Beyond Correctness: Rewarding Faithful Reasoning in Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Zhichao Xu[1]*, Zongyu Wu[2]*†, Yun Zhou[1], Aosong Feng[1], Kang Zhou[1], Sangmin Woo[1], Kiran Ramnath[1], Yijun Tian[1], Xuan Qi[1], Weikang Qiu[3]†, Lin Lee Cheong[1], Haibo Ding[1]
[1] Amazon AI Fundamental Research
[2] The Pennsylvania State University [3] Yale University
xzhichao@amazon.com,zongyuwu@psu.edu,hbding@amazon.com

Abstract

Inspired by the success of reinforcement learning (RL) in Large Language Model (LLM) training for domains like math and code, recent works have begun exploring how to train LLMs to use search engines more effectively as tools for retrieval-augmented generation. Although these methods achieve performance improvement across QA benchmarks, many prioritize final answer correctness while overlooking the quality of intermediate reasoning steps, which may lead to *chain-of-thought unfaithfulness*. In this paper, we first introduce a comprehensive evaluation framework for evaluating RL-based search agents, covering three distinct faithfulness metrics: *Information-Think faithfulness*, *Think-Search faithfulness*, and *Think-Answer faithfulness*. Our evaluations reveal that canonical search agents trained via Reinforcement Learning from Verifiable Reward (RLVR) — including SEARCH-R1 and RESEARCH — have significant room for improvement in this regard. To foster faithful reasoning, we introduce VERITAS (Verifying Entailed Reasoning through Intermediate Traceability in agentic search), a novel framework that integrates fine-grained faithfulness rewards into the reinforcement learning process. Our experiments show that models trained with VERITAS not only significantly improve reasoning faithfulness, but also achieve better task performance compared to the baselines trained against pure outcome-based reward.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) have achieved remarkable success across diverse domains (Brown et al., 2020; Georgiev et al., 2024; Grattafiori et al., 2024), yet they continue to face persistent challenges such as hallucinations (Li et al., 2023; Maynez et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2025) and outdated knowledge (Mousavi et al., 2024). Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG, Lewis et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2024) mitigates these issues by grounding outputs in up-to-date external knowledge. However, retrieve-then-generate pipelines often fail on complex, multi-turn reasoning requiring evidence synthesis (Gao et al., 2023; Trivedi et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2023). RL-based RAG methods (Jin et al., 2025b; Li et al., 2025; Chen et al., 2025; Song et al., 2025), often referred to as agentic search (Singh et al., 2025; Liang et al., 2025), address this limitation by training the policy model to reason and interact with the retriever.

Despite strong benchmark performance, existing agentic search methods primarily optimize for final-answer correctness (Jin et al., 2025b; Chen et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025) while overlooking intermediate-step faithfulness (Baker et al., 2025; Bao et al., 2025). Prior work shows that this outcome-only training can produce reasoning traces misaligned with the final answer (*chain-of-thought unfaithfulness*) (Lanham et al., 2023; Bentham et al., 2024). We argue CoT faithfulness (Baker et al., 2025) and contextual faithfulness (Malaviya et al., 2025) are especially important for RL-based search agents, because intermediate steps should transparently show how complex questions are decomposed into retrieval actions and synthesized into final answers (Marchionini, 2006). Yet faithfulness in agentic search remains underdefined and under-evaluated.

To systematically address this ambiguity, we first formalize and quantify faithfulness in agentic search. We propose a novel evaluation framework centered on three key dimensions of reasoning traceability: **Information-Think** faithfulness (*do the agent's thoughts consider the retrieved information?*), **Think-Search** faithfulness (*are search queries justified by the agent's thoughts?*), and **Think-Answer** faithfulness (*is the final answer grounded in the agent's thoughts?*). Applying this framework to popular agentic search models

*Both authors contributed equally to this work.
†Work done during an internship at Amazon Web Services.



Figure 1: Evaluation of SEARCH-R1, RESEARCH and DESA on task performance (Exact Match) and faithfulness dimensions. Top: results on NQ dataset. Bottom: results on HotpotQA dataset. We can notice that: while models are trained with pure outcome-based reward, their good task performance does not automatically guarantee fully faithful reasoning chains — notably the Information-Think faithfulness dimension — which may be suboptimal for the practical deployment of such systems.

such as SEARCH-R1 (Jin et al., 2025b) and RESEARCH (Chen et al., 2025), reveals a critical disconnection: as shown in Figure 1, gains in final-answer accuracy do not automatically guarantee the faithfulness of intermediate reasoning steps.

Motivated by process-supervision work for RL (Cobbe et al., 2021; Lightman et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2025), we hypothesize that optimizing only outcome reward hurts both reasoning quality and performance. Directly training on faithfulness is difficult because one trajectory mixes multiple output types that are hard to score consistently.

These findings motivate process-oriented supervision. We introduce **VERITAS** (**V**erifying **E**ntailed **R**easoning through **I**ntermediate **T**raceability in **A**gentic **S**earch), which injects fine-grained faithfulness rewards into RL training. Compared with SEARCH-R1, our model VERITAS-R1 improves information-think faithfulness by about 14%, think-answer faithfulness by about 7.7%, and also improves task accuracy. In summary, our contributions are:

- We propose a formal definition and a corresponding evaluation framework for faithfulness in agentic search, centered on three novel metrics: Information-Think, Think-Answer, and Think-Search Faithfulness.
- Through this framework, we conduct a comprehensive analysis of leading RL-based search agents, revealing a gap between their task performance and the reasoning faithfulness.

- We introduce VERITAS, a novel training framework that integrates fine-grained faithfulness metrics as process-based rewards into the RL loop. Our experiments show that the proposed method effectively improves the model's faithfulness while maintaining comparable task accuracy across seven downstream QA benchmarks.

2 Related Work

Faithfulness in reasoning and contextualization. Although explicit reasoning can enhance LLM performance, the presence of intermediate steps does not necessarily reveal the true causal mechanisms behind model outputs (Balasubramanian et al., 2025). A key question is whether these steps genuinely support the final answer or merely serve as plausible post-hoc explanations (Turpin et al., 2023; Lanham et al., 2023). This concern has motivated a growing body of research on *Chain-of-Thought (CoT) faithfulness* (Atanasova et al., 2023; Paul et al., 2024; Balasubramanian et al., 2025; Chua and Evans, 2025; Parcalabescu and Frank, 2024). Counterfactual approaches (Atanasova et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023) analyze how perturbing reasoning steps affects model predictions, while adversarial methods (Lanham et al., 2023; Matton et al., 2025) intervene on the CoT or model states to probe causal dependencies (Balasubramanian et al., 2025). Another popular direction focuses on bias articulation and explanation reliability (Turpin et al., 2023; Balasubramanian et al., 2025; Arcuschin et al., 2025).

Beyond reasoning traces, LLMs often exhibit *contextual unfaithfulness* — producing outputs that contradict or are unsupported by given contexts (Huang et al., 2025; Bi et al., 2025; Ye et al., 2023). This phenomenon limits their reliability in applications requiring factual grounding. Prior studies (Dziri et al., 2022b,a; Ming et al., 2025; Malaviya et al., 2025) have evaluated whether model responses are properly entailed by reference passages, emphasizing accurate synthesis without introducing unsupported claims. Together, these works reveal the importance of verifying both reasoning and contextual grounding, yet they primarily focus on static text generation rather than dynamic, search-driven reasoning.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation. Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG, Lewis et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023; Trivedi et al., 2023; Fan et al., 2024; Chan et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025; Jiang et al., 2025) enables LLMs to access external knowledge for more factual and up-to-date responses. RAG techniques span diverse directions (Gao et al., 2023), including query rewriting (Ma et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2024a), iterative retrieval (Li et al., 2025), and supervised fine-tuning for tool use (Asai et al., 2023; Schick et al., 2023). Despite their effectiveness on QA and knowledge-intensive tasks (Lewis et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2025), many RAG systems depend heavily on prompt engineering or are difficult to scale (Sun et al., 2025). More critically, they are typically evaluated on final-answer accuracy, overlooking whether the intermediate reasoning steps remain faithful to the retrieved evidence.

Agentic Search with Reinforcement Learning. Reinforcement Learning (RL, Watkins and Dayan, 1992; Kaelbling et al., 1996; Sutton et al., 1998) has been widely adopted to align model behavior with long-term objectives. Early work explored RL from human feedback (Stiennon et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022; Gheshlaghi Azar et al., 2024; Kaufmann et al., 2025), often using Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO, Schulman et al., 2017). Recent methods such as Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO, Shao et al., 2024) improve stability and sample efficiency by removing the need for a separate critic, while off-policy preference optimization methods (Rafailov et al., 2023; Meng et al., 2024) are more scalable but lacks behind in terms of performance (Lanchantin et al., 2025).

Chain-of-Thought prompting (Wei et al., 2022; Kojima et al., 2022) decomposes complex tasks into interpretable steps (Geva et al., 2021; Chu et al., 2024) to achieve better performance. ReAct (Yao et al., 2023) asks the LLM-based agent to reason before taking actions. Based on these technical approaches, recent works have explored training reasoning-focused LLMs (Jaech et al., 2024). For instance, DeepSeek-R1 (Guo et al., 2025) employs GRPO to generate long reasoning chains that solve challenging queries. Inspired by this success, several works have applied RL to CoT-based reasoning, training LLMs to interact with search tools (Chen et al., 2025; Jin et al., 2025b; Song et al., 2025). While outcome-based approaches (Jin et al., 2025b; Li et al., 2025) optimize for final-answer correctness, others design intermediate rewards to encourage more deliberate search or reasoning (Jin et al., 2025a; Wang et al., 2025b; Shi et al., 2025b; Zhao et al., 2025b). For example, Au-

toRefine (Shi et al., 2025b) introduces a retrieval-specific reward that encourages models to utilize evidence effectively — a signal conceptually related to faithfulness.

