

# CORRECTIVE RETRIEVAL AUGMENTED GENERATION

**Anonymous authors**

Paper under double-blind review

## ABSTRACT

Large language models (LLMs) inevitably exhibit hallucinations since the accuracy of generated texts cannot be secured solely by the parametric knowledge they encapsulate. Although retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) is a practicable complement to LLMs, it relies heavily on the relevance of retrieved documents, raising concerns about how the model behaves if retrieval goes wrong. To this end, we propose the **C**orrective **R**etrieval **A**ugmented **G**eneration (CRAG) to improve the robustness of generation. Specifically, a lightweight retrieval evaluator is designed to assess the overall quality of retrieved documents for a query, returning a confidence degree based on which different knowledge retrieval actions can be triggered. Since retrieval from static and limited corpora can only return sub-optimal documents, large-scale web searches are utilized as an extension for augmenting the retrieval results. Besides, a decompose-then-recompose algorithm is designed for retrieved documents to selectively focus on key information and filter out irrelevant information in them. CRAG is plug-and-play and can be seamlessly coupled with various RAG-based approaches. Experiments on four datasets covering short- and long-form generation tasks show that CRAG can significantly improve the performance of RAG-based approaches.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Large language models (LLMs) have attracted increasing attention and exhibited impressive abilities to understand instructions and generate fluent language texts (Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022; Touvron et al., 2023a). Nevertheless, LLMs inevitably manifest hallucinations (Ji et al., 2023) due to their struggle with factual errors (Mallen et al., 2023; Min et al., 2023) and inability to secure the accuracy of generated texts solely by the parametric knowledge they encapsulate (Zhang et al., 2023b; Muhlgay et al., 2023).

Prior research has introduced the retrieval techniques to incorporate the knowledge relevant to input and augment generation, as exemplified by retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) (Lewis et al., 2020). In this framework, the input to models is augmented by prepending relevant documents that are retrieved from an external knowledge corpus (Gua et al., 2020). While RAG serves as a practicable complement to LLMs, its effectiveness is contingent upon the relevance and accuracy of the retrieved documents (Li et al., 2022; Tan et al., 2022). The heavy reliance of generation on the retrieved knowledge raises significant concerns about the model’s behavior and performance in scenarios where retrieval may fail or return inaccurate results (Shi et al., 2023). As Figure 1 shows that a low-quality retriever is prone to introducing a substantial amount of irrelevant information, impeding the models from acquiring accurate knowledge and potentially misleading them, resulting in issues such as hallucinations (Zhang et al., 2023b). However, most conventional RAG approaches indiscriminately incorporate the retrieved documents, regardless of whether these documents are relevant or not (Rony et al., 2022). Furthermore, current methods mostly treat complete documents as reference knowledge both during retrieval and utilization. But a considerable portion of the text within these retrieved documents is often non-essential for generation, which should not have been equally referred to and involved in RAG.

On account of the above issues, this paper particularly studies the scenarios where the retriever returns inaccurate results. A method named **C**orrective **R**etrieval-**A**ugmented **G**eneration (CRAG) is proposed to self-correct the results of retriever and improve the utilization of documents for augmenting generation. A lightweight retrieval evaluator is designed to assess the overall quality of retrieved documents for a query. This serves as a crucial component in RAG, contributing to

054 informative generation by reviewing and evaluating the relevance and reliability of the retrieved  
 055 documents. A confidence degree is quantified based on which different knowledge retrieval actions  
 056 of {Correct, Incorrect, Ambiguous} can be triggered. For the latter two actions, large-  
 057 scale web searches (Piktus et al., 2021; Komeili et al., 2022) are integrated as a strategic extension,  
 058 since retrieval from static and limited corpora can only return sub-optimal documents in terms  
 059 of scope and diversity. This augmentation is implemented to broaden the spectrum of retrieved  
 060 information, harnessing the expansive and dynamic nature of the web to complement and enrich the  
 061 initially obtained documents. Furthermore, to eliminate redundant contexts contained in retrieved  
 062 documents that are unhelpful for RAG, a decompose-then-recompose algorithm is meticulously  
 063 crafted throughout the retrieval and utilization process. This algorithm ensures the refinement of  
 064 retrieved information, optimizing the extraction of key insights and minimizing the inclusion of  
 065 non-essential elements, thereby enhancing the utilization of retrieved data.

066 CRAG is plug-and-play and experimentally  
 067 implemented into RAG (Lewis et al., 2020) and  
 068 Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) for demonstrating  
 069 its adaptability to RAG-based approaches.  
 070 Results on four datasets of PopQA (Mallen  
 071 et al., 2023), Biography (Min et al., 2023),  
 072 Pub Health (Zhang et al., 2023a), and Arc-  
 073 Challenge (Bhaktavatsalam et al., 2021) show  
 074 that CRAG can significantly improve the per-  
 075 formance of standard RAG and state-of-the-art  
 076 Self-RAG, demonstrating its generalizability  
 077 across both short- and long-form generation  
 078 tasks. To facilitate others to reproduce our  
 079 results, we will publish all source code later.

080 In summary, our contributions in this paper are  
 081 three-fold: 1) This paper studies the scenarios  
 082 where the retriever returns inaccurate results  
 083 and, to the best of our knowledge, makes the  
 084 first attempt to design corrective strategies for  
 085 RAG to improve its robustness. 2) A plug-  
 086 and-play method named CRAG is proposed  
 087 to improve the ability of automatic self-  
 088 correction and efficient utilization of retrieved  
 089 documents. 3) Experimental results extensively  
 090 demonstrate CRAG’s adaptability to RAG-  
 091 based approaches and its generalizability across  
 092 short- and long-form generation tasks.

## 093 2 RELATED WORK

094  
 095 **Hallucinations of LLMs** Although LLMs have exhibited impressive abilities to understand  
 096 instructions and generate fluent language texts (Bang et al., 2023; Qin et al., 2023; Zhong et al.,  
 097 2023), one of the most severe issues that LLMs have still been struggling with is hallucinations. As  
 098 many studies found (Shuster et al., 2021), either outdated information or incorrect knowledge that is  
 099 activated would seriously result in hallucinations. Large-scale unregulated training data collection,  
 100 low proportion of high-quality sampling data, imperfection of data allocation in the input space,  
 101 and many other realistic factors could impact the LLMs and exacerbate the problems. Thus, it is  
 102 obvious that the lack of accurate and specific knowledge can lead to misleading or even inaccurate  
 103 generation, which will severely hurt the experience of users in most practical applications.

104 **Retrieval-Augmented Generation** RAG (Lewis et al., 2020; Guu et al., 2020) is regarded as a  
 105 useful method to address the issues above, which enhances the input questions of generative LLMs  
 106 with retrieved documents. It usually provides an extra knowledge source from a specific corpus,  
 107 i.e., Wikipedia, which greatly improves the performance of LLMs in a variety of tasks, especially  
 in the knowledge-intensive ones. The proposed methods generally leverage information retrieval




Figure 1: The examples show that a low-quality retriever is prone to introducing a substantial amount of irrelevant information, impeding the generators from acquiring accurate knowledge and potentially misleading them.

to supply documents containing relevant knowledge for generative LLMs. Earlier studies adopt either sparse or dense retrievers at the front end of a pre-trained language model that specializes in response generation. Despite this, the methods above usually ignore a question, *what if the retrieval goes wrong?* Since the purpose of introducing a retrieval is to secure that generative LMs can obtain relevant and accurate knowledge. If retrieved documents are irrelevant, the retrieval system can even exacerbate the factual error that LMs make.

