation (1) and (2) from two perspectives:

- **Reasoning Augmentation:** Assuming the retrieval quality is high, we have $p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x)) \gg p_{\theta}(k|x)$, and thus $p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x)) \gg p_{\theta}(r|x, R(x), k)$ usually. We express equation (2) as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RARE}} = -\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x))] \downarrow -\mathbb{E}_{(x,k,r)} [\log p_{\theta}(r|x, R(x), k)] \uparrow. \quad (3)$$

Compared with vanilla models, RARE’s loss function in equation (3) focuses more on contextualized reasoning. Hence, RARE helps the modeling of reasoning.

- **Knowledge Augmentation:** Comparing the first term of equation (2) with equation (1), with high-quality retrieval, the loss term transforms from knowledge remembering into knowledge integration, such as extracting useful information from lots of retrieved documents. According to Bloom’s taxonomy, $p_{\theta}(k|x, R(x))$ has already stepped into the levels of "understanding" and "application" of knowledge, whereas $p_{\theta}(k|x)$ still mainly remains at the level of "remembering", i.e. rote memorization. Hence, RARE helps the modeling of knowledge integration, rather than memorization.

General Case Extension In real-world settings, domain knowledge k and contextualized reasoning r intertwine in an alternative manner (e.g., Fig. 1; step-by-step differential diagnosis in Fig. 2). The generation process can be extended and modeled as follows:

$$y_t = \bigoplus_{i=1}^t (k_i \oplus r_i),$$

where k_i and r_i represent the knowledge tokens and reasoning tokens at step i , respectively, and y_t represents the concatenation of the autoregressive outputs from the first t steps. The joint generation distributions remain highly similar:




Figure 2: This figure demonstrates that compared to RAG (only with domain knowledge), RARE (combining domain knowledge and thinking) enables LLMs to reason more deeply and accurately. RAG depends only on surface indicators, hastily concluding that the patient requires immediate glucose-lowering intervention, leading to an incorrect answer. In contrast, RARE integrates both clinical indicators and the effectiveness of prior treatment, carefully reasoning that the patient needs second-line therapy while providing a individualized treatment plan—ultimately arriving at the correct answer.

$$p_{\text{vanilla}}(y_t|x) = \prod_{i=1}^t \underbrace{p_{\theta}(k_i|x, y_{i-1})}_{\text{Knowledge Remembering}} \cdot \underbrace{p_{\theta}(r_i|x, y_{i-1}, k_i)}_{\text{Contextualized Reasoning}}$$

$$p_{\text{RARE}}(y_t|x, R(x)) = \prod_{i=1}^t \underbrace{p_{\theta}(k_i|x, R(x), y_{i-1})}_{\text{Knowledge Integration}} \cdot \underbrace{p_{\theta}(r_i|x, R(x), y_{i-1}, k_i)}_{\text{Contextualized Reasoning}}$$

The relevant analytical conclusions remain consistent with the simplest case, and are omitted due to space reason.

3.3 The Practice of RARE

Knowledge Distillation RARE is an innovative training method whose effectiveness heavily depends on the construction of high-quality training data. While domain specificity may affect the transferability of thinking patterns, cognitive science research suggests that individuals with high cognitive abilities tend to exhibit flexible contextualized adaptation [37]. Advanced reasoning models such as QwQ-32B and DeepSeek-R1 have already demonstrated such high-level cognitive characteristics. Based on this, we propose the following knowledge distillation process:

Given a question x and its retrieved knowledge $R(x)$, we utilize QwQ-32B to generate a complete output containing both the Chain of Thought $k \oplus r$ and the final answer y . Experiments indicate that the quantity of training data significantly impacts model performance. To address this, we introduce an adaptive resampling mechanism: when incorrect answer y is detected, the system automatically initiates multiple iterative refinements until a correct answer y is obtained or the maximum retry limit (default: 8 attempts) is reached. This method effectively ensures both the reliability and adequacy of the training corpus.

Contextualized Reasoning This study adopts the concept of Contextualized Reasoning, which is theoretically grounded in Polanyi’s paradox [35, 14]: human cognitive content consists of (1) *Explicit*

knowing, which can be formally articulated (e.g., the Supply-Demand Logic Chain in Fig. 1), and (2) *Tacit knowing*, which is too challenging to express explicitly (e.g., the complex domain-specific thinking process in Fig. 2). Fortunately, tacit knowing is not entirely unlearnable; rather, it can be acquired through concrete scenarios and case studies [5]—a principle that underpins our training strategy.

