Baleen: Robust Multi-Hop Reasoning at Scale via Condensed Retrieval

Anonymous Author(s)
Affiliation
Address
email

Abstract

Multi-hop reasoning (i.e., reasoning across two or more documents) is a key ingredient for NLP models that leverage large corpora to exhibit broad knowledge. To retrieve evidence passages, multi-hop models must contend with a fast-growing search space across the hops, represent complex queries that combine multiple information needs, and resolve ambiguity about the best order in which to hop between training passages. We tackle these problems via Baleen, a system that improves the accuracy of multi-hop retrieval while learning robustly from weak training signals in the many-hop setting. To tame the search space, we propose *condensed retrieval*, a pipeline that summarizes the retrieved passages after each hop into a single compact context. To model complex queries, we introduce a *focused late interaction* retriever that allows different parts of the same query representation to match disparate relevant passages. Lastly, to infer the hopping dependencies among unordered training passages, we devise *latent hop ordering*, a weak-supervision strategy in which the trained retriever itself selects the sequence of hops. We evaluate Baleen on retrieval for two-hop question answering and many-hop claim verification, establishing state-of-the-art performance.

1 Introduction

In *open-domain* reasoning, a model is tasked with retrieving evidence from a large corpus to answer questions, verify claims, or otherwise exhibit broad knowledge. In practice, such open-domain tasks often further require *multi-hop* reasoning, where the evidence must be extracted from two or more documents. To do this effectively, a model must learn to use *partial* evidence it retrieves to bridge its way to additional documents leading to an answer. In this vein, HotPotQA [24] contains complex questions answerable by retrieving two passages from Wikipedia, while HoVer [10] contains claims that can only be verified (or disproven) by combining facts from up to four Wikipedia passages.

Table 1 illustrates this using the claim *"The MVP of [a] game Red Flaherty umpired was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame"* from the HoVer validation set. To verify this claim, a HoVer model must identify facts spread across three Wikipedia pages: *Red Flaherty* umpired in the World Series in 1955, 1958, 1965, and 1970. The MVP of the *1965 World Series* was *Sandy Koufax*. Koufax was later elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

This three-hop claim illustrates three major challenges in multi-hop retrieval. First, *multi-hop queries encompass multiple information needs*; the claim above referenced facts from three disparate passages. Second, *retrieval errors in each hop propagate to subsequent hops*. This can happen if the model directly retrieves information about the Baseball Hall of Fame, confuses Red Flaherty with, say, Robert Flaherty, or singles out the MVP of, say, the *1958* World Series, which Flaherty also umpired. Third, due to the dependency between hops, *retrievers must learn an effective sequence of hops*, where previously-retrieved clues lead to other relevant passages. These inter-passage dependencies

Submitted to 35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2021). Do not distribute.

Table 1: An example (multi-hop) claim Q_0 to verify and an illustration of *condensed retrieval* queries Q_t after each hop $t \geq 1$. Page titles are in bold. We shorten the Wikipedia sentences for presentation.

Q_0	The MVP of [a] game Red Flaherty umpired was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.
Q_1	The MVP of [a] game Red Flaherty umpired was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame. **Red Flaherty**: He umpired in World Series 1955, 1958, 1965, and 1970.
Q_2	The MVP of [a] game Red Flaherty umpired was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame. Red Flaherty: He umpired in World Series 1955, 1958, 1965, and 1970. **1965 World Series**: It is remembered for MVP Sandy Koufax.
Q_3	The MVP of [a] game Red Flaherty umpired was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame. Red Flaherty: He umpired in World Series 1955, 1958, 1965, and 1970. 1965 World Series: It is remembered for MVP Sandy Koufax. **Sandy Koufax:** He was elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

can be non-obvious for *many-hop* problems with three or more passages, and are often left unlabeled, as it can be expensive to annotate one (or every) sequence in which facts could be retrieved.

These challenges call for highly expressive query representations, robustness to retrieval errors, and scalability to many hops over massive document collections. Existing systems fall short on one or more of these criteria. For instance, many state-of-the-art systems rely on bag-of-words [18] or single-vector dot-product [23] retrievers, whose capacity to model an open-domain question is limited [13], let alone complex multi-hop queries. Furthermore, existing systems embed trade-offs when it comes to "hopping": they employ brittle greedy search, which limits recall per hop; or they employ beam search over an exponential space, which reduces scalability to many hops; or they assume explicit links that connect every passage with related entities, which ties them to link-structured corpora. Lastly, to order the hops, many systems use fragile supervision heuristics (e.g., finding passages whose page titles appear in other passages) tailored for particular datasets like HotPotQA.