**Advanced RAG** Many advanced approaches have been developed from the original RAG in recent years (Zhang et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024). Considering that retrieval is sometimes unnecessary for some queries, conversely, responses without retrieval are even more accurate in many situations. Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) is proposed to selectively retrieve knowledge and introduce a critic model to decide whether to retrieve. Yoran et al. (2024) designed an NLI model to identify the irrelevant context and improve robustness. SAIL (Luo et al., 2023) is tuned on instructions to insert retrieved documents before instructions. While Toolformer (Schick et al., 2023) is pre-trained for calling APIs such as Wikipedia. In addition, in some long-text generation tasks, external knowledge is needed more than once, and when to retrieve should be concerned. Jiang et al. (2023) actively anticipate future content and decide when and what to retrieve in long-form generation.

Compared with recent studies (Schick et al., 2023; Luo et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2024) that are the most relevant to our work, a main difference should be highlighted. These approaches target on exploiting retrieval as a useful tool to augment generation or whether retrieval is necessary, while this study particularly studies the scenarios where the retriever returns inaccurate results. To the best of our knowledge, this paper makes the first attempt to explore and design corrective strategies for RAG to improve its robustness of generation.

### 3 TASK FORMULATION

Following previous work (Lewis et al., 2020; Asai et al., 2024), given input  $\mathcal{X}$  and an accessible corpus containing a large amount of knowledge documents  $\mathcal{C} = \{d_1, \dots, d_N\}$ , the system is expected to generate the output  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The entire framework is usually divided into a retriever  $\mathcal{R}$  and a generator  $\mathcal{G}$ . The retriever  $\mathcal{R}$  aims to retrieve the top- $\mathcal{K}$  documents  $\mathcal{D} = \{d_{r_1}, \dots, d_{r_k}\}$  that are relevant to the input  $\mathcal{X}$  from the corpus  $\mathcal{C}$ . Based on the input  $\mathcal{X}$  and the retrieved results  $\mathcal{D}$ , the generator  $\mathcal{G}$  is responsible for generating the output  $\mathcal{Y}$ . This framework can be formulated as:

$$P(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X}) = P(\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{X})P(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D}|\mathcal{X}). \quad (1)$$

It shows that the retriever and generator are seamlessly coupled, exhibiting low risk tolerance. Any unsuccessful retrieval can result in an unsatisfactory response, regardless of the impressive abilities of the generator. This is exactly the focus of this paper to improve the robustness of generation.

## 4 CRAG: CORRECTIVE RETRIEVAL AUGMENTED GENERATION

### 4.1 OVERVIEW OF MODEL INFERENCE

Figure 2 and Algorithm 1 present an overview of CRAG at inference, which designs corrective strategies to improve the robustness of generation. Given an input query and the retrieved documents from any retriever, a lightweight retrieval evaluator is constructed to estimate the relevance score of retrieved documents to the input query (Section 4.2). The relevance score is quantified into a total of three confidence degrees and then triggered the corresponding actions:  $\{\text{Correct}, \text{Incorrect}, \text{Ambiguous}\}$  (Section 4.3). If the action `Correct` is triggered, the retrieved documents will be refined into more precise knowledge strips. This refinement operation involves knowledge decomposition, filter, and recombination (Section 4.4). If the action `Incorrect` is triggered, the retrieved documents will be discarded. Instead, web searches are resorted to and regarded as complementary knowledge sources for corrections (Section 4.5). Eventually, when it cannot confidently make a correct or incorrect judgment, a soft and balanced action `Ambiguous` which combines both of them is triggered. After optimizing the retrieval results, an arbitrary generative model can be adopted.




Figure 2: An overview of the proposed CRAG at inference. A retrieval evaluator is constructed to evaluate the relevance of the retrieved documents to the input, and estimate a confidence degree based on which different knowledge retrieval actions of {Correct, Incorrect, Ambiguous} can be triggered.

#### 4.2 RETRIEVAL EVALUATOR

It is natural to wonder whether the retrieved documents are accurate or not before using them, which is significant since irrelevant or misleading messages can be identified in this way. The accuracy of the retrieval evaluator undeniably plays a pivotal role in shaping the overall system performance, as it influences the outcomes of subsequent processes. Our objective is to correct the retrieved documents if they are irrelevant. Specifically, T5-large (Raffel et al., 2020) is adopted for initializing the retrieval evaluator and fine-tuned. Its parameter size is much smaller than the most current LLMs (Touvron et al., 2023a;b; Chowdhery et al., 2023; Anil et al., 2023; Brown et al., 2020; Ouyang et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023). To ensure all experimental results were comparable with Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024), the same retrieval results through Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022) provided by Self-RAG were also adopted in our experiments. The relevance signals for fine-tuning the evaluator can be collected from the existing datasets. For example, PopQA (Mallen et al., 2023) provides the golden subject wiki title from wikipedia for each question. We can use that to track a not 100% relevant but rather high-quality passage. We utilized that as the relevance signals for fine-tuning the retrieval evaluator.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, the negative samples for fine-tuning were all randomly sampled from the retrieval results, which are rather similar to the input query but not relevant. More details about this fine-tuning step can be referred to in Appendix B.3. For every question, there are generally 10 documents retrieved. The question is concatenated with each single document as the input, and the evaluator predicts the relevance score for each question-document pair individually. We also tried to prompt ChatGPT to identify the retrieval relevance for comparison, but it underperforms as elaborated in Section 5.5. Based on these calculated relevance scores, a final judgment is made as to whether the retrieval is correct or not associated with the action trigger. In our proposed framework, the retrieval quality is evaluated at a relatively low cost without the need to have access to large and expensive LLMs. Compared with the critic model of

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/akariasai/PopQA>

---

**Algorithm 1:** CRAG Inference

---

**Require:**  $E$  (Retrieval Evaluator),  $W$  (Query Rewriter),  $G$  (Generator)  
**Input :**  $x$  (Input question),  $D = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k\}$  (Retrieved documents)  
**Output :**  $y$  (Generated response)

- 1  $score_i = E$  evaluates the relevance of each pair  $(x, d_i)$ ,  $d_i \in D$
- 2 **Confidence** = Calculate and give a final judgment based on  $\{score_1, score_2, \dots, score_k\}$   
// **Confidence** has 3 optional values: [CORRECT], [INCORRECT] or [AMBIGUOUS]
- 3 **if**  $Confidence == [CORRECT]$  **then**
- 4     Internal\_Knowledge = Knowledge\_Refine( $x, D$ )
- 5      $k =$  Internal\_Knowledge
- 6 **else if**  $Confidence == [INCORRECT]$  **then**
- 7     External\_Knowledge = Web\_Search( $W$  Rewrites  $x$  for searching)
- 8      $k =$  External\_Knowledge
- 9 **else if**  $Confidence == [AMBIGUOUS]$  **then**
- 10    Internal\_Knowledge = Knowledge\_Refine( $x, D$ )
- 11    External\_Knowledge = Web\_Search( $W$  Rewrites  $x$  for searching)
- 12     $k =$  Internal\_Knowledge + External\_Knowledge
- 13 **end**
- 14  $G$  predicts  $y$  given  $x$  and  $k$

---

Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) that instruction-tuned LLaMA-2 (7B), the evaluator designed in CRAG demonstrates the advantages of being quite lightweight (0.77B).