This methodology aligns with the educational theory of cognitive apprenticeship [9], enabling the model to gradually acquire expert-level domain thinking capabilities through contextualized case-based learning.

Model Training RARE, adopts a knowledge distillation-driven supervised fine-tuning paradigm, implemented as follows: Given a domain space S and its dataset $A \subset S$, our constructed domain adaptation framework can be formally expressed as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{RARE}} = \mathcal{L}(\theta_A; D_{\text{train}}^A) \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{(x, R(x), y) \sim D_{\text{test}}^A} [\ell(f_{\theta_A}(x, R(x)), y)]$$

where \mathcal{M} represents the methodological framework, D_{train}^A is a high-quality dataset obtained through knowledge distillation (incorporating reasoning process), and D_{test}^A contains only the problem x , the retrieved content $R(x)$, and the ground truth answer y for validation.

The implementation process of this method consists of two key stages:

1. **Fine-tuning stage:** Based on lightweight foundation models (such as Llama-3.1-8B), supervised learning is performed on the domain-specialized dataset D_{train}^A , optimizing model parameters θ_A until convergence.
2. **Domain performance verification:** The model’s capability is evaluated on a strictly isolated test set D_{test}^A , calculating the expected alignment between the predicted output $f_{\theta_A}(x, R(x))$ and the ground truth answer y .

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

This study focuses on knowledge-intensive question-answering (QA) datasets or those that can be conveniently transformed into a QA format (e.g., fact-checking datasets). The advantage of such datasets lies in the fact that these knowledge-intensive tasks inherently require models to perform multi-hop contextualized reasoning, while the standardized output structure of the QA format facilitates answer accuracy verification.

In the healthcare domain, we have established a multidimensional evaluation framework covering medical diagnosis, scientific literature analysis, and public health verification. Specifically, we employ five benchmark datasets: MedQA (clinical medical QA), PubMedQA (biomedical literature reasoning), PubHealth (public health fact-checking), CoVERT (pandemic knowledge verification), and BioASQ (biomedical semantic QA). These datasets are used to assess the model’s domain knowledge application and contextualized reasoning capabilities in complex medical scenarios.

Retrieved Content The retrieved content for MedQA, PubMedQA, and BioASQ comes from the multi-source medical knowledge base MedOmniKB [8], where we select the top_k = 3 source (which contains multiple documents). For the remaining datasets, we use the ground truth documents provided by the dataset itself.

4.2 Baselines

Our training primarily focuses on lightweight small models (e.g., Llama-3.1-8B), so we compare our method with various previous enhancement approaches:

- **CoT:** No training is performed. The model is provided only with the question x and a CoT prompt (e.g., “let’s think step-by-step”), allowing it to generate contextualized reasoning r and the final answer y based solely on its parametric knowledge.

Model	MedQA	PubMedQA	PubHealth	CoVERT	BioASQ
Llama-3.1-8B					
CoT	61.35	52.00	33.71	51.67	77.11
SFT	65.12	54.40	56.11	55.29	81.20
RAG	69.60	74.40	50.73	57.67	90.15
RARE	82.10	76.60	63.36	66.67	93.16
Qwen-2.5-7B					
CoT	57.50	37.20	20.02	31.67	74.30
SFT	62.22	45.80	57.17	43.33	78.77
RAG	66.77	54.80	46.96	47.00	90.79
RARE	78.95	78.63	63.04	74.14	93.95
Mistral-7B-v0.3					
CoT	51.77	34.29	31.68	50.00	68.94
SFT	57.58	44.40	53.16	41.67	78.52
RAG	56.48	70.88	48.01	46.67	90.78
RARE	71.25	76.94	64.91	67.80	91.96
GPT-4	80.99	46.40	34.17	41.33	83.38
GPT-4 + RAG	–	75.20	64.42	65.67	–
GPT-3.5	57.19	49.60	46.23	37.67	74.30
DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B + RAG	72.66	73.49	50.12	50.00	92.58

Table 1: Performance of Models Trained with the RARE Method (ACC)