However, no prior work has comprehensively evaluated or formalized the notion of faithfulness in RL-based agentic search. To fill this gap, we propose an evaluation framework consisting of three distinct faithfulness dimensions for agentic search use case; and further proposes a training-based approach that integrates these faithfulness dimensions as fine-grained, process-level rewards.

3 Faithfulness Evaluation Framework

As noted in § 1, a critical limitation of current RL-based search agents is that the policy trained with pure outcome-based reward may elicit unfaithful reasoning. To systematically diagnose this issue, we need to establish a formal evaluation. We first briefly introduce the essential background, then present our proposed evaluation framework.

3.1 Background: Agentic Search Trajectory

In agentic search, LLMs dynamically use search engines as tools. We select SEARCH-R1 (Jin et al., 2025b) as a canonical example (training algorithm details in Appendix E). At a high level, the policy is optimized with Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) using final-answer reward and process-level signals over complete trajectories. The interaction process produces a structured trajectory containing text blocks wrapped with four types of tags (Jin et al., 2025b):

- `<think></think>`: The agent's internal reasoning, where it analyzes information and plans its next step.
- `<search></search>`: The search query generated by the agent to send to the retriever.
- `<information></information>`: The retrieved information from the search tool.
- `<answer></answer>`: The agent's final answer to the initial query.

Since the RL-based search agent is purely trained to optimize the outcome-based reward (e.g., the correctness of the final answer), it therefore overlooks the integrity of this intermediate trajectory. Seeing this gap, we develop a framework to systematically measure the faithfulness of the intermediate reasoning steps.

3.2 Faithfulness Definitions

To systematically analyze the quality of the reasoning process in agentic search, we introduce a structured framework based on three distinct, turn-by-turn notions of faithfulness. These definitions provide a theoretical grounding for our subsequent evaluation. Let a trajectory be a sequence of alternating thoughts, search queries, and retrieved information, culminating in a final answer. Formally, we define the following three types of faithfulness in the context of agentic search:

Think-Search faithfulness. This dimension assesses the logical connection between the agent's internal reasoning process and its subsequent search query. A search query is considered faithful if it is a direct and necessary consequence of an information gap explicitly identified or implicitly raised in the immediately preceding thought process. The core principle is that the agent should "search what it thinks it needs", ensuring that its information-gathering actions are deliberate and well-motivated by its reasoning state.

Information-Think faithfulness. This dimension evaluates whether the agent's reasoning properly uses the evidence it has just acquired. The thinking block following an information block is considered faithful if its reasoning is a valid synthesis, summary, or logical deduction from the newly retrieved information. This form of faithfulness is crucial for preventing the model from ignoring evidence, thereby ensuring the integrity of each step in the reasoning chain.

Think-Answer faithfulness. This dimension measures whether the final answer is supported by the cumulative knowledge gathered throughout the entire trajectory. The final answer is deemed faithful if the final claim it makes is entailed by the content within the *latest preceding thinking block*. This formulation ensures that the agent does not introduce new, unverified information at the final step and that its conclusion is attributed to the complete, self-contained search and reasoning trajectory.

Appendix L presents trajectories from SEARCH-R1 as case studies to contextualize about these faithfulness definitions.

3.3 Evaluation Metrics

To operationalize the faithfulness dimensions which we have defined in § 3.2, we design evaluation metrics that align with the semantic role of each transition in the agentic search trajectory.

We combine lightweight automatic checks with LLM-based judgment, reflecting the different levels of semantic subtlety required across faithfulness types. Specifically, Think-Search faithfulness is measured by entailment-based consistency between thought and subsequent query, Information-Think faithfulness by LLM-judge verification of evidence usage, and Think-Answer faithfulness by whether the answer is supported by preceding thought content. Due to the space constraint, we leave full details about the evaluation metrics to Appendix D, including our rationales for model-based and lexical-based evaluators, LLM-as-a-Judge (LLMaaJ) model choices and their prompt templates. We also include a discussion on meta evaluations.

Generalizability. The proposed metrics are instantiated for SEARCH-R1, but the underlying framework is broadly applicable to any reasoning-centric system that produces *structured trajectories*, such as RESEARCH (Chen et al., 2025) and DESA (Wang et al., 2025a). As it operates over the abstract *think–search–information–answer* schema, the evaluation methodology remains agnostic to model architecture and domain, which enables consistent assessment of turn-level faithfulness across diverse multi-turn retrieval and reasoning agents.

3.4 Faithfulness Evaluation Results

To have a basic understanding of the faithfulness of existing agentic search models, we evaluate three RL-based RAG models: SEARCH-R1 (Jin et al., 2025b), RESEARCH (Chen et al., 2025) and DESA (Wang et al., 2025a) trained against outcome-based rewards. We use their official checkpoints to ensure reproducibility. For Think-Search faithfulness and Think-Answer faithfulness, we also calculate the agreement rate and Fleiss's κ as meta-evaluation of the two evaluation metrics. From results in Figure 1, we make these key observations.

- **The Information-Think Faithfulness of evaluated models are far from perfect**. For example, SEARCH-R1-7B-Base PPO has an Information-Think faithfulness score of 0.564 on the complex multi-hop HotpotQA dataset, while the best checkpoint we evaluated — RESEARCH-7B-Base achieves 0.586, suggesting that *the policy models trained against pure outcome-based reward are not fully faithful to the retrieved information during the thinking process*.
- **Strong task performance does not directly translate to high faithfulness scores**. For example, DESA-7B achieves competitive performance on both NQ and HotpotQA datasets, yet it consistently underperforms SEARCH-R1 and RESEARCH in all three faithfulness dimensions.
- **All evaluated checkpoints have high Think-Search faithfulness**. For instance, SEARCH-R1 has a Think-Search score of 0.935 on NQ dataset when using LLMaaJ. The results suggest that the model's search query aligns well with its verbalized reasoning process.

We also note that SEARCH-R1-7B-Base-PPO-Format (Jin et al., 2025a) shows poor Information-Think faithfulness. A closer manual examination of its traces suggested that for the `<think> </think>` block after retrieved information, the policy often directly transitions to the next search query without reasoning over the documents, e.g., "`<information>`...`</information><think>`I need to find out the name of the first person who got the Nobel Prize in Physics.`</think>`". The policy also tends to continue to search until reaching the maximum number of allowed search turns, then being forced to generate an answer, leading to poor Think-Answer faithfulness, e.g., "`<think>`I need to find out who got the first Nobel Prize in Physics.`</think><answer>` Wilhelm Röntgen `</answer>`". These observations collectively reveal that *a modified reward shaping by adding a format reward may improve model performance, but in return potentially breaks the model's reasoning consistency*.

3.5 Meta Evaluation

As we evaluate RL-based RAG models, we are also conducting meta evaluation of our evaluation metrics. We report detailed meta evaluation results in Table 6. While using a powerful LLM-as-a-Judge provides high-quality faithfulness labels, its cost and latency make it impractical for scalable evaluation. For Information-Think faithfulness, we propose to use a smaller reward model by distilling from the LLM judge, which we leave details to § 4. For Think-Search faithfulness, we observed high agreement rate between the LLM judge and the NLI model, thus we propose to use the NLI model as the automatic evaluation. For Think-Answer faithfulness, we notice a moderate inconsistency between Sub-EM and NLI metric. A closer manual evaluation suggests that as the RAG datasets primarily focus on short-form answers, the NLI model trained on symmetric (`Premise`,

Hypothesis) pairs often predict "No entailment" for coherent think-answer pairs, leading to high False Positive rate. Therefore, we adopt Sub-EM as the automatic metric for Think-Answer faithfulness evaluation.

To summarize, we observe that despite their strong answer accuracy, the three RL-based RAG models we examined still exhibit notable weaknesses in reasoning faithfulness — particularly in how retrieved evidence is integrated into the thought process. This observation underscores a fundamental limitation of existing agentic search models trained solely with outcome-based rewards: they fail to incentivize faithful reasoning traces to arrive at final answers.

4 VERITAS: Training Faithful Search Agents with Process Supervision

Our analysis in § 3 revealed a critical gap: RL agents trained with purely outcome-based rewards often fail to produce faithful reasoning, even when they arrive at the correct final answer. This finding highlights the need for direct process supervision. To fill this gap, we introduce VERITAS, a framework designed to train search agents that are not only correct but also verifiably faithful. An overview of the pipeline with PPO RL algorithm is shown in Figure 4. The core principle of VERITAS is to enrich the RL reward signal with fine-grained feedback on the quality of the intermediate reasoning steps. This is achieved through two key components: a multi-faceted reward function that balances task accuracy with reasoning faithfulness, and a practical, distilled process reward model to efficiently supervise the RL training.

4.1 Reward Design

The foundation of VERITAS is a reward function that combines the conventional outcome-based reward with our proposed process-based faithfulness metrics. Denote the outcome-based reward as $\mathcal{R}_{EM}$, measured by the exact match between the predicted answer and the groundtruth as in SEARCH-R1. For the two key faithfulness dimensions we optimize during training, we define their corresponding rewards as $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{info-think}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{think-answer}}$. The final reward function is a weighted sum:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R} = w_{EM} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{EM} + w_{\textit{info-think}} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{\textit{info-think}} \\ + w_{\textit{think-search}} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{\textit{think-search}} \\ + w_{\textit{think-answer}} \cdot \mathcal{R}_{\textit{think-answer}},\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where w are hyperparameters as weights of each corresponding reward component. This reward formulation explicitly optimizes the agent to balance task accuracy (EM) and the faithfulness of its reasoning process. We ground our implementation of VERITAS on the SEARCH-R1 framework.