### 4.3 ACTION TRIGGER

To correct the irrelevant documents and refine the target documents as needed, actions should be executed discriminately. Based on the aforementioned confidence score for each retrieved document, three types of actions are designed and triggered accordingly where the upper and lower thresholds are set. If the confidence score is higher than the upper threshold, the retrieved document is identified as `Correct`, while identified as `Incorrect` if below the lower threshold. Otherwise, a more soft and intermediate action, i.e., `Ambiguous` is executed. Each retrieved document is conducted individually and integrated eventually.

**Correct** Here, a retrieval is assumed `Correct` when the confidence score of *at least one retrieved document* is higher than the upper threshold. If so, it means that there are relevant documents in the retrieved results, and the knowledge from the retrieval results is supposed to be more reliable and accurate. However, even if a relevant document can be found, there is inevitably some noisy knowledge strips in this document. To extract the most critical knowledge strips within this document, a knowledge refinement method is further designed which will be elaborated in Section 4.4.

**Incorrect** Besides, a retrieval is assumed `Incorrect` when the confidence scores of *all retrieved documents* are below the lower threshold. This indicates that all retrieved documents are considered irrelevant, which are unhelpful for generation. Once the knowledge from the retrieval results is judged to be inaccurate, it is unwise to still get stuck in it, which is likely to result in fabricated facts. Therefore, we need to seek new sources of knowledge for correction. Here, web search is introduced to search from the Internet as elaborated in Section 4.5. This corrective action helps overcome the embarrassing challenge where no reliable knowledge can be referred to.

**Ambiguous** Except for the above two situations, the remaining will be assigned to an intermediate action of `Ambiguous`. This generally occurs when the accuracy of the retrieval is hard to distinguish and the evaluator gives an intermediate score. Since the retrieval evaluator is not confident in its judgment, both types of processed knowledge in `Correct` and `Incorrect` are combined to complement each other. Implementing such a moderating and soft strategy can significantly contribute to strengthening the robustness and resilience of the system, fostering a more adaptable framework for optimal performance.

**Discussion** Preliminary experiments of employing only the `Correct` and `Incorrect` actions show that the efficacy of CRAG was easily affected by the accuracy of the retrieval evaluator. The reason might be the distinct knowledge switch for all input cases, regardless of the level of confidence in their judgment. The design of the `Ambiguous` action significantly helps to mitigate the dependence on the accuracy of the retrieval evaluator.

#### 4.4 KNOWLEDGE REFINEMENT

Given a retrieved relevant document, a decompose-then-recompose knowledge refinement method is designed to further extract the most critical knowledge strips in it. To obtain fine-grained retrieval results, we segmented the retrieved results into internal strips. If a retrieved result is as short as one or two sentences, it is regarded as an individual strip, otherwise, retrieval documents are required to be split into smaller units which generally consist of a few sentences according to the total length. The scale is assumed to include an independent piece of information, and the filtering is based on the segments. Then, the retrieval evaluator fine-tuned in Section 4.2 is employed to calculate the relevance score of each knowledge strip. Based on these scores, irrelevant knowledge strips are filtered out, while relevant ones are recomposed via concatenation in order, namely internal knowledge.

#### 4.5 WEB SEARCH

It would be more intelligent if a system itself could determine that its existing knowledge corpus could not solve the problem well and turn to additional external knowledge for help. On the contrary, even if a system knows that the existing knowledge cannot solve the problem, but still sticks to the limited knowledge corpus, it will only give a fabricated fact in the end, which is called hallucination. Therefore, it is extremely important to seek complementary external knowledge if the retrieved results are all assumed irrelevant, and we consider a system that knows what it doesn't know and what it cannot answer to be more intelligent than one that clings to limited knowledge and is incapable of seeking external knowledge. Since retrieval from static and limited corpora can only return sub-optimal documents in terms of scope and diversity, large-scale web searches (Piktus et al., 2021; Komeili et al., 2022) are integrated as a strategic extension of RAG. Specifically, the inputs are rewritten into queries composed of keywords by ChatGPT to mimic the daily usage of search engine. The prompt for rewriting is shown in Appendix A. In CRAG, a public and accessible commercial web search API is adopted to generate a series of URL links for every query. Considering that knowledge from large-scale web searches could introduce biases or unreliable information, authoritative and regulated web pages like Wikipedia are preferred, which can significantly help mitigate these issues. Moreover, we utilize the URL links to navigate web pages, transcribe their content, and employ the same knowledge refinement method as Section 4.4 to derive the relevant web knowledge, namely external knowledge.

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

We conducted experiments to extensively demonstrate CRAG's adaptability to RAG-based approaches and its generalizability across both short- and long-form generation tasks.

### 5.1 TASKS, DATASETS AND METRICS

CRAG was evaluated on four datasets, including **PopQA** (Mallen et al., 2023) (*short-form* generation), **Biography** (Min et al., 2023) (*long-form* generation), **PubHealth** (Zhang et al., 2023a) (*true-or-false* question), and **Arc-Challenge** (Bhakthavatsalam et al., 2021) (*multiple-choice* question). Following previous work, accuracy was adopted as the evaluation metric for PopQA, PubHealth, and Arc-Challenge. FactScore (Min et al., 2023) was adopted as the evaluation metric for Biography. Readers can refer to Appendix B.1 for more details. The same metrics are used because our proposed method is comparable to previous studies, since we used the same retrieval results as previous work. The difference lies in that our motivation is to improve the retrieval quality by correcting the retrieval results that the system judges to be of low quality. This can be analogous to RAG's augmentation to standalone parameterized language models and we further augment RAG with corrective strategies.

Table 1: Overall evaluation results on the test sets of four datasets. Results are separated based on the generation LLMs. **Bold** numbers indicate the best performance among all methods and LLMs. **Gray-colored bold** scores indicate the best performance using a specific LLM. \* indicates the results reproduced by us, otherwise results except ours are cited from their original papers.