We tackle these problems with **Baleen**,[1] a new multi-hop reasoning system that improves accuracy and robustness. We introduce a *condensed retrieval* architecture, where the retrieved facts from each hop are summarized into a short context that becomes a part of the query for subsequent hops, if any (Table 1). Unlike beam search, condensed retrieval allows effective scaling to many hops, and we find that it complements greedy search (i.e., taking the best passage per hop) in improving recall considerably. We then tackle the complexity of queries by proposing a *focused late interaction* passage retriever (**FLIPR**), a robust learned retriever that allow different parts of the same query representation to match disparate relevant passage. FLIPR inherits the scalability of the vanilla late interaction paradigm of ColBERT [12] but uniquely allows the same query to exhibit different matching patterns against different passages. Lastly, we devise *latent hop ordering*, a weak-supervision strategy that uses the retriever itself to select effective hop paths.

We first test Baleen on the two-hop HotPotQA benchmark, finding evidence of saturation: we achieve 86.7% top-pair accuracy in retrieving the gold passage pairs, up from 84.1% for existing work. We then test Baleen's ability to scale accurately to more hops, reporting our main results using the recent many-hop HoVer task. We build a strong *many-hop* baseline model that combines recent results from the open-domain question answering [13] and multi-hop [18] literatures. This baseline combines ColBERT retrieval and standard greedy search with an ELECTRA [5] re-ranker, and generalizes typical text-based heuristics to order the hops for training. After verifying its strong results on HotPotQA, we show that it outperforms the official TF-IDF + BERT baseline of HoVer by over 30 points in retrieval accuracy. Against this strong baseline itself, Baleen improves passage retrieval accuracy by another 17 points, raising it to over 90% at $k = 100$ passages. Baleen also improves the evidence extraction F1 score dramatically, outperforming even the *oracle retrieval* + BERT results by Jiang et al. [10]. Our ablations (§5.3) show that Baleen's FLIPR retriever, condenser architecture, and latent supervision are essential to its strong performance. We will release our code upon acceptance.

2 Background & related work

Open-domain reasoning There is significant recent interest in NLP models that can solve tasks by retrieving evidence from a large corpus. The most popular such task is arguably open-domain question

[1] In marine biology, "baleen" refers to the filter-feeding system that baleen whales use to capture small organisms, filtering out seawater. So too does our system seek to capture relevant facts from a sea of documents.

answering (OpenQA; Chen et al. 2), which extends the well-studied machine reading comprehension (MRC) problem over supplied question–passage pairs to answering questions given only a large text corpus like Wikipedia. Other open-domain tasks span claim verification (e.g., FEVER; Thorne et al. 19), question generation (e.g., with Jeopardy as in Lewis et al. 15), and open dialogue (e.g., Wizard of Wikipedia; Dinan et al. 7), among others. Many of these datasets are compiled in the recently-introduced KILT benchmark [16] for *knowledge-intensive* tasks. Among models for these tasks, the most relevant to our work are OpenQA models that include *learned* retrieval components. These include ORQA [14], REALM [8], and DPR [11]. Lewis et al. [15] introduced RAG, which by virtue of a seq2seq architecture can tackle OpenQA as well as other open-domain problems, including claim verification and question generation.

Multi-hop open-domain reasoning Most of the open-domain tasks from §2 can be solved by finding *one* relevant passage in the corpus, often by design. In contrast, a number of recent works explore multi-hop reasoning over multiple passages. These include QAngaroo [22] and 2WikiMultiHopQA [9], among others. While thus "multi-hop", these tasks supply the relevant passages for each example (possibly with small set of "distractor" candidates), and thus do not require retrieval from a large corpus. To our knowledge, HotPotQA was the first large-scale open-domain multi-hop task, particularly in its retrieval-oriented "fullwiki" setting. HotPotQA catalyzed much follow-up research. However, it is limited to only two-hop questions, many of which may not require strong multi-hop reasoning capabilities (see Chen and Durrett 3; Wang et al. 21), softening the retrieval challenges discussed in §1. Very recently, Jiang et al. [10] introduced the HoVer many-hop verification dataset, which contains two-, three-, and four-hop examples. HoVer contains just over 18,000 training examples, about 5$\times$ smaller than HotPotQA, adding to the challenge posed by HoVer.

Multi-hop open-domain models To conduct the "hops", many prior multi-hop systems (e.g., Asai et al. [1]; Zhao et al. [25]) assume explicit links that connect every passage with related entities. We argue that this risks tying systems to link-structured knowledge bases (like Wikipedia) or producing brittle architectures tailored for datasets constructed by following hyperlinks (like HotPotQA). Recently, Xiong et al. [23] and Qi et al. [18] introduce MDR and IRRR, state-of-the-art systems that assume no explicit link structure. Instead, they use an *iterative retrieval* paradigm that retrieves passages relevant to the question, reads these passages, and then formulates a new query for another hop if necessary. We adopt this iterative formulation and tackle three major challenges for multi-hop retrieval.