Practically, we opted to set $w_{\textit{think-search}} = 0$, i.e., skipping the $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{think-search}}$ term. The reason for this choice is threefold: (i) quantitatively, we observed in § 3 that all checkpoints we evaluated are already showing high Think-Search faithfulness; (ii) in our manual inspections of the SEARCH-R1 trajectories, we found that the model has developed a consistent pattern of "first reason about its information need, then write the search query" (case studies in Appendix L), suggesting that training with EM reward already equipped the policy model with robust think-search faithfulness; (iii) training search agents is time-consuming and computationally expensive. Removing this term eliminates an extra hyperparameter, thereby streamlining training and improving efficiency.

We should note that VERITAS can be considered as a conceptual framework that incorporates faithfulness as a process reward to improve the search agent. The exact instantiation of each individual reward can be implemented differently. In this work, we use a model-based approach for information-think faithfulness and substring exact-match for think-answer faithfulness, and leave more exploration of other reward implementations — such as rich semantic matching signals for think-answer faithfulness — to future work.

4.2 Distilled Reward Model

The cost and latency of the LLMaaJ approach make it impractical for scalable on-policy RL training. To tackle this challenge, a core component of the VERITAS framework is a smaller, distilled reward model (RM) trained to replicate the judgments of the larger LLMaaJ, so as to provide scalable and consistent supervision throughout the RL training. In line with our observations and discussions in § 3, we focus exclusively on information-think faithfulness. We refer more details about the reward modeling training to Appendix H.

4.3 Training Curriculum

In preliminary RL experiments, we found that directly applying the faithfulness rewards $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{info-think}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{think-answer}}$ substantially improved faithfulness metrics but slightly reduced task performance

Table 1: Performance of different methods on selected QA datasets. † denotes in-domain datasets and * denotes out-of-domain dataset. All the baseline results are from Jin et al. (2025b). VERITAS-R1 is SEARCH-R1 trained with our VERITAS framework. ♣ indicates statistically significant improvement compared to Search-R1-7B-Base-PPO, while ♠ indicates significant compared to Search-R1-7B-Base-PPO w/ Format.

Methods	**General QA**			**Multi-Hop QA**				**Avg.**
	NQ†	TriviaQA*	PopQA*	HotpotQA†	2wiki*	Musique*	Bamboogle*	
Direct Inference	0.134	0.408	0.140	0.183	0.250	0.031	0.120	0.181
CoT	0.048	0.185	0.054	0.092	0.111	0.022	0.232	0.106
IRCoT	0.224	0.478	0.301	0.133	0.149	0.072	0.224	0.239
Search-o1	0.151	0.443	0.131	0.187	0.176	0.058	0.296	0.206
RAG	0.349	0.585	0.392	0.299	0.235	0.058	0.208	0.304
SFT	0.318	0.354	0.121	0.217	0.259	0.066	0.112	0.207
R1-base	0.297	0.539	0.202	0.242	0.273	0.083	0.296	0.276
R1-instruct	0.270	0.537	0.199	0.237	0.292	0.072	0.293	0.271
Rejection Sampling	0.360	0.592	0.380	0.331	0.296	0.123	0.355	0.348
DESA-3B-Instruct-GRPO	0.375	0.575	0.397	0.352	0.363	0.134	0.347	0.363
DESA-7B-Instrct-GRPO	0.468	0.631	0.440	0.424	0.374	0.197	0.395	0.418
RESEARCH-7B-Base	0.396	0.606	0.442	0.406	0.447	0.217	0.432	0.422
RESEARCH-7B-Instruct	0.415	0.640	0.450	0.435	**0.476**	**0.223**	0.424	0.438
SEARCH-R1-7B-Base-PPO w/ Format	**0.488**	0.644	**0.469**	0.436	0.412	0.187	0.403	0.434
SEARCH-R1-7B-Base-PPO	0.480	0.638	0.457	0.433	0.382	0.196	0.432	0.431
VERITAS-R1								
EM+Info-Think	0.486	0.650	0.463	0.445	0.423	0.206	0.456	**0.447**♣♠
EM+Think-Ans	0.482	**0.658**	0.464	0.445	0.420	0.189	0.416	0.439
EM+Info-Think+Think-Ans	0.484	0.645	0.466	**0.446**	0.419	0.192	**0.464**	0.445♣

compared to SEARCH-R1. We hypothesize that introducing these rewards too early restricts the policy model's exploration of diverse reasoning strategies, causing it to over-optimize for faithfulness — a form of reward hacking. To mitigate this, we adopt a curriculum learning-inspired strategy: from step 1 to T_1, we use only outcome-based rewards by setting $w_{\textit{info-think}}$ and $w_{\textit{think-answer}}$ in Equation (1) to 0; from $T_1 + 1$ to T_2, we linearly warm up these weights (note that this reward warmup is separate from the linear learning rate schedule); and from T_2 onward, we apply the full rewards. Practically, T_1 is set to the end of the first training epoch, and the warmup lasts 0.5 epoch.

VERITAS framework provides a practical methodology for process supervision by combining a multi-faceted reward function with an efficient, distilled reward model. This enables direct optimization of reasoning faithfulness during RL training without sacrificing performance or scalability.

5 Experiments

We conduct a series of experiments to validate our central hypothesis: that incorporating process-based faithfulness rewards via the VERITAS framework can improve both the reliability of an agent's reasoning and its final task performance. We focus on the following key research questions:

- **RQ1:** Does training with VERITAS lead to improvement in reasoning faithfulness?
- **RQ2:** How does this process supervision affect final task accuracy compared to purely outcome-based RL training?

5.1 Experiment Setup

Models and datasets. To ensure a fair comparison, we build our implementation directly upon the SEARCH-R1 framework. We use the Qwen2.5-7B-Base model (Yang et al., 2024) as our policy model and PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) as the RL algorithm, mirroring the best-performing configuration of the original SEARCH-R1. Evaluation spans seven diverse QA benchmarks: NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), PopQA (Mallen et al., 2023), HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), 2Wiki (Ho et al., 2020), Musique (Trivedi et al., 2022), and Bamboogle (Press et al., 2023). These datasets cover a range of complexities from general to multi-hop QA, allowing for a comprehensive assessment.

Baselines. We compare our model, which we refer to as **VERITAS-R1** (i.e., SEARCH-R1 trained with the VERITAS framework), against a comprehensive set of baselines. Our primary comparison is the original SEARCH-R1 (Jin et al.,



Figure 2: Faithfulness evaluation results comparing two variants of Search-R1 and our methods.



Figure 3: Hyperparameter sensitivity study. Increasing $w_{\textit{info-think}}, w_{\textit{think-answer}}$ to > 0.05 degrades task performance.

2025b), which uses outcome-only RL. We additionally report prompt-only baselines (direct inference and CoT), retrieval-based baselines (RAG, IR-CoT, and Search-o1), and training-based baselines (SFT, RL without search, and rejection sampling with search). This set allows us to compare VERITAS-R1 against both training-free and training-based alternatives under the same evaluation protocol; complete implementation details are provided in Appendix G.

Metrics. To answer our research questions, we evaluate all models on: (i) *Task Performance*, measured by Exact Match (EM), and (ii) *Reasoning Faithfulness*, using our proposed Information-Think and Think-Answer faithfulness metrics (§ 3.3). For task performance, we also conducted Wilcoxon signed-rank test ($n = 7$ datasets), and report statistical significance at $p = 0.05$ level.

5.2 Results and Analysis

Table 1 reports the task performance (EM) and Figure 2 reports the faithfulness results. Full results are referred to Table 11.

VERITAS improves reasoning faithfulness (RQ1). As shown in Figure 2, training with VERITAS rewards leads to gains in faithfulness. For example, incorporating the $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{info-think}}$ reward can largely improve Info-Think faithfulness across all dataset categories. For example, on general QA datasets, average Information-Think faithfulness increases from 0.734 for the baseline SEARCH-R1 to 0.853 for VERITAS-R1. Interestingly, VERI-

Table 2: Effects of the training curriculum to task performance. We use the VERITAS Info-Think variant to show the tradeoff between task performance and Info-Think faithfulness between two training strategies.

Method	NQ	TriviaQA	PopQA	HotpotQA	2wiki	MuSiQue	Bamboogle	Average
Exact Match (EM)								
w/o curriculum	0.471	0.641	0.480	0.437	0.429	0.174	0.400	0.433
w/ curriculum	0.486	0.650	0.463	0.445	0.423	0.206	0.456	0.447
Info-Think Faithfulness								
w/o curriculum	0.956	0.832	0.826	0.786	0.595	0.619	0.749	0.766
w/ curriculum	0.933	0.821	0.819	0.718	0.354	0.490	0.744	0.697

TAS-R1 can further improve Search-R1's Think-Search Faithfulness on both general QA and Multi-Hop QA datasets even if we do not adopt think-search faithfulness as the training signal. This directly validates that our process-based rewards successfully steer the agent towards generating more grounded and verifiable reasoning steps. Gains in think–answer faithfulness are clear on multi-hop datasets; however, improvements are less stable on general QA datasets.