Method	PopQA (Accuracy)	Bio (FactScore)	Pub (Accuracy)	ARC (Accuracy)
<i>LMs trained with propriety data</i>				
LLaMA2-c <sub>13B</sub>	20.0	55.9	49.4	38.4
Ret-LLaMA2-c <sub>13B</sub>	51.8	79.9	52.1	37.9
ChatGPT	29.3	71.8	70.1	<b>75.3</b>
Ret-ChatGPT	50.8	-	54.7	<b>75.3</b>
Perplexity.ai	-	71.2	-	-
<i>Baselines without retrieval</i>				
LLaMA2 <sub>7B</sub>	14.7	44.5	34.2	21.8
Alpaca <sub>7B</sub>	23.6	45.8	49.8	45.0
LLaMA2 <sub>13B</sub>	14.7	53.4	29.4	29.4
Alpaca <sub>13B</sub>	24.4	50.2	55.5	54.9
CoVE <sub>65B</sub>	-	71.2	-	-
<i>Baselines with retrieval</i>				
LLaMA2 <sub>7B</sub>	38.2	78.0	30.0	48.0
Alpaca <sub>7B</sub>	46.7	76.6	40.2	48.0
SAIL	-	-	69.2	48.4
LLaMA2 <sub>13B</sub>	45.7	77.5	30.2	26.0
Alpaca <sub>13B</sub>	46.1	77.7	51.1	57.6
<i>LLaMA2-hf-7b</i>				
RAG	50.5	44.9	48.9	43.4
CRAG	<b>54.9</b>	47.7	<b>59.5</b>	<b>53.7</b>
Self-RAG*	29.0	32.2	0.7	23.9
Self-CRAG	49.0	<b>69.1</b>	0.6	27.9
<i>SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b</i>				
RAG	52.8	59.2	39.0	53.2
CRAG	59.8	74.1	<b>75.6</b>	68.6
Self-RAG	54.9	81.2	72.4	67.3
Self-CRAG	<b>61.8</b>	<b>86.2</b>	74.8	67.2

## 5.2 BASELINES

We primarily compared CRAG with both approaches with and without retrieval, where the latter can be further split into standard RAG and latest advanced RAG, including:

**Baselines without retrieval.** We evaluated some public LLMs, LLaMA2-7B,13B (Touvron et al., 2023b), instruction-tuned models, Alpaca-7B,13B (Dubois et al., 2023), and CoVE<sub>65B</sub> (Dhuliawala et al., 2024) which introduces iterative engineering to improve the factuality of LLM generations. Propriety LLMs such as LLaMA2-chat<sub>13B</sub> and ChatGPT are also included.

**Standard RAG.** We evaluated the standard RAG (Lewis et al., 2020) where an LM generates output given the query prepended with the top retrieved documents using the same retriever as in our system. Here we adopted several public instruction-tuned LLMs, including LLaMA2-7B, 13B (Touvron et al., 2023b), Alpaca-7B,13B (Dubois et al., 2023), as well as LLaMA2-7B instruction-tuned in Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024).

**Advanced RAG.** (1) SAIL (Luo et al., 2023) that instruction-tuned an LM on the Alpaca instruction-tuning data with top retrieved documents inserted before instructions. (2) Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) that tuned the LLaMA2 on the instruction-tuning data containing several sets of reflection tokens which were labeled by GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023). (3) Following Asai et al. (2024), we also cited the results of retrieval-augmented baselines trained with private data: Ret-ChatGPT and Ret-LLaMA-chat, which deploy the same augmentation technique above, as well as perplexity.ai, an InstructGPT-based production search system.

### 5.3 RESULTS

Table 1 presents the results on four datasets. The model coupling the proposed method with standard RAG is named CRAG and that coupling with Self-RAG is named Self-CRAG. Readers can refer to Appendix B.3 for more implementation details of our proposed methods. From these results, we can conclude the following findings:

*First, the proposed method can significantly improve the performance of RAG and Self-RAG.* Specifically, as shown in table 1, CRAG outperformed RAG by margins of 19.0% accuracy on PopQA, 14.9% FactScore on Biography, 36.6% accuracy on PubHealth, and 8.1% accuracy on Arc-Challenge when based on *SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b*, as well as by margins of 9.6% accuracy on PopQA, 2.8% FactScore on Biography, and 2.0% on Arc-Challenge when based on *LLaMA2-hf-7b*. Compared with the current state-of-the-art Self-RAG, Self-CRAG outperformed it by margins of 20.0% accuracy on PopQA, 36.9% FactScore on Biography, and 4.0% accuracy on Arc-Challenge when based on *LLaMA2-hf-7b*, as well as by margins of 6.9% accuracy on PopQA, 5.0% FactScore on Biography, and 2.4% accuracy on PubHealth, when based on *SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b*. These results demonstrated the adaptability of CRAG which is plug-and-play and can be implemented into RAG-based approaches.

*Second, the proposed method demonstrated great generalizability across a variety of generation tasks.* In particular, these benchmarks reported in Table 1 respectively represent different practical scenarios including short-form entity generation (PopQA), long-form generation (Biography), and closed-set tasks (PubHealth, Arc-Challenge). These results verified the consistent effectiveness of CRAG. Its versatility across a spectrum of tasks underscores its robust capabilities and generalizability across diverse scenarios.

*Third, the proposed method exhibited greater flexibility in replacing the underlying LLM generator.* It can be seen that CRAG still showed competitive performance when the underlying LLMs was changed from *SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b* to *LLaMA2-hf-7b*, while the performance of Self-RAG dropped significantly, even underperforming the standard RAG on several benchmarks. The reason for these results is that Self-RAG needs to be instruction-tuned using human or LLM annotated data to learn to output special critic tokens as needed, while this ability is not learned in common LLMs. CRAG does not have any requirements for this ability. As you can imagine, when more advanced LLMs are available in the future, they can be coupled with CRAG easily, while additional instruction tuning is still necessary for Self-RAG.

### 5.4 ABLATION STUDY

#### The impact of each triggered action.

To further verify the effectiveness of triggered actions designed in the retrieval evaluator, ablation tests for removing each single action in the proposed method were conducted as shown in Table 2. Evaluations on the PopQA dataset were conducted to demonstrate the performance change in terms of accuracy. Specifically, when the action `Correct` or `Incorrect` was removed, it was merged with `Ambiguous` so that the proportion that originally triggered `Correct` or `Incorrect` would trigger `Ambiguous`.

On the other hand, when the action `Ambiguous` was removed, there was only one threshold against which all input queries clearly triggered `Correct` or `Incorrect`. From these results, it can be seen that there was a performance drop no matter which action was removed, illustrating that each action contributed to improving the robustness of generation. To further illustrate the study, experiments are also conducted by triggering only one action once, and the results shown in the appendix also prove the consistency.

Table 2: Ablation study for removing each single action on the PopQA dataset in terms of accuracy.

	LLaMA2-hf-7b	SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b
CRAG	54.9	59.8
w/o. <code>Correct</code>	53.2	58.3
w/o. <code>Incorrect</code>	54.4	59.5
w/o. <code>Ambiguous</code>	54.0	59.0
Self-CRAG	49.0	61.8
w/o. <code>Correct</code>	43.6	59.6
w/o. <code>Incorrect</code>	47.7	60.8
w/o. <code>Ambiguous</code>	48.1	61.5



**The impact of each knowledge utilization operation.** Table 3 illustrated how the performance changed if a key knowledge utilization operation was ablated. Evaluations on the PopQA dataset in terms of accuracy were conducted by individually removing the knowledge utilization operations of document refinement, search query rewriting, and external knowledge selection. Removing document refinement denoted that the original retrieved documents were directly fed to the following generator, as in most existing works. Additionally, removing search query rewriting denoted that questions were not rewritten into queries consisting of keywords during knowledge searching. Eventually, removing knowledge selection denoted that all searched content of web pages was all regarded as the external knowledge without selection. These results help derive the findings that the performance of the final system degraded no matter which knowledge utilization operation was removed, revealing that each knowledge utilization operation contributed to improving the utilization of knowledge.