ColBERT: late interaction paradigm Most learned-retrieval systems for OpenQA (§2) encode every query and passage into a *single* dense vector. Khattab and Zaharia [12] argue that such single-vector representations are not sufficiently expressive to model retrieval in many scenarios and introduce *late interaction*, a paradigm that represents every query and every document at a finer granularity: it uses a vector *for each constituent token*. Within this paradigm, they propose ColBERT, a state-of-the-art retriever wherein a BERT encoder embeds the query into a matrix of N vectors (given N tokens) and encodes every passage in the corpus as matrix of M vectors (for M tokens per passage). The passage representations are query-independent and thus are computed offline and indexed for fast retrieval. During retrieval with query q, ColBERT assigns a score to a passage d by finding the maximum-similarity (MaxSim) score between each vector in q's representation and *all* the vectors of d and then summing these MaxSim scores. This MaxSim-decomposed interaction enables scaling to massive collections with millions of passages, using vector-similarity indexes. Khattab and Zaharia [12] find this fine-grained matching to outperform single-vector representations, a finding extended to open-domain question answering by Khattab et al. [13]. In this work, we propose FLIPR (§3.1), a retriever with an improved late interaction mechanism for complex multi-hop queries. Whereas existing retrievers, whether traditional (e.g., TF-IDF) or neural [14; 11; 12], seek passages that match *all* of the query, multi-hop queries need to match disparate contexts. FLIPR handles this explicitly with *focused* late interaction.

Relevance-guided supervision Khattab et al. [13] propose an iterative strategy for weakly-supervising retrievers called relevance-guided supervision (RGS). RGS assumes that no labeled passages are supplied for training the retriever. Instead, every training question is associated with a short answer string whose presence in a passage is taken as a weak signal for relevance. RGS starts with an off-the-shelf retriever and uses it to collect the top-k passages for each training question, dividing these passages into positive and negative examples based on inclusion of the short answer



Figure 1: The architecture of Baleen with iterative retrieval and condensing. The model begins with iteration $t = 1$, provided initial user input Q_0. For every t, FLIPR takes in Q_{t-1} and retrieves the top-K passages, the condenser summarizes the relevant facts, and an updated query Q_t is produced. When $t = T$, Q_T is fed to the reader, which outputs a final prediction.

string. These examples are used to train a stronger retriever, which is then used to repeat this process one or two times. We draw inspiration from RGS when designing latent hop ordering: unlike RGS, we *do* have gold-labeled passages for training but we crucially have multiple hop and their order is not given. Lastly, our supervision for the *first hop* shares inspiration with GoldEn [17], which uses a bag-of-words model to identify the "more easily retrieved" passage among just two for HotPotQA.

3 Baleen

We now introduce Baleen, which uses an iterative retrieval paradigm to find relevant facts in $T \geq 1$ successive hops. On HotPotQA (§4) and HoVer (§5), we use Baleen with $T = 2$ and $T = 4$, respectively. As illustrated in Table 1, the input to Baleen is a textual *query* Q_0 like a question to answer or a claim to verify. The goal of hop t is to take in query Q_{t-1} and output an updated query Q_t containing the initial input query *and* pertinent facts extracted from the t hops.

The Baleen architecture is depicted in Figure 1. In every hop, FLIPR (§3.1) uses Q_{t-1} to retrieve K passages from the full corpus. These passages are fed into a two-stage *condenser* (§3.3), which reads these passages and extracts the most relevant *facts* (i.e., individual sentences). The facts are *condensed* into a single sequence and added to Q_t for the subsequent hop, if any. Once all hops are complete, Baleen's task-specific *reader* processes Q_T, which now contains the query and all condensed facts, to solve the downstream task. Baleen's retriever, condenser, and reader are implemented as Transformer encoders [20] and are trained individually. We use BERT-base [6] for FLIPR and, like Qi et al. [18] and Xiong et al. [23], use ELECTRA-large [5] for the other components. For supervision, we introduce the *latent hop ordering* scheme (§3.2).

3.1 FLIPR: Focused Late Interaction

The FLIPR encoders and interaction mechanism are shown in Figure 2. Our query encoder reads Q_{t-1} and outputs a vector representation of every token in the input. Each query embedding interacts with all passage embeddings via a MaxSim operator, permitting us to inherit the efficiency and scalability of ColBERT [12]. While vanilla ColBERT sums all the MaxSim outputs indiscriminately, FLIPR considers only the strongest-matching query embeddings for evaluating each passage: it sums only the top-$\hat{N}$ partial scores from N scores, with $\hat{N} < N$.