- **SFT**: The model is trained using question x and its corresponding ground-truth answer y . During testing, the model is given only the question x and is expected to generate the answer y directly from its parametric knowledge.
- **RAG**: No training is performed. The model is provided with the question x , the retrieved content $R(x)$, and a CoT prompt, enabling it to generate contextualized reasoning r and the final answer y .
- **GPT-4**: Configured similarly to **CoT**, using the GPT-4-0613 version.
- **GPT-4 + RAG**: Configured similarly to **RAG**, using the GPT-4-0613 version.
- **GPT-3.5**: Configured similarly to **CoT**, using the GPT-3.5-turbo-0125 version.

4.3 Results

Table 1 presents the performance comparison of models trained using the RARE method. The experimental results demonstrate that RARE outperforms the three baseline methods—CoT, SFT, and RAG—across all benchmark tasks when applied to lightweight models such as Llama-3.1-8B, Qwen-2.5-7B, and Mistral-7B-v0.3.

The aforementioned experiments effectively demonstrate the efficacy of RARE. For models, possessing domain-specific thinking capabilities facilitates the integration of fragmented knowledge and enhances response quality. Models trained via RARE methodology exhibited significant performance improvements across most tasks. Compared to the same-sized reasoning model DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Llama-8B, our RARE-finetuned Llama-3.1-8B demonstrated superior performance across all tasks, notably achieving a 10% improvement on the medical diagnosis task MedQA. Our findings suggest that domain-specific thinking requires specialized training. Moreover, when compared to trillion-parameter models like GPT-4, our lightweight models (7B/8B parameters) trained with RARE methodology surpassed GPT-4’s accuracy by over 20% on PubMedQA, PubHealth, and CoVERT tasks.

Our results indicate that developing domain-specific thinking through RARE’s contextualized reasoning approach is more effective at enhancing specialized domain reasoning capabilities than simply increasing model size or incorporating external retrieval mechanisms. We further explored RARE’s performance across additional modalities and observed that the RARE-trained Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct model achieved a 5% accuracy improvement on VQA-RAD.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced RARE, a novel paradigm designed to address the challenges of integrating domain-specific knowledge and reasoning capabilities in LLMs. Inspired by Bloom’s Taxonomy, RARE decouples knowledge storage from reasoning optimization, enabling models to bypass parameter-intensive memorization and prioritize the development of higher-order cognitive processes. By dynamically retrieving external knowledge during inference and injecting it into training prompts, RARE transforms the learning objective from rote memorization to contextualized reasoning application. This approach reallocates model capacity from static knowledge storage to reasoning-focused parameters, achieving significant performance improvements under practical constraints.

Our experiments demonstrated that lightweight models trained with RARE (e.g., Llama-3.1-8B, Qwen-2.5-7B) outperform large-scale generic models such as GPT-4 and retrieval-augmented counterparts. For instance, RARE-trained models achieved up to a 20% increase in accuracy on tasks like PubMedQA and CoVERT. These results highlight the effectiveness of RARE in enhancing domain-specific reasoning capabilities without relying solely on model scaling or external retrieval mechanisms. Our work advances a paradigm shift in large reasoning models, where knowledge is outsourced to maintainable databases, and models specialize in sophisticated, contextualized inference. This approach not only improves accuracy and updatability but also offers a scalable path for domain-specific intelligence.

Our ongoing work will include more experiments on training data curation, reinforcement learning training, diverse domain-specific, multi-modal, and general open-domain benchmarks.