Table 3: Ablation study for removing each knowledge utilization operation on the PopQA in terms of accuracy.

	LLaMA2-hf-7b	SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b
CRAG	54.9	59.8
w/o. refinement	49.8	54.2
w/o. rewriting	51.7	56.2
w/o. selection	50.9	58.6
Self-CRAG	49.0	61.8
w/o. refinement	35.9	52.2
w/o. rewriting	37.2	58.4
w/o. selection	24.9	57.9

### 5.5 ACCURACY OF THE RETRIEVAL EVALUATOR

The quality of the retrieval evaluator significantly determined the performance of the entire system. Given the document retrieval results, we assessed whether the retrieval evaluator can accurately determine the overall quality of these results. The assessment accuracy on the PopQA dataset of our retrieval evaluator and the commercial LLM ChatGPT on the document retrieval results was shown in Table 4. The prompts of *ChatGPT*, *ChatGPT-CoT*, and *ChatGPT-few-shot* used in our experiments can be referred to in Appendix A. Results reveal that the lightweight T5-based retrieval evaluator significantly outperformed the competitive ChatGPT in all settings.

Table 4: Evaluation of our retrieval evaluator and ChatGPT for the retrieval results on the PopQA dataset.

	Accuracy
Our Retrieval Evaluator (T5-based)	84.3
ChatGPT	58.0
ChatGPT-CoT	62.4
ChatGPT-few-shot	64.7

### 5.6 ROBUSTNESS TO RETRIEVAL PERFORMANCE

To further verify the robustness of the proposed method to retrieval performance, we studied how the generation performance changed given different retrieval performance. A part of accurate retrieval results were deliberately removed at random to imitate a low-quality retriever and evaluate how the performance changed. Figure 3 demonstrated the performance change of Self-RAG and Self-CRAG on the PopQA dataset. It can be seen that the generation performance of Self-RAG and Self-CRAG dropped as the retrieval performance dropped, indicating that the generator relied heavily on the quality of the retriever. Furthermore, as the retrieval performance dropped, the generation performance of Self-CRAG dropped more slightly than that of Self-RAG. These results imply the superiority of Self-CRAG over Self-RAG on enhancing the robustness to retrieval performance.




Figure 3: The generation performance of Self-RAG and Self-CRAG given different retrieval performance on the PopQA dataset with SelfRAG-LLaMA-7b. The lower horizontal line demonstrates the performance of the generator without retrieval.

## 5.7 CONSISTENT SUPPLEMENTATION OF WEB SEARCH KNOWLEDGE

This paper highlights the necessity of enhancing the retrieved context by incorporating additional information when the initial retrieval results are irrelevant and unreliable. Meanwhile, it is also crucial to confirm that the primary improvements in our method stem from the self-correction mechanism, rather than solely from the supplementary information obtained through web searches. To further demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed self-correction mechanism, both RAG and Self-RAG were consistently supplemented

with web search knowledge to ensure they had access to the same scope of the retrieved knowledge. The results in Table 5 show that consistently supplementing RAG or Self-RAG with web search knowledge can improve the performance in most cases (except Self-RAG w. web using the original LLaMA2 model), though the improvement remains limited. Furthermore, augmenting RAG or Self-RAG with the proposed self-correction mechanism significantly outperformed the models consistently supplemented with web search knowledge in all cases. This finding confirms that the observed advancements are primarily attributable to the proposed self-correction mechanism.

## 5.8 COMPUTATIONAL OVERHEAD ANALYSIS

To illustrate that our self-correction mechanism serves as a lightweight, plug-and-play solution for various RAG-based frameworks, we measured the computational overhead. FLOPs prediction formulas in Narayanan et al. (2021) were employed, with the results presented in Table 6 which shows the predicted FLOPs per token on GPUs. Due to the adaptive nature of Self-RAG, which varies its generation strategies based on input, the computational overhead cannot be precisely determined. Therefore, we present an estimated range instead. Additionally, we conducted the experiments on PopQA to assess the average execution time per instance in practice, as detailed in Table 6. The findings indicate that the self-correction mechanism incurs only modest computational overhead while significantly enhancing performance, thereby validating its lightweight nature.

## 6 CONCLUSION & LIMITATION

This paper studies the problem where RAG-based approaches are challenged if retrieval goes wrong, thereby exposing inaccurate and misleading knowledge to generative LMs. Corrective Retrieval Augmented Generation is proposed to improve the robustness of generation. Essentially, a lightweight retrieval evaluator is to estimate and trigger three knowledge retrieval actions discriminately. With the further leverage of web search and optimized knowledge utilization, CRAG has significantly improved the ability of automatic self-correction and efficient utilization of retrieved documents. Experiments extensively demonstrate its adaptability to RAG-based approaches as well as generalizability across short- and long-form generation tasks. While we primarily proposed to improve the RAG framework from a corrective perspective and CRAG can be seamlessly coupled with various RAG-based approaches, fine-tuning an external retrieval evaluator is inevitable. How to eliminate this external evaluator and equip LLMs with better retrieval evaluation capabilities will be our future work.

Table 5: Comparison results between CRAG, Self-CRAG and RAG, Self-RAG with the same input in terms of accuracy.

	LLaMA2-hf-7b	SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b
PopQA		
CRAG	54.9	59.8
RAG	50.5	52.8
RAG w. web	52.2	53.8
Self-CRAG	49.0	61.8
Self-RAG	29.0	54.9
Self-RAG w. web	24.9	57.9

Table 6: computational overhead assessment of RAG, CRAG, Self-CRAG, and Self-RAG about FLOPs per token on GPUs and executing time per instance. The upper bound of Self-CRAG is lower because only three passages are provided as input (correct, incorrect and ambiguous content). All the data in the table only represents a rough estimate of the generation phase, the retrieval and data-processing stages are not included.