We refer to this top-k filter as a "focused" interaction. Intuitively, it allows the same query to match multiple relevant passages that are contextually unrelated, by aligning—during training and inference—a different subset of the query embeddings with different relevant passages. FLIPR applies this mechanism over the representation of the query and the facts separately, keeping the top-$\hat{N}$ and top-$\hat{L}$ from N and L embeddings, respectively. More formally, the FLIPR score $S_{q,d}$ of a passage d given a query q is the summation $S_{q,d} = S^Q_{q,d} + S^F_{q,d}$ over the scores corresponding to the original query and to the facts. Define $M^Q_i = \max_{j=1}^{m} E_{q_i} \cdot E^T_{d_j}$, that is, the maximum similarity of the ith query embedding against the passage embeddings. The partial score $S^Q_{q,d}$ is computed as

$$S^Q_{q,d} = \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{N}} \text{top}_{\hat{N}} \left\{ M^Q_i : i \in [N] \right\} \tag{1}$$



Figure 2: The proposed FLIPR retriever. Sub-figure (a) depicts our encoders, which represent every query and every passage as a *set* of embeddings. Given query q and document d, sub-figure (b) illustrates our *focused* late-interaction mechanism. It finds the maximum-similarity score of each query embedding $\mathbf{q}_i$ and then *focuses* on the top-k matches only. This is analogously applied to the fact embeddings $\mathbf{f}_j$ (in orange), and both scores are finally added.

where $\text{top}_{\hat{N}}$ is an operator that keeps the largest $\hat{N}$ values in a set. We define $S^F_{q,d}$ similarly, using the fact matches M^F_i instead of M^Q_i. We confirm the gains of FLIPR against the state-of-the-art ColBERT retriever in §5.3.

3.2 Supervision: Latent Hop Ordering

For every training example, our datasets supply *unordered* gold passages. However, dependencies often exist in retrieval as Table 1 illustrates: a system needs to retrieve and read the page of *Red Flaherty* to deduce that it needs information about *1965 World Series*. Such dependencies can be complex for 3- and 4-hop examples, as in HoVer.

We propose a generic mechanism for identifying the best gold passage(s) to learn to retrieve next. The key insight is that among the gold passages, a weakly-supervised retriever with strong inductive biases would reliably "prefer" those passages it can more naturally retrieve, given the hops so far. Thus, given Q_{t-1}, we train the retriever with *every* remaining gold passage and, among those, label as positives (for Q_{t-1}) only those ranked highly by the model. We subsequently use these weakly-labeled positives to train another retriever for all the hops.

Latent hop ordering is summarized in Algorithm 1, which assumes we have already trained a single-hop (i.e., first-hop) retriever R_1 in the manner of relevance-guided supervision (see §2). To start, we use R_1 to retrieve the top-k (e.g., $k = 1000$) passages for each training question (Line 2). We then divide these passages into positives P_1 and negatives N_1 (Line 3). Positives are the highly-ranked gold passages (i.e., the intersection of gold passages and the top-$\hat{k}$ passages with, e.g., $\hat{k} = 10$) and negatives are the non-gold passages. Subsequently, we expand first-hop queries with the oracle facts from P_1 to obtain the queries for the second hop (Line 4).

We train a second-hop retriever R_2 using the aforementioned queries and negatives (Line 6). As we do not have second-hop positives, as a form of weak supervision, we train the retriever with *all* gold passages (per query) besides those already in P_1. Once trained, we use R_2 to discover the second-hop

Algorithm 1: Latent Hop Ordering, a simplified procedure

Input: Training queries & unordered gold passages; Corpus of all passages; A single-hop retriever, R_1
Output: A multi-hop retriever, $\hat{R}$

1 $Q_0 \leftarrow$ the original training queries;
2 $Ranking_1 \leftarrow R_1.retrieve(Q_0)$;
3 $P_1, N_1 \leftarrow ExtractPositives(Ranking_1)$;
4 $Q_1 \leftarrow Q_0.expand(OracleFacts(P_1))$;
5 **for** hop $t \leftarrow 2$ ***to*** T **do**
6 Train a new retriever R_t using queries Q_{t-1} and negatives N_{t-1}. For positives, use gold passages not part of any P_s for $s < t$.
7 $Ranking_t \leftarrow R_t.retrieve(Q_{t-1})$;
8 $P_t, N_t \leftarrow ExtractPositives(Ranking_t)$; $Q_t \leftarrow Q_{t-1}.expand(OracleFacts(P_t))$;
9 **end**
10 For every hop $t \in [T]$, designate Q_{t-1} as queries, P_t as positives, and P_t as negatives.
11 Train a final retriever $\hat{R}$ using this combined training data for all hops. **return** $\hat{R}$

Table 2: Retrieval results on HotPotQA-fullwiki (dev) showing saturation in finding the gold pair of passages and passages with the answer string. Baleen and its ablation baseline ColBERT-Hop exceed 90–93% P-R@20 and 94–96% Ans-R@20, largely reducing the problem to *reading* the retrieved passages. We obtain P-EM for MDR from Xiong et al. [23] and for IRRR [18] from the authors.