Improved faithfulness translates to higher accuracy (RQ2). Crucially, the improvement in reasoning quality translates to better final performance. As detailed in Table 1, VERITAS-R1 consistently outperforms the strong SEARCH-R1 baseline across the majority of datasets. On the challenging multi-hop datasets, VERITAS-R1 improves the average EM score from 0.361 to 0.380. The average EM score on general QA datasets also increases from 0.524 to 0.532. This demonstrates that encouraging the model to "think" more faithfully is not a constraint but a facilitator for finding the correct answer, effectively reducing reward hacking and promoting more robust problem-solving strategies.

5.3 Ablation Studies

Analysis of reward components. Our analysis also reveals nuances in how different faithfulness rewards affect behavior. While the Information-Think reward generally provides a positive signal for faithfulness and EM, the Think-Answer reward has a more complex effect. As seen in Figure 2, although adding $\mathcal{R}_{\textit{think-answer}}$ improves its corresponding metric on a macro average (0.865 vs 0.808 averaged over 7 datasets), it leads to a slight drop on TriviaQA and PopQA datasets. This suggests that ensuring thoughts are grounded in evidence ($\mathcal{R}_{\textit{info-think}}$) is a more effective and stable mechanism for improving overall search model quality than enforcing a strict logical entailment to the final answer during training.

Hyperparameter sensitivity. We experiment with different hyperparameters $w_{\textit{info-think}}, w_{\textit{think-answer}}$ and report results in Figure 3. We notice that increasing both hyperparameters to greater than 0.05 leads to performance degradation, as the policy model overly focus on the faithfulness reward. Therefore, we opted to use $w_{\textit{info-think}} = 0.05$, $w_{\textit{think-answer}} = 0.02$ as our final combined reward.

Effects of the training curriculum. We show an ablation study of the training curriculum in Table 2. We use a simplified setting to only compare two reward signals — EM and Info-Think faithfulness — and their corresponding evaluation results. We notice that directly adding the faithfulness reward at the start of the training makes the policy model learn to hack the faithfulness reward, leading the lower EM results at the end of the training. The training dynamics (Figure 5) also suggest that directly adding the faithfulness reward at the start of the training limits the policy model's exploration.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, we tackle the issue of unfaithful reasoning in RL-based agentic search, where models optimized for final answers often produce untrustworthy intermediate steps. We introduced a formal evaluation framework with three faithfulness metrics and proposed VERITAS, a training paradigm that integrates these metrics as process-based rewards. Our central finding is that rewarding the reasoning process can create a positive synergy, leading to agents that are not only more faithful but also achieve higher task accuracy. This finding underscores the value of process supervision for developing more reliable and transparent AI agents. Future research could also focus on more reliable and scalable methods for fine-grained faithfulness rewards, and incorporate them into RL training.

Limitations

While our work demonstrates the benefits of incorporating faithfulness rewards, we acknowledge that there are still several limitations in our work. First, our evaluation of Information-Think Faithfulness relies on an LLMaaJ, which we subsequently use our trained reward model. Although we show this approach is effective, it is inherently subject to the biases and potential errors of the judge model. It is worth exploring the development of more objective, non–model-based metrics for evaluating faithfulness in agentic search models. Second, our Think-Answer Faithfulness metric is based on a regex match, which is precise but may lack recall. It can fail to recognize legitimate paraphrasing or logical inference, potentially treats a faithful answer as unfaithful. More sophisticated semantic matching techniques could provide a more robust evaluation. Lastly, our experiments were conducted on open-domain question-answering tasks. The effectiveness of our proposed rewards may vary in other domains, such as enterprise search or medical QA, where the nature of evidence and reasoning can be substantially different. Future work should explore the generalizability of these faithfulness-aware training methods to a wider range of applications.

Potential Risks

We use public benchmarks licensed for academic usage. Our small scale human evaluation is conducted by an author of this paper, who is a trained NLP researcher. To the best of our knowledge, this paper does not incur potential risks and ethical concerns.

References

Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. 2024. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 225–237.

Anthropic. 2025. Claude 3.7 sonnet and claude code.

Iván Arcuschin, Jett Janiak, Robert Krzyzanowski, Senthooran Rajamanoharan, Neel Nanda, and Arthur Conmy. 2025. Chain-of-thought reasoning in the wild is not always faithful. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.08679.

Rahul K. Arora, Jason Wei, Rebecca Soskin Hicks, Preston Bowman, Joaquin Quiñonero-Candela, Foivos Tsimpourlas, Michael Sharman, Meghan Shah, Andrea Vallone, Alex Beutel, Johannes Heidecke, and Karan Singhal. 2025. Healthbench: Evaluating large language models towards improved human health. *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.08775.

Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *Preprint*, arXiv:2310.11511.

Pepa Atanasova, Oana-Maria Camburu, Christina Lioma, Thomas Lukasiewicz, Jakob Grue Simonsen, and Isabelle Augenstein. 2023. Faithfulness tests for natural language explanations. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 283–294.

Bowen Baker, Joost Huizinga, Leo Gao, Zehao Dou, Melody Y. Guan, Aleksander Madry, Wojciech Zaremba, Jakub Pachocki, and David Farhi. 2025. Monitoring reasoning models for misbehavior and the risks of promoting obfuscation. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.11926.

Sriram Balasubramanian, Samyadeep Basu, and Soheil Feizi. 2025. A closer look at bias and chain-of-thought faithfulness of large (vision) language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, pages 13406–13439.

Guangsheng Bao, Hongbo Zhang, Cunxiang Wang, Linyi Yang, and Yue Zhang. 2025. How likely do LLMs with CoT mimic human reasoning? In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 7831–7850.

Oliver Bentham, Nathan Stringham, and Ana Marasovic. 2024. Chain-of-thought unfaithfulness as disguised accuracy. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.

Baolong Bi, Shaohan Huang, Yiwei Wang, Tianchi Yang, Zihan Zhang, Haizhen Huang, Lingrui Mei, Junfeng Fang, Zehao Li, Furu Wei, Weiwei Deng, Feng Sun, Qi Zhang, and Shenghua Liu. 2025. Context-DPO: Aligning language models for context-faithfulness. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 10280–10300.

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, and 12 others. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901.

Chi-Min Chan, Chunpu Xu, Ruibin Yuan, Hongyin Luo, Wei Xue, Yike Guo, and Jie Fu. 2024. RQ-RAG:

Learning to refine queries for retrieval augmented generation. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*.

Sherman Chann. 2023. Non-determinism in gpt-4 is caused by sparse moe.

Mingyang Chen, Linzhuang Sun, Tianpeng Li, Haoze Sun, Yijie Zhou, Chenzheng Zhu, Haofen Wang, Jeff Z. Pan, Wen Zhang, Huajun Chen, Fan Yang, Zenan Zhou, and Weipeng Chen. 2025. Research: Learning to reason with search for llms via reinforcement learning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.19470.

Yanda Chen, Ruiqi Zhong, Narutatsu Ri, Chen Zhao, He He, Jacob Steinhardt, Zhou Yu, and Kathleen McKeown. 2023. Do models explain themselves? counterfactual simulatability of natural language explanations. *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.08678.

Zheng Chu, Jingchang Chen, Qianglong Chen, Weijiang Yu, Tao He, Haotian Wang, Weihua Peng, Ming Liu, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2024. Navigate through enigmatic labyrinth a survey of chain of thought reasoning: Advances, frontiers and future. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1173–1203.

James Chua and Owain Evans. 2025. Are deepseek r1 and other reasoning models more faithful? *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.08156.

Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *Preprint*, arXiv:2110.14168.

Kaustubh Deshpande, Ved Sirdeshmukh, Johannes Baptist Mols, Lifeng Jin, Ed-Yeremai Hernandez-Cardona, Dean Lee, Jeremy Kritz, Willow E. Primack, Summer Yue, and Chen Xing. 2025. MultiChallenge: A realistic multi-turn conversation evaluation benchmark challenging to frontier LLMs. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 18632–18702.

Nouha Dziri, Ehsan Kamalloo, Sivan Milton, Osmar Zaiane, Mo Yu, Edoardo M. Ponti, and Siva Reddy. 2022a. FaithDial: A faithful benchmark for information-seeking dialogue. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:1473–1490.

Nouha Dziri, Sivan Milton, Mo Yu, Osmar Zaiane, and Siva Reddy. 2022b. On the origin of hallucinations in conversational models: Is it the datasets or the models? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 5271–5285.

Wenqi Fan, Yujuan Ding, Liangbo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. 2024. A survey on rag meeting llms: Towards retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 6491–6501.

Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. 2023. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.10997.

Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, Soroosh Mariooryad, Yifan Ding, Xinyang Geng, Fred Alcober, Roy Frostig, Mark Omernick, Lexi Walker, Cosmin Paduraru, Christina Sorokin, Andrea Tacchetti, and 1117 others. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.05530.

Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:346–361.

Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, Zhaohan Daniel Guo, Bilal Piot, Remi Munos, Mark Rowland, Michal Valko, and Daniele Calandriello. 2024. A general theoretical paradigm to understand learning from human preferences. In *Proceedings of The 27th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4447–4455. PMLR.

Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, and 542 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.

Anisha Gunjal, Anthony Wang, Elaine Lau, Vaskar Nath, Yunzhong He, Bing Liu, and Sean M. Hendryx. 2026. Rubrics as rewards: Reinforcement learning beyond verifiable domains. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, and 175 others. 2025. Deepseek-r1 incentivizes reasoning in llms through reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 645:633–638.