	TFLOPs per token	executing time(s)
RAG	26.5	0.363
CRAG	27.2	0.512
Self-RAG	26.5~132.4	0.741
Self-CRAG	27.2~80.2	0.908

## REFERENCES

- 540  
541  
542 Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos,  
543 Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark,  
544 Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira,  
545 Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, et al. PaLM 2 technical report. *CoRR*,  
546 abs/2305.10403, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2305.10403. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.10403>.  
547
- 548 Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to  
549 retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on*  
550 *Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024.  
551 URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=hSyW5go0v8>.
- 552 Yejin Bang, Samuel Cahyawijaya, Nayeon Lee, Wenliang Dai, Dan Su, Bryan Wilie, Holy Lovenia,  
553 Ziwei Ji, Tiezheng Yu, Willy Chung, Quyet V. Do, Yan Xu, and Pascale Fung. A multitask,  
554 multilingual, multimodal evaluation of chatgpt on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. pp.  
555 675–718, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.IJCNLP-MAIN.45. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.ijcnlp-main.45>.  
556
- 557 Sumithra Bhakthavatsalam, Daniel Khashabi, Tushar Khot, Bhavana Dalvi Mishra, Kyle  
558 Richardson, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, Oyvind Tafjord, and Peter Clark. Think  
559 you have solved direct-answer question answering? try arc-da, the direct-answer AI2 reasoning  
560 challenge. *CoRR*, abs/2102.03315, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.03315>.  
561
- 562 Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In  
563 *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- 564 Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam  
565 Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh,  
566 Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay,  
567 Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope,  
568 James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm  
569 Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra,  
570 Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret  
571 Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick,  
572 Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica  
573 Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang,  
574 Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern,  
575 Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling  
576 with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:240:1–240:113, 2023. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/22-1144.html>.
- 577 Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Mojtaba Komeili, Jing Xu, Roberta Raileanu, Xian Li, Asli Celikyilmaz, and  
578 Jason Weston. Chain-of-verification reduces hallucination in large language models. pp. 3563–  
579 3578, 2024. doi: 10.18653/V1/2024.FINDINGS-ACL.212. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.212>.  
580
- 581 Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos  
582 Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for  
583 methods that learn from human feedback. *CoRR*, abs/2305.14387, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.  
584 2305.14387. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.14387>.  
585
- 586 Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Ming-Wei Chang. Retrieval augmented  
587 language model pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine*  
588 *Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine*  
589 *Learning Research*, pp. 3929–3938. PMLR, 2020. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/guu20a.html>.  
590
- 591 Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand  
592 Joulin, and Edouard Grave. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning.  
593 *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2022, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jKN1pXi7b0>.

- 594 Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Yejin Bang, Andrea  
595 Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Comput.*  
596 *Surv.*, 55(12):248:1–248:38, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3571730. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730)  
597 [1145/3571730](https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730).
- 598 Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F. Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang,  
599 Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. Active retrieval augmented generation. In Houda Bouamor,  
600 Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods*  
601 *in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 7969–  
602 7992. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. URL [https://aclanthology.](https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.495)  
603 [org/2023.emnlp-main.495](https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.495).
- 604 Jaehyung Kim, Jaehyun Nam, Sangwoo Mo, Jongjin Park, Sang-Woo Lee, Minjoon Seo, Jung-Woo  
605 Ha, and Jinwoo Shin. Sure: Summarizing retrievals using answer candidates for open-domain  
606 QA of llms. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024,*  
607 *Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL [https://openreview.](https://openreview.net/forum?id=w4DW6qkRmt)  
608 [net/forum?id=w4DW6qkRmt](https://openreview.net/forum?id=w4DW6qkRmt).
- 609 Mojtaba Komeili, Kurt Shuster, and Jason Weston. Internet-augmented dialogue generation. In  
610 Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (eds.), *Proceedings of the 60th*  
611 *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers),*  
612 *ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pp. 8460–8478. Association for Computational  
613 Linguistics, 2022. doi: 10.18653/V1/2022.ACL-LONG.579. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.579)  
614 [18653/v1/2022.acl-long.579](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.579).
- 615 Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin,  
616 Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian  
617 Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP  
618 tasks. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan,  
619 and Hsuan-Tien Lin (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual*  
620 *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12,*  
621 *2020, virtual*, 2020. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/6b493230205f780e1bc26945df7481e5-Abstract.html)  
622 [6b493230205f780e1bc26945df7481e5-Abstract.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/6b493230205f780e1bc26945df7481e5-Abstract.html).
- 623 Huayang Li, Yixuan Su, Deng Cai, Yan Wang, and Lemao Liu. A survey on retrieval-augmented text  
624 generation. *CoRR*, abs/2202.01110, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.01110>.
- 625 Yanming Liu, Xinyue Peng, Xuhong Zhang, Weihao Liu, Jianwei Yin, Jiannan Cao, and Tianyu  
626 Du. RA-ISF: learning to answer and understand from retrieval augmentation via iterative  
627 self-feedback. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the*  
628 *Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting,*  
629 *August 11-16, 2024*, pp. 4730–4749. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.  
630 18653/V1/2024.FINDINGS-ACL.281. URL [https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.281)  
631 [findings-acl.281](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.281).
- 632 Hongyin Luo, Tianhua Zhang, Yung-Sung Chuang, Yuan Gong, Yoon Kim, Xixin Wu, Helen Meng,  
633 and James R. Glass. Search augmented instruction learning. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino,  
634 and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023,*  
635 *Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 3717–3729. Association for Computational Linguistics,  
636 2023. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-emnlp.242>.
- 637 Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi.  
638 When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric  
639 memories. In Anna Rogers, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings*  
640 *of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1:*  
641 *Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pp. 9802–9822. Association for  
642 Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.ACL-LONG.546. URL [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.546)  
643 [18653/v1/2023.acl-long.546](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.546).
- 644 Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinx Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit  
645 Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation  
646 of factual precision in long form text generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and  
647

- 648 Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural*  
649 *Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 12076–12100.  
650 Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. URL [https://aclanthology.org/](https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.741)  
651 [2023.emnlp-main.741](https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.741).
- 652 Dor Muhlgay, Ori Ram, Inbal Magar, Yoav Levine, Nir Ratner, Yonatan Belinkov, Omri Abend,  
653 Kevin Leyton-Brown, Amnon Shashua, and Yoav Shoham. Generating benchmarks for factuality  
654 evaluation of language models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.06908, 2023. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2307.  
655 06908. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.06908>.
- 656 Deepak Narayanan, Mohammad Shoeybi, Jared Casper, Patrick LeGresley, Mostofa Patwary,  
657 Vijay Korthikanti, Dmitri Vainbrand, Prethvi Kashinkunti, Julie Bernauer, Bryan Catanzaro,  
658 Amar Phanishayee, and Matei Zaharia. Efficient large-scale language model training on GPU  
659 clusters using megatron-lm. In Bronis R. de Supinski, Mary W. Hall, and Todd Gamblin  
660 (eds.), *International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and*  
661 *Analysis, SC 2021, St. Louis, Missouri, USA, November 14-19, 2021*, pp. 58. ACM, 2021. doi:  
662 10.1145/3458817.3476209. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458817.3476209>.
- 663 OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774.  
664 URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.08774>.
- 665 Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin,  
666 Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser  
667 Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan  
668 Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In  
669 *NeurIPS*, 2022. URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/blfede53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html)  
670 [blfede53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/blfede53be364a73914f58805a001731-Abstract-Conference.html).
- 671 Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Dmytro Okhonko, Samuel Broscheit,  
672 Gautier Izacard, Patrick S. H. Lewis, Barlas Oguz, Edouard Grave, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian  
673 Riedel. The web is your oyster - knowledge-intensive NLP against a very large web corpus.  
674 *CoRR*, abs/2112.09924, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.09924>.
- 675 Chengwei Qin, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, Jiaao Chen, Michihiro Yasunaga, and Diyi Yang.  
676 Is chatgpt a general-purpose natural language processing task solver? In Houda Bouamor, Juan  
677 Pino, and Kalika Bali (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in*  
678 *Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pp. 1339–1384.  
679 Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.EMNLP-MAIN.85.  
680 URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.85>.
- 681 Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi  
682 Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-  
683 text transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 21:140:1–140:67, 2020. URL [http://jmlr.org/](http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html)  
684 [papers/v21/20-074.html](http://jmlr.org/papers/v21/20-074.html).
- 685 Md. Rashad Al Hasan Rony, Ricardo Usbeck, and Jens Lehmann. Dialogk: Knowledge-structure  
686 aware task-oriented dialogue generation. In Marine Carpuat, Marie-Catherine de Marneffe, and  
687 Iván Vladimir Meza Ruíz (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics:*  
688 *NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, pp. 2557–2571. Association for  
689 Computational Linguistics, 2022. doi: 10.18653/V1/2022.FINDINGS-NAACL.195. URL  
690 <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-naacl.195>.
- 691 Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli,  
692 Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom.  
693 Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. 2023.  
694 URL [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/d842425e4bf79ba039352da0f658a906-Abstract-Conference.html)  
695 [d842425e4bf79ba039352da0f658a906-Abstract-Conference.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/d842425e4bf79ba039352da0f658a906-Abstract-Conference.html).
- 696 Freda Shi, Xinyun Chen, Kanishka Misra, Nathan Scales, David Dohan, Ed H. Chi, Nathanael  
697 Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Large language models can be easily distracted by irrelevant context.  
698 In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and  
699 Jonathan Scarlett (eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*,  
700  
701