Model	**Retriever**	**Architect.**	**Supervis.**	**P-EM**	**P-R@20**	**Ans-R@20**
MDR	DPR	Beam	Heuristic	81.2	82.9	89.4
IRRR	ELECTRA/BM25	Rerank	Heuristic	84.1	-	-
ColBERT-Hop (ablation)	ColBERT	Rerank	Heuristic	85.2	90.3	94.7
Baleen	FLIPR	Condense	Latent	**86.7**	**93.3**	**96.3**

positives P_2, to collect negatives N_2, and to expand the queries (Lines 7 and 8). We repeat this procedure for the third hop onward. Once this iterative procedure is complete, we have bootstrapped positives (and negatives) corresponding to every retrieval hop for each query. We combine these sets to train a single multi-hop retriever (Lines 10 and 11), which takes a query Q_t and learns to discriminate the positives in P_t from the negatives in N_t for every $t \in [T]$. In §5.3, we indeed find that this *generic* latent procedure outperforms a typical hand-crafted heuristic that relies on trying to match titles against the text.

3.3 Condenser: per-hop fact extraction

After each hop, the condenser proceeds in two stages. In the first stage, it reads Q_{t-1} and the top-K passages retrieved by FLIPR. The input passages are divided into their constituent sentences and every sentence is prepended with a special token. The output embedding corresponding to these sentence markers are scored via a linear layer, assigning a score to each sentence in every retrieved passage. We train the first-stage condenser with a cross-entropy loss over the sentences of two passages, a positive and a negative.

Across the K passages, the top-k facts are identified and concatenated into the second-stage condenser model. As above, we include special tokens between the sentences, and the second-stage condenser assigns a score to every fact while attending jointly over all of the top-k facts. This allows direct comparison and mutual conditioning. Every fact whose score is positive is selected to proceed, and the other facts are discarded. We train the second-hop condenser over a set of 7–9 facts, some positive and others (sampled) negative, using a linear combination of cross-entropy loss for each positive fact (against all negatives) and binary cross-entropy loss for each individual fact.

In practice, this condensed architecture offers novel tradeoffs against a re-ranking pipeline. On one hand, condensed retrieval scales better to more hops, as it represents the facts from K long passages using only a few sentences. This may provide stronger interpretability, as the inputs to the retriever (e.g., the example in Table 1) become more focused. On the other hand, re-ranking requires only passage-level labels, which can be cheaper to collect, and provides the retriever with broader context, which can help resolve ambiguous references. Empirically, we find the two approaches to be complementary. In §5.3, we show not only that condensing is competitive with re-ranking (despite much shorter context; §C), but also that a single retriever that uses both pipelines together substantially outperforms a standard rerank-only pipeline.

Reader: task-specific processing After all hops are conducted, a reader is used to extract answers or verify the claim. We use a standard Transformer encoder, in particular ELECTRA-large [5], which we feed the final output Q_t of our multi-hop retrieval and condensing pipeline. We train for question answering similar to Khattab et al. [13] or claim verification similar to Jiang et al. [10].

4 Diagnosing retrieval saturation on HotPotQA

Before beginning our primary evaluation on the many-hop HoVer benchmark, we first investigate the capacity of HotPotQA in reflecting the challenges on multi-hop retrieval (§1). We use HotPotQA's "fullwiki" setting, where the input to the model is a question whose answer requires retrieving two passages from Wikipedia. Similar to related work [23], we report passage-level exact-match (EM) and Recall@k (R@k) on the development set. These are the percentage of questions for which the model

Table 3: Our main passage retrieval results on HoVer. To compare with Jiang et al. [10], the Retrieval@100 results are for *supported* claims. The other results are for all claims. ⋆Marked result rows are from Jiang et al. The table reports fine-grained dev-set scores, and we submitted to the organizers and obtained **64.6** Psg-EM and **88.9** Psg-F1 for Baleen on the held-out test set.

	Retrieval@100				**Passage EM**				**Passage F1**			
Model / # Hops	**All**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**All**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**All**	**2**	**3**	**4**
TF-IDF + BERT⋆	44.6	80.0	39.2	15.6	12.5	34.0	5.8	1.0	60.2	69.9	58.2	53.4
ColBERT-Hop	74.8	95.8	77.9	47.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baleen	**92.2**	**97.7**	**93.1**	**85.1**	**63.6**	**75.8**	**62.5**	**52.6**	**89.2**	**90.2**	**89.9**	**86.8**
Oracle + BERT⋆	-	-	-	-	34.0	50.9	28.1	26.2	80.6	81.7	79.1	82.2
Human⋆	-	-	-	-	77.0	85.0	82.4	65.8	93.5	92.5	95.3	91.4

correctly identifies the two gold passages and for which the model's top-k retrieved passages contain both gold passages, respectively.[2] We also report Answer-Recall@k, the percentage of questions whose short answer string is found in the top-k passages (excluding yes/no questions).