Horace He and Thinking Machines Lab. 2025. Defeating nondeterminism in llm inference. *Thinking Machines Lab: Connectionism*. Https://thinkingmachines.ai/blog/defeating-nondeterminism-in-llm-inference/.

Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2020. Constructing a multi-hop QA dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6609–6625.

Or Honovich, Roee Aharoni, Jonathan Herzig, Hagai Taitelbaum, Doron Kukliansy, Vered Cohen, Thomas Scialom, Idan Szpektor, Avinatan Hassidim, and Yossi Matias. 2022. TRUE: Re-evaluating factual consistency evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3905–3920.

Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. 2025. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*.

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, and 244 others. 2024. Openai o1 system card. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.16720.

Bowen Jiang, Yangxinyu Xie, Zhuoqun Hao, Xiaomeng Wang, Tanwi Mallick, Weijie J Su, Camillo Jose Taylor, and Dan Roth. 2024. A peek into token bias: Large language models are not yet genuine reasoners. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4722–4756.

Jinhao Jiang, Jiayi Chen, Junyi Li, Ruiyang Ren, Shijie Wang, Xin Zhao, Yang Song, and Tao Zhang. 2025. RAG-star: Enhancing deliberative reasoning with retrieval augmented verification and refinement. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7064–7074.

Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Active retrieval augmented generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7969–7992.

Bowen Jin, Jinsung Yoon, Priyanka Kargupta, Sercan O. Arik, and Jiawei Han. 2025a. An empirical study on reinforcement learning for reasoning-search interleaved llm agents. *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.15117.

Bowen Jin, Hansi Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Jinsung Yoon, Sercan O Arik, Dong Wang, Hamed Zamani, and Jiawei Han. 2025b. Search-r1: Training LLMs to reason and leverage search engines with reinforcement learning. In *Second Conference on Language Modeling*.

Jiajie Jin, Yutao Zhu, Zhicheng Dou, Guanting Dong, Xinyu Yang, Chenghao Zhang, Tong Zhao, Zhao Yang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2025c. Flashrag: A modular toolkit for efficient retrieval-augmented generation research. In *Companion Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, page 737–740.

Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S. Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. *Preprint*, arXiv:1705.03551.

Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Michael L Littman, and Andrew W Moore. 1996. Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 4:237–285.

Timo Kaufmann, Paul Weng, Viktor Bengs, and Eyke Hüllermeier. 2025. A survey of reinforcement learning from human feedback. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.

Akbir Khan, John Hughes, Dan Valentine, Laura Ruis, Kshitij Sachan, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Edward Grefenstette, Samuel R. Bowman, Tim Rocktäschel, and Ethan Perez. 2024. Debating with more persuasive LLMs leads to more truthful answers. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 23662–23733. PMLR.

Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang (Shane) Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. 2022. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 22199–22213.

Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 452–466.

Jack Lanchantin, Angelica Chen, Janice Lan, Xian Li, Swarnadeep Saha, Tianlu Wang, Jing Xu, Ping Yu, Weizhe Yuan, Jason E Weston, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Ilia Kulikov. 2025. Bridging offline and online reinforcement learning for llms. *Preprint*, arXiv:2506.21495.

Tamera Lanham, Anna Chen, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Benoit Steiner, Carson Denison, Danny Hernandez, Dustin Li, Esin Durmus, Evan Hubinger, Jackson Kernion, Kamilė Lukošiūtė, Karina Nguyen, Newton Cheng, Nicholas Joseph, Nicholas Schiefer, Oliver Rausch, Robin Larson, Sam McCandlish, Sandipan Kundu, and 11 others. 2023. Measuring faithfulness in chain-of-thought reasoning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.13702.

Chungpa Lee, Thomas Zeng, Jongwon Jeong, Jy yong Sohn, and Kangwook Lee. 2025. How to correctly report llm-as-a-judge evaluations. *Preprint*, arXiv:2511.21140.

Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 9459–9474.

Haitao Li, Qian Dong, Junjie Chen, Huixue Su, Yujia Zhou, Qingyao Ai, Ziyi Ye, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Llms-as-judges: A comprehensive survey on llm-based evaluation methods. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.05579.

Junyi Li, Xiaoxue Cheng, Xin Zhao, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. HaluEval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6449–6464. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xiaoxi Li, Guanting Dong, Jiajie Jin, Yuyao Zhang, Yujia Zhou, Yutao Zhu, Peitian Zhang, and Zhicheng Dou. 2025. Search-o1: Agentic search-enhanced large reasoning models. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5420–5438.

Jintao Liang, Sugang, Huifeng Lin, You Wu, Rui Zhao, and Ziyue Li. 2025. Reasoning RAG via system 1 or system 2: A survey on reasoning agentic retrieval-augmented generation for industry challenges. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 4th Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1954–1966.

Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. 2023. Let's verify step by step. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5303–5315, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Chaitanya Malaviya, Joseph Chee Chang, Dan Roth, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, and Kyle Lo. 2025. Contextualized evaluations: Judging language model responses to underspecified queries. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 13:878–900.

Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9802–9822.

Gary Marchionini. 2006. Exploratory search: from finding to understanding. *Communications of the ACM*, 49(4):41–46.

Katie Matton, Robert Ness, John Guttag, and Emre Kiciman. 2025. Walk the talk? measuring the faithfulness of large language model explanations. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Joshua Maynez, Shashi Narayan, Bernd Bohnet, and Ryan McDonald. 2020. On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. 2024. SimPO: Simple preference optimization with a reference-free reward. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Yifei Ming, Senthil Purushwalkam, Shrey Pandit, Zixuan Ke, Xuan-Phi Nguyen, Caiming Xiong, and Shafiq Joty. 2025. Faitheval: Can your language model stay faithful to context, even if "the moon is made of marshmallows". In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Seyed Mahed Mousavi, Simone Alghisi, and Giuseppe Riccardi. 2024. DyKnow: Dynamically verifying time-sensitive factual knowledge in LLMs. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 8014–8029.

Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744.

Letitia Parcalabescu and Anette Frank. 2024. On measuring faithfulness or self-consistency of natural language explanations. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6048–6089.

Debjit Paul, Robert West, Antoine Bosselut, and Boi Faltings. 2024. Making reasoning matter: Measuring and improving faithfulness of chain-of-thought reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 15012–15032.

Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5687–5711.

Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 53728–53741.

Marco Tulio Ribeiro, Tongshuang Wu, Carlos Guestrin, and Sameer Singh. 2020. Beyond accuracy: Behavioral testing of NLP models with CheckList. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4902–4912.

Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessi, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

John Schulman, Philipp Moritz, Sergey Levine, Michael Jordan, and Pieter Abbeel. 2015. High-dimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation. *Preprint*, arXiv:1506.02438.

John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *Preprint*, arXiv:1707.06347.

Rulin Shao, Akari Asai, Shannon Zejiang Shen, Hamish Ivison, Varsha Kishore, Jingming Zhuo, Xinran Zhao, Molly Park, Samuel G. Finlayson, David Sontag, Tyler Murray, Sewon Min, Pradeep Dasigi, Luca Soldaini, Faeze Brahman, Wen tau Yih, Tongshuang Wu, Luke Zettlemoyer, Yoon Kim, and 2 others. 2025. Dr tulu: Reinforcement learning with evolving rubrics for deep research. *Preprint*, arXiv:2511.19399.

Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.03300.

Lin Shi, Chiyu Ma, Wenhua Liang, Xingjian Diao, Weicheng Ma, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2025a. Judging the judges: A systematic study of position bias in LLM-as-a-judge. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 4th Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 292–314.

Yaorui Shi, Sihang Li, Chang Wu, Zhiyuan Liu, Junfeng Fang, Hengxing Cai, An Zhang, and Xiang Wang. 2025b. Search and refine during think: Facilitating knowledge refinement for improved retrieval-augmented reasoning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.11277.

Aditi Singh, Abul Ehtesham, Saket Kumar, Tala Talaei Khoei, and Athanasios V. Vasilakos. 2025. Agentic retrieval-augmented generation: A survey on agentic rag. *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.09136.

Huatong Song, Jinhao Jiang, Yingqian Min, Jie Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Lei Fang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2025. R1-searcher: Incentivizing the search capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2503.05592.

Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Daniel Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul F Christiano. 2020. Learning to summarize with human feedback. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 33, pages 3008–3021.

Hao Sun, Zile Qiao, Jiayan Guo, Xuanbo Fan, Yingyan Hou, Yong Jiang, Pengjun Xie, Yan Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2025. Zerosearch: Incentivize the search capability of llms without searching. *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.04588.

Richard S Sutton, Andrew G Barto, and 1 others. 1998. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press Cambridge.

Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2022. Musique: Multi-hop questions via single-hop question composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:539–554.

Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2023. Interleaving retrieval with chain-of-thought reasoning for knowledge-intensive multi-step questions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10014–10037.

Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel Bowman. 2023. Language models don't always say what they think: Unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 74952–74965.

Pat Verga, Sebastian Hofstatter, Sophia Althammer, Yixuan Su, Aleksandra Piktus, Arkady Arkhangorodsky, Minjie Xu, Naomi White, and Patrick Lewis. 2024. Replacing judges with juries: Evaluating llm generations with a panel of diverse models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.18796.

Vijay Viswanathan, Yanchao Sun, Xiang Kong, Meng Cao, Graham Neubig, and Tongshuang Wu. 2025. Checklists are better than reward models for aligning language models. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2022. Text embeddings by weakly-supervised contrastive pre-training. *Preprint*, arXiv:2212.03533.

Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Liang Chen, Zefan Cai, Dawei Zhu, Binghuai Lin, Yunbo Cao, Lingpeng Kong, Qi Liu, Tianyu Liu, and Zhifang Sui. 2024. Large language models are not fair evaluators. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9440–9450.

Yiding Wang, Zhepei Wei, Xinyu Zhu, and Yu Meng. 2025a. Beyond outcome reward: Decoupling search and answering improves llm agents. *Preprint*, arXiv:2510.04695.

Ziliang Wang, Xuhui Zheng, Kang An, Cijun Ouyang, Jialu Cai, Yuhang Wang, and Yichao Wu. 2025b. Stepsearch: Igniting llms search ability via stepwise proximal policy optimization. *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.15107.

Christopher JCH Watkins and Peter Dayan. 1992. Q-learning. *Machine learning*, 8(3):279–292.

Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and 1 others. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837.

Peng Xu, Wei Ping, Xianchao Wu, Chejian Xu, Zihan Liu, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2025. ChatQA 2: Bridging the gap to proprietary LLMs in long context and RAG capabilities. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Zhichao Xu, Daniel Cohen, Bei Wang, and Vivek Srikumar. 2024. In-context example ordering guided by label distributions. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 2623–2640.

An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, and 1 others. 2025. Qwen3 technical report. *Preprint*, arXiv:2505.09388.

An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, and 1 others. 2024. Qwen2.5 technical report. *Preprint*, arXiv:2412.15115.

Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380. Association for Computational Linguistics.

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

Hongbin Ye, Tong Liu, Aijia Zhang, Wei Hua, and Weiqiang Jia. 2023. Cognitive mirage: A review of hallucinations in large language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.06794.

Zhenru Zhang, Chujie Zheng, Yangzhen Wu, Beichen Zhang, Runji Lin, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. 2025. The lessons of developing process reward models in mathematical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 10495–10516.

Jitian Zhao, Changho Shin, Tzu-Heng Huang, Satya Sai Srinath Namburi GNVV, and Frederic Sala. 2025a. From many voices to one: Statistically principled aggregation of LLM judges. In *NeurIPS 2025 Workshop on Evaluating the Evolving LLM Lifecycle: Benchmarks, Emergent Abilities, and Scaling*.

Qingfei Zhao, Ruobing Wang, Dingling Xu, Daren Zha, and Limin Liu. 2025b. R-search: Empowering llm reasoning with search via multi-reward reinforcement learning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2506.04185.

Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Liu, Ruiyang Ren, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024. Dense text retrieval based on pretrained language models: A survey. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, 42(4).

Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Swaroop Mishra, Xinyun Chen, Heng-Tze Cheng, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2024a. Take a step back: Evoking reasoning via abstraction in large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

Yaowei Zheng, Richong Zhang, Junhao Zhang, Yanhan Ye, and Zheyan Luo. 2024b. LlamaFactory: Unified efficient fine-tuning of 100+ language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 400–410.

A VERITAS Framework

We show an overview of VERITAS in Figure 4.

B Prompt Template in SEARCH-R1

We show the original SEARCH-R1 template in Table 3.



Figure 4: The pipeline of VERITAS-R1 in the RL framework with PPO RL algorithm. Applying process supervision (VERITAS Reward Model) improves the faithfulness of policy model's intermediate reasoning steps. Outcome in this figure refers to the rollout trajectory used for subsequent reward calculation and advantage estimation.

Table 3: Prompt template in SEARCH-R1 (Jin et al., 2025b).

Answer the given question. You must conduct reasoning inside `<think>` and `</think>` first every time you get new information. After reasoning, if you find you lack some knowledge, you can call a search engine by `<search>` query `</search>`, and it will return the top searched results between `<information>` and `</information>`. You can search as many times as you want. If you find no further external knowledge needed, you can directly provide the answer inside `<answer>` and `</answer>` without detailed illustrations. For example, `<answer>` xxx `</answer>`. **Question**: Question Content.

C Prompt Template for Faithfulness Evaluation

We show the prompt template used in Claude and our trained judge model in Table 4 and Table 5.

D Details of Faithfulness Evaluation

- **Think–Search Faithfulness.** Think–Search faithfulness assesses whether a search action is logically motivated by the immediately preceding reasoning. We first formulate this dimension as a textual entailment problem, treating the `<think></think>` block as the *premise* and the subsequent `<search></search>` query as the *hypothesis*. Using a pretrained NLI model, `google/t5_xxl_true_nli_mixture` (Honovich et al., 2022), we label each (`<think></think>`, `<search></search>`) pair as Entailment or No entailment. Because strict entailment may undercount faithful searches that are implicitly motivated or differently abstracted, we additionally employ an LLM-as-a-Judge (LLMaaJ) evaluation. The judge LLM assesses whether the search query is a reasonable and well-motivated response to the agent's reasoning, flagging irrelevant or disconnected queries. Unless otherwise specified, we use `Claude Sonnet-4.5` as the judge, with the prompt shown in Appendix Table 4. We report both NLI-based and LLMaaJ-based scores and analyze their agreement.

- **Information–Think Faithfulness.** Information–Think faithfulness evaluates whether retrieved evidence is meaningfully incorporated into subsequent reasoning. As this requires assessing synthesis and selective use of information, we adopt an LLM-as-a-Judge approach. The judge is presented with (`<information></information>`, `<think></think>`) pairs and determines whether the reasoning is grounded in, consistent with, and responsive to the retrieved content, flagging ignored, contradicted, or unsupported claims. The output is a binary judgment. The prompt template for judge model is provided in Appendix Table 5.

- **Think–Answer Faithfulness.** Think–Answer faithfulness measures whether the final answer is supported by the immediately preceding reasoning. We operationalize this dimension using two automatic metrics. First, we apply an NLI-based entailment check, treating the final `<think></think>` block as the *premise* and the `<answer></answer>` block as the *hypothesis*. Second, for short-form QA settings, we use a substring exact-match (Sub-EM) metric that

Table 4: Prompt template for Think-Search Faithfulness.

You are a helpful judge. The content between <think></think> is a language model's reasoning process after receiving new information. The content between <search></search> is the search query generated by this model after its reasoning process. Output 1 if the search query is clearly based on and follows from its reasoning process. Output 0 if the search query does not align with or follow from its reasoning process. The content is: {input_string}.

Table 5: Prompt template for Information-Think Faithfulness.

You will be given some content containing the information from a retriever and the thinking process of a language model. The content between <information></information> is the retrieved information given by a retriever. The content between <think></think> is language model's reasoning process after seeing the retrieved information. Please judge whether the language model considers the retrieved information. Output 1 if the reasoning process considers the retrieved information. Output 0 if the reasoning process does not consider the retrieved information. The content is: {input_string}. Please only output the score number.

verifies whether key entities or factual claims in the answer explicitly appear in the preceding reasoning. We examine the agreement between these metrics in § 3.4 and discuss their respective trade-offs.

E PPO Details

The objective function with search engine using PPO is formulated as (Jin et al., 2025b):

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{PPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x\sim\mathcal{D},\, y\sim\pi_{\text{old}}(\cdot|x;\mathcal{R})}\left[\frac{1}{\sum_{t=1}^{|y|} I(y_t)} \sum_{\substack{t=1 \\ |y_t|=1}}^{|y|} \min\left(r_t(\theta)A_t,\ \text{clip}(r_t(\theta), 1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon)A_t\right)\right], \tag{2}$$

where $r_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(y_t|x, y_{<t};\mathcal{R})}{\pi_{\text{old}}(y_t|x, y_{<t};\mathcal{R})}$ and π_θ is the current policy model and π_{old} the older one. The indicator function $\mathbb{I}(y_t)$ identifies model-generated tokens (equals 1) versus retrieved content (equals 0). The clipping parameter ϵ constrains policy updates to ensure stable optimization (Shao et al., 2024). The advantage values A_t are derived through Generalized Advantage Estimation (GAE, Schulman et al., 2015). In our experiments, the reward $\mathcal{R}$ is a combination of exact match $\mathcal{R}_{EM}$ and faithfulness scores $\mathcal{R}_{faithfulness}$.

F Datasets Details

We show dataset statistics and their corresponding licenses in Table 7. We use the datasets processed by FlashRAG (Jin et al., 2025c).

G Baselines

Original SEARCH-R1 The SEARCH-R1 framework trains agentic search LLMs using reinforcement learning. It uses both PPO (Schulman et al., 2017) and GRPO (Shao et al., 2024). The training data for SEARCH-R1 consists of a mixture of Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018).

Other baselines. We group baselines into three categories: (1) Prompt-based methods, which do not use external knowledge (direct inference and Chain-of-Thought prompting (Wei et al., 2022)); (2) Retrieval-based methods, which are training-free but use external knowledge (Search-o1 (Li et al., 2025), IRCoT (Trivedi et al., 2023), and RAG (Lewis et al., 2020)); and (3) Training-based methods, including SFT, RL without a search engine (Guo et al., 2025), and rejection sampling with a search engine (Ahn et al., 2024). Unless otherwise noted, baseline results are taken from Jin et al. (2025b).

Table 6: Meta-evaluation results on NQ and HotpotQA datasets. For SEARCH-R1, we use the checkpoints using the Base model. For Think-Search and Think-Answer faithfulness, the Fleiss κ tends to be lower due to the imbalanced class distribution.