References

- [1] Dogu Araci. Finbert: Financial sentiment analysis with pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10063*, 2019.
- [2] Patricia Armstrong. Bloom’s taxonomy. *Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching*, pages 1–3, 2010.
- [3] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, et al. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arxiv:2310.11511*, 2023.
- [4] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511*, 2023.
- [5] David Autor. Polanyi’s paradox and the shape of employment growth. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014.
- [6] Benjamin S Bloom, Bertram B Mesia, and David R Krathwohl. Taxonomy of educational objectives (two vols: The affective domain & the cognitive domain). *New York. David McKay*, 9:122–136, 1964.
- [7] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Paper.pdf.
- [8] Zhe Chen, Yusheng Liao, Shuyang Jiang, Pingjie Wang, Yiqiu Guo, Yanfeng Wang, and Yu Wang. Towards omni-rag: Comprehensive retrieval-augmented generation for large language models in medical applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.02460*, 2025.
- [9] Allan Collins and Manu Kapur. *Cognitive apprenticeship*, volume 291. na, 2006.
- [10] DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-r1-lite-preview is now live: unleashing supercharged reasoning power!, November 2024. URL: <https://api-docs.deepseek.com/news/news1120>.
- [11] Guanting Dong, Yutao Zhu, Chenghao Zhang, Zechen Wang, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. Understand what LLM needs: Dual preference alignment for retrieval-augmented generation. *CoRR*, abs/2406.18676, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.18676>, arXiv:2406.18676, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2406.18676.
- [12] Guhao Feng, Bohang Zhang, Yuntian Gu, Haotian Ye, Di He, and Liwei Wang. Towards revealing the mystery behind chain of thought: a theoretical perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [13] Daniel Fleischer, Moshe Berchansky, Moshe Wasserblat, and Peter Izsak. Rag foundry: A framework for enhancing llms for retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02545*, 2024.
- [14] Stephen Gourlay. Tacit knowledge, tacit knowing, or behaving? 2002.
- [15] Xinyan Guan, Jiali Zeng, Fandong Meng, Chunlei Xin, Yaojie Lu, Hongyu Lin, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Jie Zhou. Deeprag: Thinking to retrieval step by step for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.01142*, 2025.
- [16] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [17] Kexin Huang, Jaan Altosaar, and Rajesh Ranganath. Clinicalbert: Modeling clinical notes and predicting hospital readmission. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.05342*, 2019.
- [18] Jinhao Jiang, Zhipeng Chen, Yingqian Min, Jie Chen, Xiaoxue Cheng, Jiapeng Wang, Yiru Tang, Haoxiang Sun, Jia Deng, Wayne Xin Zhao, et al. Technical report: Enhancing llm reasoning with reward-guided tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11694*, 2024.