We compare against the state-of-the-art models MDR and IRRR. We additionally compare with ColBERT-Hop, a strong baseline that ablates Baleen's retriever, condenser, and supervision: ColBERT-Hop uses the state-of-the-art neural retriever ColBERT (see §2), employs a typical re-ranker architecture, and uses heuristic supervision. The results are shown in Table 2. Baleen demonstrates strong results, finding both gold passages in over 93% of all questions in just k=20 passages. We argue that this effectively reduces the open-retrieval task to a narrow distractor-setting one, in which *reader* models are supplied with only a few passages that are (nearly) guaranteed to contain the answer and are expected to extract the answer from just those passages. While reading the retrieved passages may still pose additional challenges beyond retrieval, it should be just one of the many challenging aspects of multi-hop reasoning at scale. This motivates our focus on HoVer.

5 Main evaluation on HoVer

We now conduct our primary evaluation, applying Baleen on the many-hop claim verification dataset HoVer, following the evaluation protocol of Jiang et al. [10]. First, we study the retrieval performance of Baleen in §5.1. Subsequently (§5.2), we investigate its sentence extraction and claim verification performance, which constitutes a test of overall end-to-end system effectiveness. We compare a four-hop Baleen system against the official baseline and the ColBERT-Hop system from §4.[3] Refer to §B in the supplementary material for implementation details and hyperparameters.

Task description The input to the model is a claim, which is often one or a few sentences long. The model is to attempt to verify this claim, outputting "Supported" if the corpus contains enough evidence to verify the claim, or otherwise "Unsupported" if the corpus contradicts—or otherwise fails to support—this claim. Alongside this binary label, the model must extract facts (i.e., sentences) that justify its prediction. In particular, HoVer contains two-, three-, and four-hop claims that require facts from 2–4 different Wikipedia pages, and the model must find and extract one or more supporting facts from *each* of these pages for every claim. Models are not given the number of hops per claim.

5.1 Evaluating retrieval effectiveness

Table 3 reports the retrieval and passage extraction quality of the systems. We report three metrics, each sub-divided by the number of hops of each claim. The first is *Retrieval@100*, which is the percentage of claims for which the system retrieves *all* of the relevant passages within the top-100 results. To compare with Jiang et al. [10], we report the Retrieval@100 results only for supported claims. All other metrics are reported for all claims. The second metric is *Passage EM*, which is the

[2]For MDR, we use the authors released retrieval to compute P-R@20. The authors originally report 80.2, but we do not penalize the MDR retriever for finding both gold passages split across different pairs.

[3]At the time of writing, MDR's open-source implementation only supports two-hop retrieval and the IRRR implementation is not publicly available. Moreover, both Xiong et al. [23] and Qi et al. [18] explore training only with *two* gold passages (though IRRR includes evaluation on a yet-unreleased 3-hop test set too).

Table 4: Our main sentence extraction results on HoVer. ⋆Marked results are from Jiang et al. [10]. The table reports fine-grained results on the dev set and, where available, includes "dev/test" scores separated by a slash for the held-out test set score. In our test evaluation on the HoVer leaderboard, Baleen increases the overall "HoVer Score" metric from **15.3** for the baseline to **57.5**.

	Sentence EM				**Sentence F1**				**Verification**
Model / # of Hops	**All**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**All**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**Accuracy**
TF-IDF + BERT⋆	4.8/4.5	13.6	1.9	0.2	50.6/49.5	57.2	49.8	45.0	73.7
Baleen 1-hop	19.7	40.9	15.4	4.3	72.3	77.5	72.4	66.4	-
Baleen 2-hop	37.0	46.9	35.7	28.4	80.8	81.2	81.8	78.7	-
Baleen 3-hop	38.9	47.1	37.0	33.2	81.4	**81.2**	82.3	**80.0**	-
Baleen 4-hop	**39.2**/39.8	**47.3**	**37.7**	**33.3**	**81.5**/80.4	**81.2**	**82.5**	**80.0**	**84.5**/84.9
Oracle + BERT⋆	19.9	25.0	18.4	17.1	71.9	68.3	71.5	76.4	81.2
Human⋆	56.0	75.0	73.5	42.1	88.7	86.5	93.1	87.3	88.0

percentage of claims for which the system can provide the *exact* set of relevant passages. The third metric is *Passage F1*, which uses the standard F1 measure to offer a relaxed version of EM.

At the top of the table, the TF-IDF baseline retrieves top-100 results in one round of retrieval. At the bottom of the table, we include the results reported by Jiang et al. [10] for their BERT ranking model when supplied with oracle retrieval, and also their reported human performance. We show Baleen's performance after four hops, where Baleen's FLIPR retrieves 25 passages in each hop. Note that we exclude passages retrieved in hop t from the retrieval in further hops $t' > t$. As the table shows, Baleen achieves strong results, outperforming the official baseline model by 47.6 points in Retrieval@100, 51.1 points in Passage EM, and 29.0 points in Passage F1. In fact, Baleen's performance also consistently exceeds "Oracle + BERT" at passage extraction.