- 702 volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 31210–31227. PMLR, 23–29 Jul  
703 2023. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v202/shi23a.html>.  
704
- 705 Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. Retrieval augmentation  
706 reduces hallucination in conversation. In Marie-Francine Moens, Xuanjing Huang, Lucia Specia,  
707 and Scott Wen-tau Yih (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP*  
708 *2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 16-20 November, 2021*, pp. 3784–3803.  
709 Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. doi: 10.18653/V1/2021.FINDINGS-EMNLP.  
710 320. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.findings-emnlp.320>.
- 711 Chao-Hong Tan, Jia-Chen Gu, Chongyang Tao, Zhen-Hua Ling, Can Xu, Huang Hu, Xiubo  
712 Geng, and Daxin Jiang. Tektok: Augmenting text generation via task-specific and open-  
713 world knowledge. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio (eds.),  
714 *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May*  
715 *22-27, 2022*, pp. 1597–1609. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022. doi: 10.  
716 18653/V1/2022.FINDINGS-ACL.125. URL [https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.  
717 findings-acl.125](https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-acl.125).
- 718 Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée  
719 Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez,  
720 Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation  
721 language models. *CoRR*, abs/2302.13971, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2302.13971. URL  
722 <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.13971>.
- 723 Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei,  
724 Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher,  
725 et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288, 2023b.  
726 doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2307.09288. URL [https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.  
727 09288](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2307.09288).
- 728 Zihao Wang, Anji Liu, Haowei Lin, Jiaqi Li, Xiaojuan Ma, and Yitao Liang. RAT: retrieval  
729 augmented thoughts elicit context-aware reasoning in long-horizon generation. *CoRR*,  
730 abs/2403.05313, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2403.05313. URL [https://doi.org/10.  
731 48550/arXiv.2403.05313](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.05313).
- 732 Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. Making retrieval-augmented language  
733 models robust to irrelevant context. 2024. URL [https://openreview.net/forum?id=  
734 ZS4m74kZpH](https://openreview.net/forum?id=ZS4m74kZpH).
- 735 Tianhua Zhang, Hongyin Luo, Yung-Sung Chuang, Wei Fang, Luc Gaitskell, Thomas Hartvigsen,  
736 Xixin Wu, Danny Fox, Helen Meng, and James R. Glass. Interpretable unified language checking.  
737 *CoRR*, abs/2304.03728, 2023a. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2304.03728. URL [https://doi.org/  
738 10.48550/arXiv.2304.03728](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.03728).
- 739 Tianjun Zhang, Shishir G. Patil, Naman Jain, Sheng Shen, Matei Zaharia, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E.  
740 Gonzalez. RAFT: adapting language model to domain specific RAG. *CoRR*, abs/2403.10131,  
741 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2403.10131. URL [https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.  
742 2403.10131](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.10131).
- 743 Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemaou Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao,  
744 Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, Longyue Wang, Anh Tuan Luu, Wei Bi, Freda Shi, and Shuming  
745 Shi. Siren’s song in the AI ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *CoRR*,  
746 abs/2309.01219, 2023b. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2309.01219. URL [https://doi.org/10.  
747 48550/arXiv.2309.01219](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.01219).
- 748 Qihuang Zhong, Liang Ding, Juhua Liu, Bo Du, and Dacheng Tao. Can chatgpt understand too?  
749 A comparative study on chatgpt and fine-tuned BERT. *CoRR*, abs/2302.10198, 2023. doi: 10.  
750 48550/arXiv.2302.10198. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.10198>.  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755

756 A TASK PROMPTS

757  
758 The prompts for generating knowledge keywords as web search queries were illustrated in Table 7.

759  
760  
761 Table 7: The few-shot prompt to GPT-3.5 Turbo for generating knowledge keywords as web search  
762 queries.

---

763 Extract at most three keywords separated by comma from the following dialogues and questions as queries  
764 for the web search, including topic background within dialogues and main intent within questions.

765 question: What is Henry Feilden’s occupation?  
766 query: Henry Feilden, occupation

767  
768 question: In what city was Billy Carlson born?  
769 query: city, Billy Carlson, born

770 question: What is the religion of John Gwynn?  
771 query: religion of John Gwynn

772  
773 question: What sport does Kiribati men’s national basketball team play?  
774 query: sport, Kiribati men’s national basketball team play

775 question: [question]  
776 query:

---

777  
778 The prompts to instruct ChatGPT as the evaluator were illustrated in Table 8, Table 9, and Table 10  
779 respectively.

780  
781  
782 Table 8: The direct prompt to GPT-3.5 Turbo as the evaluator.

---

783 Given a question, does the following document have exact information to answer the question? Answer  
784 yes or no only.  
785 Question: [question]  
786 Document: [document]

---

787  
788  
789 Table 9: The prompt to GPT-3.5 Turbo with Chain-of-Thought as the evaluator.

---

790 Given a question, does the following document have exact information to answer the question?  
791 Question: [question]  
792 Document: [document]  
793 Think Step by step, and answer with yes or no only.

---

810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863

---

Table 10: The few-shot prompt to GPT-3.5 Turbo as the evaluator.

---

Given a question, does the following document have exact information to answer the question? Answer yes or no only.

Question: In what city was Abraham Raimbach born?

Document: Bancroft was born on November 25, 1839 in New Ipswich, New Hampshire to James Bancroft and Sarah Kimball. At an early age he was cared for by Mr. and Mrs. Patch of Ashby, Massachusetts, the neighboring town. While not legally adopted, they named him Cecil Franklin Patch Bancroft, adding Franklin Patch after the son Mr. and Mrs. Patch had who recently died. He attended public schools in Ashby as well as the Appleton Academy in New Ipswich. He entered Dartmouth College in 1856 at the age of sixteen and graduated in 1860 near the top of his class. Bancroft continued his education as he began his career in teaching. He took classes at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City during the 1864-65 academic year. While there he was a member of the United States Christian Commission, traveling to support soldiers during the Civil War. He then transferred to the Andover Theological Seminary where he would graduate in 1867.