- [19] Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Luyu Gao, et al. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv:2305.06983*, 2023.
- [20] Bowen Jin, Hansi Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Dong Wang, Hamed Zamani, and Jiawei Han. Search-r1: Training llms to reason and leverage search engines with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09516*, 2025.
- [21] David R Krathwohl. A revision of bloom’s taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice*, 41(4):212–218, 2002.
- [22] Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [23] Xiaoxi Li, Guanting Dong, Jiajie Jin, Yuyao Zhang, Yujia Zhou, Yutao Zhu, Peitian Zhang, and Zhicheng Dou. Search-o1: Agentic search-enhanced large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.05366*, 2025.
- [24] Hao Liu, Zhengren Wang, Xi Chen, Zhiyu Li, Feiyu Xiong, Qinhan Yu, and Wentao Zhang. Hoprag: Multi-hop reasoning for logic-aware retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12442*, 2025.
- [25] Jingyu Liu, Jiaen Lin, and Yong Liu. How much can RAG help the reasoning of llm? *CoRR*, abs/2410.02338, 2024. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2410.02338>, arXiv: 2410.02338, doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2410.02338.
- [26] Renqian Luo, Liai Sun, Yingce Xia, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Tie-Yan Liu. Biogpt: generative pre-trained transformer for biomedical text generation and mining. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 23(6):bbac409, 2022.
- [27] Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5303–5315, 2023.
- [28] Yingqian Min, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Jie Chen, Jia Deng, Yiwen Hu, Yiru Tang, Jiapeng Wang, Xiaoxue Cheng, Huatong Song, et al. Imitate, explore, and self-improve: A reproduction report on slow-thinking reasoning systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09413*, 2024.
- [29] Jessica Morley, Caio CV Machado, Christopher Burr, Josh Cowls, Indra Joshi, Mariarosaria Taddeo, and Luciano Floridi. The ethics of ai in health care: a mapping review. *Social science & medicine*, 260:113172, 2020.
- [30] OpenAI, :, Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, Alex Iftimie, Alex Karpenko, Alex Tachard Passos, Alexander Neitz, Alexander Prokofiev, Alexander Wei, Allison Tam, Ally Bennett, Ananya Kumar, Andre Saraiva, Andrea Vallone, Andrew Duberstein, Andrew Kondrich, Andrey Mishchenko, Andy Applebaum, Angela Jiang, Ashvin Nair, Barret Zoph, Behrooz Ghorbani, Ben Rossen, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Boaz Barak, Bob McGrew, Borys Minaiev, Botao Hao, Bowen Baker, Brandon Houghton, Brandon McKinzie, Brydon Eastman, Camillo Lugaresi, Cary Bassin, Cary Hudson, Chak Ming Li, Charles de Bourcy, Chelsea Voss, Chen Shen, Chong Zhang, Chris Koch, Chris Orsinger, Christopher Hesse, Claudia Fischer, Clive Chan, Dan Roberts, Daniel Kappler, Daniel Levy, Daniel Selsam, David Dohan, David Farhi, David Mely, David Robinson, Dimitris Tsipras, Doug Li, Dragos Oprica, Eben Freeman, Eddie Zhang, Edmund Wong, Elizabeth Proehl, Enoch Cheung, Eric Mitchell, Eric Wallace, Erik Ritter, Evan Mays, Fan Wang, Felipe Petroski Such, Filippo Raso, Florencia Leoni, Foivos Tsimpourlas, Francis Song, Fred von Lohmann, Freddie Sulit, Geoff Salmon, Giambattista Parascandolo, Gildas Chabot, Grace Zhao, Greg Brockman, Guillaume Leclerc, Hadi Salman, Haiming Bao, Hao Sheng, Hart Andrin, Hessam Bagherinezhad, Hongyu Ren, Hunter Lightman, Hyung Won Chung, Ian Kivlichan, Ian O’Connell, Ian Osband, Ignasi Clavera Gilaberte, Ilge Akkaya, Ilya Kostrikov, Ilya Sutskever, Irina Kofman, Jakub Pachocki, James Lennon, Jason Wei, Jean Harb, Jerry Twore, Jiacheng Feng, Jiahui Yu, Jiayi Weng, Jie Tang, Jieqi Yu, Joaquin Quiñero Candela, Joe Palermo, Joel Parish, Johannes Heidecke, John Hallman, John Rizzo, Jonathan Gordon, Jonathan Uesato, Jonathan Ward, Joost Huizinga, Julie Wang, Kai Chen, Kai Xiao, Karan Singhal, Karina Nguyen, Karl Cobbe, Katy Shi, Kayla Wood, Kendra Rimbach, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Kevin Liu, Kevin Lu, Kevin Stone, Kevin Yu, Lama Ahmad, Lauren Yang, Leo Liu, Leon Maksin, Leyton Ho, Liam Fedus, Lilian Weng, Linden Li, Lindsay McCallum, Lindsey Held, Lorenz Kuhn, Lukas Kondraciuk, Lukasz Kaiser, Luke