5.2 Evaluating end-to-end effectiveness

Next, we evaluate the performance of fact/sentence extraction and thereby the end-to-end claim verification of Baleen. The results are in Table 4, where *Sentence EM* and *Sentence F1* are defined similar to the corresponding metrics in Table 3 but focus on sentence-level extraction. Moreover, *Verification Accuracy* is the percentage of claims that are labelled correctly as "Supported" or "Unsupported". In Table 4, we see that Baleen's sentence-level results mirror its document-level results, with large performance gains across the board against the baseline model. Baleen also outperforms the oracle-retrieval BERT model of Jiang et al. [10], emphasizing the strong retrieval and condensing performance of Baleen. In the leaderboard test-set evaluation (scores expected to be posted soon), Baleen increases the overall "HoVer Score" metric from 15.3 for the baseline to 57.5.

5.3 Ablation studies

Lastly, Table 5 reports various settings and ablations of Baleen, corresponding to its contributions. Here, models **A** and **F** are simply the four-hop Baleen and ColBERT-Hop in the previous experiments, respectively. Models **B** and **C** test the effect of different architectural decisions on Baleen. In particular, model **B** replaces our condensed retrieval architecture with a simpler re-ranking architecture, which reflects a common design choice for multi-hop systems. In this case, FLIPR is given the top-ranked passage as context in each hop, helping expose the value of extracting facts in condensed retrieval. Second, model **C** trains a FLIPR retriever that uses both a condenser pipeline and a reranking pipeline, and retains the overall top-100 unique passages retrieved. The results indicate that condensing indeed offers complimentary gains and the hybrid model attains the highest scores.

Moreover, models **D** and **E** test modifications to the retriever, while using the condenser of model **A**. Specifically, **D** replaces our FLIPR retriever with a simpler ColBERT retriever, while retaining all other components of our architecture. This allows us to contrast our proposed focused late interaction with the "vanilla" late interaction of ColBERT. Further, model **E** replaces our weak-supervision strategy for inferring effective hop orders with a hand-crafted rule that deliberately exploits a bias common to HotPotQA and HoVer, namely that passage titles can be a strong signal for hop ordering.

Table 5: Retrieval@100 comparison between Baleen and five ablation settings.

	Model	All	2	3	4
	Architecture Ablations				
A	Baleen$_{\text{CONDENSE}}$ (main architecture)	92.2	97.7	93.1	85.1
B	Baleen$_{\text{RERANK}}$	91.2	98.7	93.0	80.0
C	Baleen$_{\text{HYBRID}}$	**94.5**	**99.2**	**94.4**	**90.0**
	Retrieval Ablations (over arch. **A**)				
D	w/o FLIPR (uses ColBERT retrieval modeling)	87.4	97.3	89.5	73.4
E	w/o LHO (uses a recursive title/passage-overlap heuristic for ordering)	84.8	97.1	88.3	65.6
	Full Model Ablation (over arch. **B**)				
F	ColBERT-Hop (w/o FLIPR, LHO)	74.8	95.8	77.9	47.6

6 Discussion

Research limitations This work investigates multi-hop reasoning at a large scale by focusing on the challenges presented by retrieval in this setting. While *reading* the retrieved (or supplied) passages to solve a downstream task is another important aspect, one that has received more attention in the literature, we do not attempt to advance the state of the art approaches for multi-hop reader models. The majority of multi-hop retrieval work to date has focused on two-hop retrieval. We leverage the recently-released HoVer dataset to scale our investigation to four retrieval hops, and Baleen allows for an arbitrary number of hops in principle, but more evaluation is needed before we can claim generality to an arbitrary number of hops. We propose a condenser architecture that summarizes contexts extractively. This architectural decision allows us to scale easily to many hops as it condenses the hop information into a short context, but doing so relies on the availability on sentence-level training information (as in HotPotQA and HoVer) and extracting sentences might in principle lose important context. We expect future work to be able to infer the sentence-level labels in a latent manner and we are excited about work like decontextualization [4] that tries to retain important context for standalone sentences. Lastly, considering that learning neural retrievers for large-scale many-hop tasks is a recently-emerging topic, we had to design our own strong baseline to strengthen our HoVer evaluation, after confirming that our baseline was very strong on HotPotQA.

Environmental and societal impact By turning to retrieval from text corpora (see §2) as a mechanism to find and use knowledge, we seek to build scalable and efficient models that can reason and solve downstream tasks without growing their number of trainable parameters dramatically. We use Wikipedia, which has favorable licensing (generally under CC BY-SA 3.0), and publicly-released datasets HoVer and HotPotQA (CC BY-SA 4.0 licenses). HotPotQA and HoVer are crowd-sourced, and we expect models trained on them to reflect the biases of the underlying data. Moreover, automated systems for answering questions or verifying claims can have misleading outputs or may even be abused. That said, we believe that focusing on retrieval and extractive models as a way to help users find information can offer net gains to society, especially in contrast with large generative models that may hallucinate or make statements ungrounded in a human-written corpus.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose Baleen, a system for multi-hop reasoning that tackles the complexity of multi-hop queries with the *focused late interaction* mechanism for retrieval and mitigates the exponential search space problem by employing an aggressive *condensed retrieval* pipeline in every hop, which consolidates the pertinent information retrieved throughout the hops into a relatively short context while preserving high recall. Moreover, Baleen deals with the difficulty of ordering passages for many-hop supervision via *latent hop ordering*. By employing a strong retriever, incorporating a condenser, and avoiding brittle heuristics, Baleen can robustly learn from limited training signal. We evaluated Baleen's retrieval on HotPotQA and the recent many-hop HoVer claim verification dataset and found that it greatly outperforms the baseline models.