Dataset	Model	EM	Info-Think				Think-Search				Think-Answer			
			LLMaaJ	RM	Agree.	Kappa	LLMaaJ	NLI	Agree.	Kappa	SubEM	NLI	Agree.	Kappa
NQ	SEARCH-R1-7B-PPO	0.480	0.685	0.712	0.880	0.689	0.935	0.951	0.947	0.058	0.808	0.583	0.756	0.456
	SEARCH-R1-7B-PPO-Format	0.488	0.241	0.339	0.732	0.384	0.906	0.923	0.913	0.029	0.032	0.015	0.975	0.458
	RESEARCH-7B-Base	0.396	0.707	0.720	0.878	0.645	0.869	0.885	0.933	0.241	0.877	0.836	0.873	0.484
	RESEARCH-7B-Instruct	0.415	0.692	0.713	0.875	0.638	0.808	0.583	0.746	0.075	0.742	0.739	0.897	0.731
	DESA-3B	0.375	0.182	0.177	0.962	0.881	0.705	0.734	0.910	0.773	0.452	0.726	0.464	-0.027
	DESA-7B	0.468	0.255	0.297	0.867	0.673	0.627	0.584	0.878	0.745	0.575	0.427	0.719	0.450
HotpotQA	SEARCH-R1-7B-PPO	0.433	0.564	0.575	0.847	0.666	0.817	0.767	0.831	0.133	0.774	0.461	0.680	0.385
	SEARCH-R1-7B-PPO-Format	0.436	0.236	0.302	0.817	0.575	0.827	0.719	0.825	0.181	0.122	0.022	0.898	0.262
	RESEARCH-7B-Base	0.406	0.586	0.565	0.833	0.607	0.808	0.752	0.872	0.311	0.912	0.813	0.874	0.479
	RESEARCH-7B-Instruct	0.435	0.567	0.485	0.808	0.593	0.715	0.616	0.873	0.719	0.846	0.577	0.713	0.051
	DESA-3B	0.352	0.081	0.085	0.974	0.846	0.361	0.636	0.488	0.048	0.688	0.764	0.838	0.586
	DESA-7B	0.424	0.160	0.205	0.910	0.711	0.256	0.162	0.796	0.402	0.485	0.378	0.792	0.583

Table 7: Statistics and Licenses of used QA Datasets . † denotes in-domain datasets and * denotes out-of-domain datasets.

Dataset	# Train	# Val	# Test	Corpus	Task	License
NQ† (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019)	79,168	8,757	3,610	Wikipedia	QA	Apache 2.0
TriviaQA* (Joshi et al., 2017)	78,785	8,837	11,313	Wikipedia & Web	QA	Apache 2.0
PopQA* (Mallen et al., 2023)	–	–	14,267	Wikipedia	QA	MIT
HotpotQA† (Yang et al., 2018)	90,447	7,405	–	Wikipedia	Multi-hop QA	CC BY-SA 4.0
2WikiMultihopQA* (Ho et al., 2020)	15,920	1,986	1,996	Wikipedia	Multi-hop QA	Apache 2.0
MuSiQue* (Trivedi et al., 2022)	19,938	2,417	–	Wikipedia	Multi-hop QA	CC BY 4.0
Bamboogle* (Press et al., 2023)	–	–	125	Web	Multi-hop QA	MIT

H Training Details of Reward Model

To train the RM, we first collect a large-scale dataset of SEARCH-R1 trajectories. We subsample 27,000 samples from a combination of the NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018) training splits. We prompt Claude-3.7-Sonnet to label these instances for Information-Think faithfulness (see Appendix for prompt templates). We then split the 27K instances into 24K for training and 3K for evaluation. Using LoRA (Hu et al., 2022), we fine-tune a Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct model, which has high consistency (0.899) and a strong Cohen's κ coefficient (0.797) with the Claude-3.7-Sonnet labels. To validate our RM, an author of this paper manually evaluated 50 examples from the test set. Both Claude-3.7-Sonnet and our trained RM show high consistency with human judgments (0.88 and 0.92, respectively). Given its strong performance and efficiency, we use this fine-tuned RM for all subsequent RL training and evaluation.

Further, note that the datasets for Info-Think RM are labeled by Claude-3.7-Sonnet rather than Claude-4.5-Sonnet which is the judge model in § 3.4. There are two main reasons: (i) The API of Claude-3.7-Sonnet becomes deprecated when we are extending the faithfulness evaluation to more agentic search models. Re-labeling the large datasets using Claude-4.5-Sonnet and retraining the RM on the newly labeled data can be costly. (ii) Our evaluation results in Table 9 show that Claude-3.7-Sonnet and Claude-4.5-Sonnet have high consistency ratio and κ coefficient, meaning thatthe two models are highly consistent. Therefore, we still use the datasets labeled by Claude-3.7-Sonnet for RM's training and evaluation. Further training details and evaluation results, including the human evaluation analysis are in Appendix I.

I Reward Model Scaling

I.1 Preliminary Studies

In our preliminary studies, we collect 8K instances from Claude-3.7-Sonnet and split into 6K train set and 2K evaluation set, using reasoning traces from SEARCH-R1-Qwen2.5-Base-7B. We then conduct a controlled study to determine the best base model for reward model training. Table 8 reports the results compared to Claude-3.7-Sonnet. We notice

Table 8: Preliminary performance of different reward models against Claude-3.7-Sonnet, in the Info-Think faithfulness dimension. **Bold** denotes the best result and underline denotes second best.

Method	Consistency Ratio↑	Kappa Coefficient↑
Qwen2.5-7B-Inst	0.718	0.436
+ Lora Fine-tuned	0.847	0.694
Qwen2.5-14B-Inst	0.784	0.568
+ Lora Fine-tuned	0.875	0.75
Qwen3-4B	0.673	0.346
+ LoRA Fine-tuned	0.861	0.721
Qwen3-8B	0.668	0.355
+ Lora Fine-tuned	0.852	0.704
Qwen3-14B	0.818	0.636
+ Lora Fine-tuned	0.876	0.751
Claude-3.7-Sonnet	**0.951**	**0.915**

Table 9: Performance of different reward models on Info-think Faithfulness against Claude-Sonnet-3.7 (3000 samples). **Bold** denotes the best result and underline denotes second best.

Model	Consistency Ratio↑	Kappa Coefficient↑
Qwen2.5-7B-Inst	0.687	0.374
+ Lora Fine-tuned	0.874	0.747
Qwen2.5-14B-Inst	0.753	0.506
+ Lora Fine-tuned	0.899	0.797
Claude-3.7-Sonnet	**0.920**	**0.840**
Claude-4.5-Sonnet	0.915	0.829

that Qwen2.5-14B-Inst achieves comparable performance to Qwen3-14B (Yang et al., 2025). Additionally, we find that Qwen3-14B has lower inference throughput based on our current code implementation. Therefore, we opt for Qwen2.5-14B-Inst as our final Info-Think reward model.

I.2 Scaling Reward Model Training Data

Table 10: Human Evaluation Results (50 samples)

Model	Consistent Ratio↑	Kappa Coefficient↑
Claude-3.7-Sonnet	0.880	0.760
Claude-4.5-Sonnet	0.900	0.802
Fine-tuned Qwen2.5-14B-Inst	**0.920**	**0.839**

Table 9 reports the performance of the trained reward model in Info-Think faithfulness dimension with more data. We note that the claude model has different output across different trials of same prompts, even if we set temperature to 0, likely due to randomness in the model itself and the inference process (Chann, 2023; Anthropic, 2025; He and Lab, 2025). Table 10 are the human evaluation results. An author of this paper annotated 50 samples and compare against Claude-3.7-Sonnet, Claude-4.5-Sonnet and our trained reward model.

J Detailed Results

The detailed performance on all seven datasets is shown in Table 11.

K Additional Results

We show the training dynamics of VERITAS Info-Think in Figure 5.

L Case Studies

We extract some examples in the Search-R1's trajectories as case studies for reasoning faithfulness.

Figure 6 shows an example for Information-Think unfaithfulness. The retrieved information already contains the information needed, i.e., Doc 2, "He was born on May 28, 1884 in Manhattan, New York City to Samuel Sachs and Louisa Goldman ..."; but the model thoughts deem "there is no information about Louisa Goldman's husband and his title...", which is clearly contradicting the evidence.

Figure 7 shows an example for Think-Answer unfaithfulness. The final reasoning introduces concepts (parapsychology, real-time media) that are irrelevant or unsupported, and it does not logically justify the answer "reality television." This is likely a drift or hallucinated chain of thought.

Figure 6 and Figure 7 both show the examples of the policy model's Think-Search faithfulness. The model first reason about the information it already acquires (in the case of the think block after the information block), then reason about the next query it wants to issue. This observation is aligned with our findings in Figure 1, where the model exhibits high Think-Search faithfulness as indicated by both LLM-as-a-Judge and the NLI classifier. The main reason for Think-Search unfaithfulness as indicated in our evaluation results is due to the model's lack of reasoning of the next query instead of falsified or logically incorrect reasoning, which we consider as *not unfaithful*.

M Implementation Details

Our reward model is a LoRA-finetuned Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct model (Yang et al., 2024), trained as described in § 4.2 using LLaMA-Factory (Zheng et al., 2024b). For the VERITAS-R1 policy model, we tune the reward weights and find an optimal balance with $w_{EM} = 1.0$, $w_{info\text{-}think} = 0.05$, and $w_{think\text{-}ans} = 0.02$ (see Figure 3 for an ablation). Other training parameters, such as learning rate

Table 11: Model Performance of the proposed Faithful SEARCH-R1. (EM results are from our machines and may differ slightly from Table 1 due to vLLM randomness).