- Metz, Madelaine Boyd, Maja Trebacz, Manas Joglekar, Mark Chen, Marko Tintor, Mason Meyer, Matt Jones, Matt Kaufer, Max Schwarzer, Meghan Shah, Mehmet Yatbaz, Melody Y. Guan, Mengyuan Xu, Mengyuan Yan, Mia Glaese, Mianna Chen, Michael Lampe, Michael Malek, Michele Wang, Michelle Fradin, Mike McClay, Mikhail Pavlov, Miles Wang, Mingxuan Wang, Mira Murati, Mo Bavarian, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Nat McAleese, Neil Chowdhury, Neil Chowdhury, Nick Ryder, Nikolas Tezak, Noam Brown, Ofir Nachum, Oleg Boiko, Oleg Murk, Olivia Watkins, Patrick Chao, Paul Ashbourne, Pavel Izmailov, Peter Zhokhov, Rachel Dias, Rahul Arora, Randall Lin, Rapha Gontijo Lopes, Raz Gaon, Reah Miyara, Reimar Leike, Renny Hwang, Rhythm Garg, Robin Brown, Roshan James, Rui Shu, Ryan Cheu, Ryan Greene, Saachi Jain, Sam Altman, Sam Toizer, Sam Toyer, Samuel Miserendino, Sandhini Agarwal, Santiago Hernandez, Sasha Baker, Scott McKinney, Scottie Yan, Shengjia Zhao, Shengli Hu, Shibani Santurkar, Shraman Ray Chaudhuri, Shuyuan Zhang, Siyuan Fu, Spencer Papay, Steph Lin, Suchir Balaji, Suvansh Sanjeev, Szymon Sidor, Tal Broda, Aidan Clark, Tao Wang, Taylor Gordon, Ted Sanders, Tejal Patwardhan, Thibault Sottiaux, Thomas Degry, Thomas Dimson, Tianhao Zheng, Timur Garipov, Tom Stasi, Trapit Bansal, Trevor Creech, Troy Peterson, Tyna Eloundou, Valerie Qi, Vineet Kosaraju, Vinnie Monaco, Vitthyr Pong, Vlad Fomenko, Weiyei Zheng, Wenda Zhou, Wes McCabe, Wojciech Zaremba, Yann Dubois, Yinghai Lu, Yining Chen, Young Cha, Yu Bai, Yuchen He, Yuchen Zhang, Yunyun Wang, Zheng Shao, and Zhuohan Li. OpenAI o1 system card, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16720>, arXiv:2412.16720.
- [31] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023. arXiv:2303.08774.
- [32] Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikannan Sankarasubbu. Med-halt: Medical domain hallucination test for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15343*, 2023.
- [33] Shishir G Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E Gonzalez. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15334*, 2023.
- [34] Duy Khoa Pham and Bao Quoc Vo. Towards reliable medical question answering: Techniques and challenges in mitigating hallucinations in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13808*, 2024.
- [35] Michael Polanyi. Tacit knowing: Its bearing on some problems of philosophy. *Reviews of modern physics*, 34(4):601, 1962.
- [36] Stephen E. Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *FTIR*, 3(4):333–389, 2009.
- [37] Walter C Sá, Richard F West, and Keith E Stanovich. The domain specificity and generality of belief bias: Searching for a generalizable critical thinking skill. *Journal of educational psychology*, 91(3):497, 1999.
- [38] Qwen Team. Qwq: Reflect deeply on the boundaries of the unknown, November 2024. URL: <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b-preview/>.
- [39] Hieu Tran, Zonghai Yao, Junda Wang, Yifan Zhang, Zhichao Yang, and Hong Yu. Rare: Retrieval-augmented reasoning enhancement for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.02830*, 2024.
- [40] Fei Wang, Xingchen Wan, Ruoxi Sun, Jiefeng Chen, and Sercan Ö Arık. Astute rag: Overcoming imperfect retrieval augmentation and knowledge conflicts for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07176*, 2024.
- [41] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [42] Liang Wang, Haonan Chen, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Zhicheng Dou, and Furu Wei. Chain-of-retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14342*, 2025.
- [43] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, and Furu Wei. Query2doc: Query expansion with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07678*, 2023.
- [44] Zhengren Wang, Qinhan Yu, Shida Wei, Zhiyu Li, Feiyu Xiong, Xiaoxing Wang, Simin Niu, Hao Liang, and Wentao Zhang. QAEncoder: Towards Aligned Representation Learning in Question Answering System, September 2024. arXiv:2409.20434 [cs]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2409.20434>, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2409.20434.

- [45] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [46] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. Bloomberggpt: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023.
- [47] Fangyuan Xu, Weijia Shi, and Eunsol Choi. Recomp: Improving retrieval-augmented lms with compression and selective augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04408*, 2023.
- [48] Peng Xu, Wei Ping, Xianchao Wu, Lawrence McAfee, Chen Zhu, Zihan Liu, Sandeep Subramanian, Evelina Bakhturina, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. Retrieval meets long context large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03025*, 2023.
- [49] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- [50] Tian Ye, Zicheng Xu, Yuanzhi Li, and Zeyuan Allen-Zhu. Physics of language models: Part 2.2, how to learn from mistakes on grade-school math problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16293*, 2024.
- [51] Tianjun Zhang, Shishir G. Patil, Naman Jain, Sheng Shen, Matei Zaharia, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. Raft: Adapting language model to domain specific rag, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.10131>, arXiv:2403.10131.
- [52] Penghao Zhao, Hailin Zhang, Qinhan Yu, Zhengren Wang, Yunteng Geng, Fangcheng Fu, Ling Yang, Wentao Zhang, Jie Jiang, and Bin Cui. Retrieval-augmented generation for ai-generated content: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19473*, 2024.