References

[1] Akari Asai, Kazuma Hashimoto, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Richard Socher, and Caiming Xiong. Learning to retrieve reasoning paths over wikipedia graph for question answering. *ICLR 2020*, 2020.

[2] Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. Reading Wikipedia to answer open-domain questions. arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00051, 2017. URL `https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.00051`.

[3] Jifan Chen and Greg Durrett. Understanding dataset design choices for multi-hop reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12106*, 2019.

[4] Eunsol Choi, Jennimaria Palomaki, Matthew Lamm, Tom Kwiatkowski, Dipanjan Das, and Michael Collins. Decontextualization: Making sentences stand-alone. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:447–461, 2021.

[5] Kevin Clark, Minh-Thang Luong, Quoc V Le, and Christopher D Manning. ELECTRA: Pre-training text encoders as discriminators rather than generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.10555*, 2020.

[6] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.

[7] Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01241*, 2018.

[8] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. Realm: Retrieval-augmented language model pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.08909*, 2020.

[9] Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and A. Aizawa. Constructing a multi-hop qa dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. *ArXiv*, abs/2011.01060, 2020.

[10] Yichen Jiang, Shikha Bordia, Zheng Zhong, Charles Dognin, Maneesh Singh, and Mohit Bansal. HoVer: A dataset for many-hop fact extraction and claim verification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.03088*, 2020.

[11] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906*, 2020.

[12] Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. ColBERT: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over BERT. *SIGIR 2020*, 2020.

[13] Omar Khattab, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. Relevance-guided supervision for openqa with colbert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00814*, 2020.

[14] Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00300*, 2019.

[15] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandara Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11401*, 2020.

[16] Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vassilis Plachouras, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Kilt: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.02252*, 2020.

[17] Peng Qi, Xiaowen Lin, Leo Mehr, Zijian Wang, and Christopher D. Manning. Answering complex open-domain questions through iterative query generation. In *2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, 2019. URL `https://nlp.stanford.edu/pubs/qi2019answering.pdf`.

[18] Peng Qi, Haejun Lee, Oghenetegiri Sido, Christopher D Manning, et al. Retrieve, rerank, read, then iterate: Answering open-domain questions of arbitrary complexity from text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.12527*, 2020.

[19] James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. Fever: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and verification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 809–819, 2018.

[20] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Ł ukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*, pages 5998–6008. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL `http://papers.nips.cc/paper/7181-attention-is-all-you-need.pdf`.

[21] Haoyu Wang, Mo Yu, Xiaoxiao Guo, Rajarshi Das, Wenhan Xiong, and Tian Gao. Do multi-hop readers dream of reasoning chains? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14520*, 2019.

[22] Johannes Welbl, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. Constructing datasets for multi-hop reading comprehension across documents. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6:287–302, 2018.

[23] Wenhan Xiong, Xiang Lorraine Li, Srini Iyer, Jingfei Du, Patrick Lewis, William Yang Wang, Yashar Mehdad, Wen-tau Yih, Sebastian Riedel, Douwe Kiela, et al. Answering complex open-domain questions with multi-hop dense retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12756*, 2020.

[24] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 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, 2018.

[25] Chen Zhao, Chenyan Xiong, Corby Rosset, Xia Song, Paul Bennett, and Saurabh Tiwary. Transformer-xh: Multi-evidence reasoning with extra hop attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.

Checklist

1. For all authors...
   (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? [Yes]
   (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes] See §6.
   (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [Yes] See §6.
   (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes]
2. If you are including theoretical results...
   (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]
   (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]
3. If you ran experiments...
   (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [No] Code and instructions will be made public for the camera ready, if this work is accepted.
   (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [Yes] See §B in the supplementary material.
   (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [No] Due to the computational cost and considering the large and consistent nature of our gains, we run these experiments once. Notice that for both datasets, we train on 18k–90k and evaluate on 4k–7k examples. See more data details in §A in the supplementary material.

(d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [Yes] Appendix B in the supplementary material describes our computational resources and the computational cost of training and evaluating Baleen on the four-hop HoVer dataset. That said, we acknowledge that it is difficult to account comprehensively for all of the resource use connected to a multi-month project.

4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
   (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes]
   (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes] See §6.
   (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [No]
   (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [N/A]
   (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [N/A]
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
   (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [N/A]
   (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]
   (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [N/A]