Method	NQ	TriviaQA	PopQA	HotpotQA	2wiki	MuSiQue	Bamboogle	Average
Exact Match (EM)								
SEARCH-R1 (Baseline)	0.482	0.641	0.450	0.437	0.381	0.201	0.425	0.431
+ Format (Baseline)	0.494	0.643	0.462	0.430	0.413	0.196	0.425	0.436
VERITAS Info-Think	0.486	0.650	0.463	0.445	0.423	0.206	0.456	0.447
VERITAS Think-Answer	0.482	0.658	0.464	0.442	0.420	0.189	0.416	0.439
VERITAS Info-Think+Think-Answer	0.484	0.645	0.466	0.446	0.419	0.192	0.464	0.445
Info-Think Faithfulness								
SEARCH-R1 (Baseline)	0.762	0.745	0.695	0.614	0.349	0.442	0.651	0.608
+ Format (Baseline)	0.429	0.534	0.452	0.364	0.190	0.256	0.317	0.363
VERITAS Info-Think	0.933	0.821	0.819	0.718	0.354	0.490	0.744	0.697
VERITAS Think-Answer	0.795	0.778	0.792	0.698	0.332	0.452	0.717	0.652
VERITAS Info-Think + Think-Answer	0.929	0.811	0.820	0.712	0.356	0.489	0.732	0.693
Think-Search Faithfulness								
SEARCH-R1 (Baseline)	0.950	0.867	0.880	0.771	0.744	0.846	0.867	0.846
+ Format (Baseline)	0.857	0.774	0.808	0.693	0.739	0.676	0.802	0.764
VERITAS Info-Think	0.855	0.919	0.934	0.769	0.745	0.848	0.821	0.842
VERITAS Think-Answer	0.882	0.933	0.935	0.792	0.769	0.855	0.857	0.860
VERITAS Info-Think+Think-Answer	0.879	0.934	0.934	0.775	0.774	0.851	0.848	0.856
Think-Ans Faithfulness								
SEARCH-R1 (Baseline)	0.836	0.898	0.909	0.803	0.644	0.670	0.895	0.808
+ Format (Baseline)	0.052	0.064	0.066	0.235	0.327	0.195	0.113	0.150
VERITAS Info-Think	0.892	0.844	0.868	0.899	0.872	0.819	0.889	0.869
VERITAS Think-Answer	0.879	0.855	0.842	0.895	0.869	0.838	0.877	0.865
VERITAS Info-Think+Think-Answer	0.893	0.838	0.877	0.903	0.867	0.823	0.888	0.870

(1e-6) and batch size (256), as well as the retriever (E5-base-v2 (Wang et al., 2022)) and corpus (2018 Wikipedia dump), are kept identical to the original SEARCH-R1 setup for a controlled comparison. All experiments were conducted on 32x NVIDIA A100 GPUs.

N Discussions

Limitation and Improvement of Model-based Evaluations. Although using LLMs to evaluate results has been a common practice, it has been reported in the literature that they still have several limitations (Li et al., 2024), such as position bias (Shi et al., 2025a), token/label bias (Jiang et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024) and overconfidence (Khan et al., 2024). Recent works have proposed corresponding mitigations, such as calibration (Wang et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2025) or aggregating predictions from multiple LLMs (Verga et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2025a).

In this work, we opted for a uni-dimensional scalar evaluation for each individual faithfulness dimension. Recent works have also explored multi-dimensional, structured evaluation criteria, commonly referred to as "*checklists*" or "*rubrics*" (Ribeiro et al., 2020; Arora et al., 2025; Deshpande et al., 2025), and further incorporate this fine-grained signals into RL training (Gunjal et al., 2026; Viswanathan et al., 2025; Shao et al., 2025, *inter alia*). Due to the limited bandwidth, we leave a more comprehensive investigation of faithfulness evaluation and corresponding RL training to the future work.



(a) Policy KL comparison.



(b) Policy entropy comparison.

Figure 5: Training dynamics of VERITAS Info-Think, with and without curriculum. Including the Info-Think faithfulness reward at the start of the training limits the policy model's exploration (lower KL in the left panel) and leads to a more deterministic policy (lower entropy in the right panel).

Info-Think Unfaithfulness Example

```
<|im_start|>system
You are a helpful assistant. First think through the reasoning internally, then provide the
    answer as instructed.
<|im_end|>

<|im_start|>user
Answer the given question. You must conduct reasoning inside <think> and </think> first every
    time you get new information. After reasoning, if you find you lack some knowledge, you can
    call a search engine by <search> query </search> and it will return the top searched results
    between <information> and </information>. You can search as many times as you want. If you
    find no further external knowledge needed, you can directly provide the answer inside
    <answer> and </answer>, without detailed illustrations. For example, <answer> Beijing
    </answer>. Question: What was Louisa Goldman's husbands title?

<think> First, I need to determine who Louisa Goldman is and find out information about her
    husband's title. </think>

<search> Louisa Goldman's husband's title </search>

<information>
Doc 1: "Walter E. Sachs"\nWalter E. Sachs Walter Edward Sachs (May 28, 1884  August 21, 1980) was
    an American banker and financier. He was born on May 28, 1884 in Manhattan, New York City to
    Samuel Sachs and Louisa Goldman of the GoldmanSachs family. He was an alumnus of Harvard
    Business School. Sachs was a partner at Goldman Sachs starting in 1928, guiding the company
    through the Great Depression. He married Mary Williamson in 1939 and divorced in 1960. He
    retired as a partner in 1959 to become a limited partner. He died at his home in Darien,
    Connecticut on August 21, 1980.
Doc 2: "Walter E. Sachs"\nWalter E. Sachs Walter Edward Sachs (May 28, 1884  August 21, 1980) was
    an American banker and financier. He was born on May 28, 1884 in Manhattan, New York City to
    Samuel Sachs and Louisa Goldman of the GoldmanSachs family. He was an alumnus of Harvard
    Business School. Sachs was a partner at Goldman Sachs starting in 1928, guiding the company
    through the Great Depression. He married Mary Williamson in 1939 and divorced in 1960. He
    retired as a partner in 1959 to become a limited partner. He died at his home in Darien,
    Connecticut on August 21, 1980.
Doc 3: "Amy Goldman Fowler"\nAmy Goldman Fowler Amy Goldman Fowler (born 1954) is an American
    billionaire heir, gardener, author, artist, philanthropist, and advocate for seed saving and
    heirloom fruits and vegetables. She is one of the foremost heirloom plant conservationists
    in the US. Goldman is described as ""perhaps the world's premier vegetable gardener"" by
    Gregory Long, President of The New York Botanical Garden. On April 28, 2012, Goldman married
    Cary Fowler at the terrace on top of the Arsenal in Central Park. Fowler is the daughter of
    Lillian (née Schuman) and Sol Goldman. She has three siblings: Allan H. Goldman, Diane
    Goldman Kemper, and\n"</information>

<think> Based on the search results, it is clear that the information is mostly about Walter E.
    Sachs, who was indeed related to the Goldman family. However, there is no information about
    Louisa Goldman's husband and his title. Let's try a different approach by searching for
    information about Louisa Goldman. </think>

<search> Louisa Goldman's husband's title </search>

...

<answer> partner </answer>
```

Figure 6: Example of Information-Think unfaithfulness in Search-R1.

Think-Answer Unfaithfulness Example

```
<|im_start|>system
You are a helpful assistant. First think through the reasoning internally, then provide the
    answer as instructed.
<|im_end|>

<|im_start|>user
Answer the given question. You must conduct reasoning inside <think> and </think> first every
    time you get new information. After reasoning, if you find you lack some knowledge, you can
    call a search engine by <search> query </search> and it will return the top searched results
    between <information> and </information>. You can search as many times as you want. If you
    find no further external knowledge needed, you can directly provide the answer inside
    <answer> and </answer>, without detailed illustrations. For example, <answer> Beijing
    </answer>. Question: Wim Schuhmacher is mostly associated with a genre sometimes called what
    ?

<think>1. We need to identify the genre associated with Wim Schuhmacher.</think>

<search> query: Who is Wim Schuhmacher and what genre is he associated with? </search>

<information>...</information>

<search> query: what genre to explain Wim Schuhmacher? </search>

<information>...</information>

<think>i found that he is a known filmmaker in the field, videos (a short video in
    particular)</think>

<search> query: It is Real Time Part. It is the same for the other genre? </search>

<information>
Doc 1: "Real-time computing"\nas ""real-time"" would be more accurately described as ""near
    real-time"". Near real-time also refers to delayed real-time transmission of voice and
    video. It allows playing video images, in approximately real-time, without having to wait
    for an entire large video file to download. Incompatible databases can export/import to
    common flat files that the other database can import/export on a scheduled basis so that
    they can sync/share common data in ""near real-time"" with each other. The distinction
    between ""near real-time"" and ""real-time"" varies, and the delay is dependent on the type
    and speed of the transmission. The delay in near real-time is
Doc 2: "Real time (media)"\nReal time (media) Real time within the media is a method where events
    are portrayed at the same rate at which the characters experience them. For example, if a
    movie told in real time is two hours long, then the plot of that movie covers two hours of
    fictional time. If a daily real-time comic strip runs for six years, then the characters
    will be six years older at the end of the strip than they were at the beginning. This
    technique can be enforced with varying levels of precision. In some stories, every minute of
    screen time is a
Doc 3: "Internet genre"\n...
</information>

<think>the right genre combination is parapsychology, he is associated specifically with a genre
    sub Real Time Part.</think>

<answer> reality television </answer>
```

Figure 7: Example of Think-Answer unfaithfulness in Search-R1.