Answer: No.

Question: In what country is Wilcza Jama, Sokółka County?

Document: Wilcza Jama is a village in the administrative district of Gmina Sokółka, within Sokółka County, Podlaskie Voivodeship, in north-eastern Poland, close to the border with Belarus.

Answer: Yes.

Question: What sport does 2004 Legg Mason Tennis Classic play?

Document: The 2004 Legg Mason Tennis Classic was the 36th edition of this tennis tournament and was played on outdoor hard courts. The tournament was part of the International Series of the 2004 ATP Tour. It was held at the William H.G. FitzGerald Tennis Center in Washington, D.C. from August 16 through August 22, 2004.

Answer: Yes.

Question: Who is the author of Skin?

Document: The Skin We're In: A Year of Black Resistance and Power is a book by Desmond Cole published by Doubleday Canada in 2020. The Skin We're In describes the struggle against racism in Canada during the year 2017, chronicling Cole's role as an anti-racist activist and the impact of systemic racism in Canadian society. Among the events it discusses are the aftermath of the assault of Dafonte Miller in late 2016 and Canada 150. The work argues that Canada is not immune to the anti-Black racism that characterizes American society. Due to an error by the publisher, the initial printing of the book's cover did not include word Black in the subtitle. The mistake was later corrected. The book won the Toronto Book Award for 2020. In 2021, the book was nominated for the Shaughnessy Cohen Prize for Political Writing.

Answer: No.

Question: [question]

Document: [document]

Answer:

---



## B EXPERIMENTS

### B.1 TASKS, DATASETS AND METRICS

CRAG was evaluated on four datasets, which are in public domain and licensed for research purposes, including:

**PopQA** (Mallen et al., 2023) is a *short*-form generation task. Generally, only one entity of factual knowledge is expected to be answered for each single question. In our experiments, we exactly followed the setting in Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) which evaluated methods on a long-tail subset consisting of 1,399 rare entity queries whose monthly Wikipedia page views are less than 100. Accuracy was adopted as the evaluation metric.

**Biography** (Min et al., 2023) is a *long*-form generation task that is tasked to generate a detailed biography about a certain entity. Following previous work, FactScore (Min et al., 2023) was adopted to evaluate the generated biographies.

**PubHealth** (Zhang et al., 2023a) is a task in health care domain consisting of true-or-false questions. Claims are represented about health with factual information, and the model is tasked to verify the authenticity and give the judgment. Accuracy was adopted as the evaluation metric.

**Arc-Challenge** (Bhakthavatsalam et al., 2021) is a multiple-choice question task about some daily commonsense science phenomena. Given a scientific event that occurs in daily life, the model is required to select the correct description among 3 or 4 optional choices. Accuracy was adopted as the evaluation metric as well.

### B.2 EXPERIMENTS COMPUTE RESOURCES

We used NVIDIA A800 80GB GPU for experiments. For LLaMA-2 (7B) generation, it occupies over 40GB memory during inference. For T5-large (0.77B) fine-tuning, it takes much less compared with LLaMA-2.

### B.3 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

**Retrieval Evaluator:** We fine-tuned the retrieval evaluator based on the lightweight T5-large (Raffel et al., 2020) pre-trained model. The dataset we used is the version provided by Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024). Specifically, the original PopQA dataset consists of 14k samples, 1,399 of which were used for testing following Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024), and the remaining were used for fine-tuning to avoid information leakage. Besides, the fine-tuned evaluator was transferred and also utilized on the Bio, Pub and ARC datasets during inference. The label of positive samples was 1, while that of negative ones was -1. At inference, the evaluator scored the relevance from -1 to 1 for each document. The two confidence thresholds for triggering one of the three actions were set empirically. Specifically, they were set as (0.59, -0.99) in PopQA, (0.5, -0.91) in PubQA and Arc-Challenge, as well as (0.95, -0.91) in Biography.

**Internal Knowledge:** To obtain fine-grained retrieval results, we segmented the retrieved results into internal strips. If a retrieved result is as short as one or two sentences, it is regarded as an individual strip, otherwise, retrieval documents are required to be split into smaller units which generally consist of a few sentences according to the total length. The scale is assumed to include an independent piece of information, and the filtering is based on the segments. We directly adopted the evaluator again for knowledge strips filtering, and the top-k is set to 5, filter threshold as -0.5.

**External Knowledge:** Google Search API was adopted to search for the relevant URLs, top-k is set to 5, and pages from Wikipedia will be added preferentially. The searched web pages are generally in the form of HTML files, where content is split with special tokens like `<p>` and `</p>`. Thus an extra segmentation like the knowledge refinement is not required, related knowledge paragraphs can be directly selected with the evaluator similar to internal knowledge. In this way, the accuracy of the search outcomes can be ensured without compromising the quality and relevance of the information used for generation.

**Generator:** As CRAG is a plug-and-play method, all generation models that can be utilized in RAG fit our approach as well. To be consistent with baselines for comparison, we adopted LLaMA2

(Touvron et al., 2023b) for the generation. We first introduced the *LLaMA2-hf-7b* from huggingface to generate responses. Since Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) fine-tuned LLaMA2 and reached a new state-of-the-art performance on several tasks, we further utilized the launched model, *SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b*, as a new generator to be consistent with their work and study the specific improvement of our method.

**Self-CRAG:** To demonstrate that our plug-and-play approach can be utilized in other concurrent studies, we specifically designed to insert our CRAG into the Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2024) framework and named it Self-CRAG. Self-RAG is an advanced RAG approach that introduces a critic model to decide whether to retrieve and which retrieved document to be referred for generation. It meets our demand for deciding which action to be triggered, thus we replaced the retrieved items in Self-RAG with our processed internal knowledge for `Correct`, external knowledge for `Incorrect`, and combined knowledge for `Ambiguous`.

#### B.4 MORE DETAILED RESULTS

**Ablation Study:** The following results in Table 11 demonstrate the ablation study by triggering one action only for all instances.

#### B.5 RESULTS ON PUBHEALTH AND ARC-CHALLENGE

It is worth mentioning that the performance on PubHealth based on *LLaMA2-hf-7b* was much worse than others. We studied these cases and found that *LLaMA2-hf-7b* is relatively weak in instruction comprehension. Most of the cases fail to generate `True` or `False` in such a binary-question task, resulting in a low accuracy during the evaluation. This situation somewhat happens in Arc-Challenge as well, when the model is tasked to generate the index of a candidate.

Table 11: Ablation study for removing only a single action on the PopQA dataset in terms of accuracy.

	LLaMA2-hf-7b	SelfRAG-LLaMA2-7b
CRAG	54.9	59.8
only Correct	52.4	56.7
only Incorrect	47.0	48.5
only Ambiguous	52.7	58.0
Self-CRAG	49.0	61.8
only Correct	48.6	57.2
only Incorrect	40.8	53.3
only Ambiguous	44.9	59.8