ZHENGLIANG SHI, Shandong University, China LINGYONG YAN, Baidu Inc., China WEIWEI SUN, Carnegie Mellon University, United States YUE FENG, University of Birmingham, UK PENGJIE REN, Shandong University, China XINYU MA, Baidu Inc., China SHUAIQIANG WANG, Baidu Inc., China DAWEI YIN, Baidu Inc., China MAARTEN DE RIJKE, University of Amsterdam, Netherland ZHAOCHUN REN*, Leiden University, Netherland

Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) integrates large language models (LLMs) with retrievers to access external knowledge, improving the factuality of LLM generation in knowledge-grounded tasks. To optimize the RAG performance, most previous work independently fine-tunes the retriever to adapt to frozen LLMs or trains the LLMs to use documents retrieved by off-the-shelf retrievers, lacking end-to-end training supervision. Recent work addresses this limitation by jointly training these two components but relies on overly simplifying assumptions of document independence, which has been criticized for being far from real-world scenarios. Thus, effectively optimizing the overall RAG performance remains a critical challenge.

We propose a **d**irect **r**etrieval-augmented **o**ptimization framework, named DRO, that enables end-to-end training of two key components: (i) a generative knowledge selection model and (ii) an LLM generator. DRO alternates between two phases: (i) document permutation estimation and (ii) re-weighted maximization, progressively improving RAG components through a variational approach. In the estimation step, we treat *document permutation* as a latent variable and directly estimate its distribution from the selection model by applying an importance sampling strategy. In the maximization step, we calibrate the optimization expectation using importance weights and jointly train the selection model and LLM generator. Our theoretical analysis reveals that DRO is analogous to policy-gradient methods in reinforcement learning. Extensive experiments in EM and F1. We also provide in-depth experiments to qualitatively analyze the stability, convergence, and variance of DRO.¹

CCS Concepts: • Information systems → Retrieval models and ranking; Retrieval models and ranking.

*Corresponding author. ¹Code is available on **G** GitHub.

Authors' Contact Information: Zhengliang Shi, Shandong University, Qingdao, China, zhengliang.shii@gmail; Lingyong Yan, Baidu Inc., Beijing, China, lingyongy@gmail.com; Weiwei Sun, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, United States, sunweiwei@gmail.com; Yue Feng, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK, y.feng.6@bham.ac.uk; Pengjie Ren, Shandong University, Qingdap, China, jay.r@outlook.com; Xinyu Ma, Baidu Inc., Beijing, China, xinyuma2016@gmail.com; Shuaiqiang Wang, Baidu Inc., Beijing, China, shqiang.wang@gmail.com; Dawei Yin, Baidu Inc., Beijing, China, yindawei@acm.org; Maarten de Rijke, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherland, m.derijke@uva.nl; Zhaochun Ren, Leiden University, Leiden, Netherland, z.ren@liacs.leidenuniv.nl.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

Conference acronym 'XX,

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnnnn



Fig. 1. Overview of DRO objective. The selection model directly estimate a document permutation for the generator to predict an answer, with both components trained jointly.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Retrieval-augmented generation, List-wise knowledge selection, Importance sampling, Expectation-Maximization principle

ACM Reference Format:

Zhengliang Shi, Lingyong Yan, Weiwei Sun, Yue Feng, Pengjie Ren, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, Maarten de Rijke, and Zhaochun Ren. 2025. Direct Retrieval-augmented Optimization: Synergizing Knowledge Selection and Language Models. In *Proceedings of 2025 (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 26 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnnnn

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have shown remarkable text generation abilities; however, they often provide factually incorrect content [4, 53, 73] due to the hallucination [16] or out-of-date information [9]. To mitigate these limitations, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) is proposed to integrate external retrievers with LLMs, which enables the model to access extensive corpora and retrieve relevant documents for references, thereby enhancing factuality. By integrating the retriever with LLMs, RAG has shown superior performance in knowledge-intensive tasks such as question answering [49, 61] and conversational information seeking [5, 24, 68].

Following the most widely used architecture [9, 11, 23], RAG typically includes two components to answer an input query: (i) *knowledge selection*, where retrieval and re-ranking models select target documents, (ii) *answer generation*, where an LLM generator generates correct answers conditioned on the selected documents. To enhance coverage and improve answer quality, RAG models often provide multiple retrieved documents as input to the generator. The interrelationships among these documents are crucial for final performance [15, 28, 32, 72]. We refer to a specific selection of retrieved documents as a *document permutation*.

Improving RAG performance. To optimize RAG performance, some studies improve knowledge accuracy by fine-tuning the retrieval or ranking model with relevance criteria [33, 38, 48]. Others enhance the robustness of LLMs against irrelevant content through supervised fine-tuning [10, 71] or in-context learning [49], teaching them to summarize key points from retrieved documents. However, these approaches optimize either the *selection* or the *generation* component separately while neglecting a dual enhancement, which may lead to sub-optimal overall performance [27, 45].

To address the above limitation, some recent studies train both the retriever and the LLM generator [23, 25, 51]. However, to avoid optimizing over the complex permutation distribution of inter-related documents, most of them simplify the retriever outputs into point-wise documents rather than the overall permutations [72]. Specifically, they first retrieve the top-k documents using a dense retriever, independently feed each document into downstream LLMs for training, and train a *point-wise dense retriever* to assign a higher similarity to the document that leads to better downstream outcomes. *However, this is far from reality, as RAG models often gather useful content from multiple documents* [62, 72], which suffers from a pronounced limitation in complex scenarios, such as multi-hop QA. Besides, training a dense retriever requires the frequent updating of the

document index [13], which is hard to operate and potentially non-compatible with established retrieval applications. Thus, a natural question is: *How to synergize (i) knowledge selection; and (ii) answer generation to optimize holistic RAG performance?*

In this paper, we propose DRO, a direct retrieval-augmented optimization method that synergizes (i) a list-wise selection model (*aka*, selector) to generate target document permutations, and (ii) an LLM generator to predict the answer, enabling end-to-end improvement. As shown in Figure 1, the core idea is to directly treat the *document permutation* as a latent variable and estimate its distribution to maximize the log-likelihood of question answering. To achieve this, DRO iteratively alternates between two steps: (i) document permutation estimation and (ii) re-weighted maximization within the Expectation-Maximization principle [33].

In the *permutation estimation* step, we first define an ideal posterior distribution of document permutation inspired by the classic expectation-maximization algorithm [33], introducing a tractable evidence lower bound (ELBO) for the log-likelihood objective. Considering exactly computing the posterior distribution is typically impractical, we employ an importance sampling strategy [8, 21] to directly estimate the document permutation distribution by sampling from the selection model. Specifically, for each input query, we first recall relevant documents using an off-the-shelf dense retriever, filtering documents with no semantic relevance to narrow down the candidate documents. The generative selector then selects a subset of documents by generating their document identifiers in an auto-regressive manner (e.g., "[1] > [2] > [3]").

In the *re-weighted maximization* step, we optimize the ELBO constructed in the estimation step, thereby improving the overall log-likelihood for question answering. We first re-weight the collected samples using importance weights to calibrate the bias introduced by sampling shifting from the importance sampling strategy. Then, we jointly optimize the selection model and the LLM generator by maximizing this re-weighted expectation, where both two components are trained with end-to-end supervision. By alternating the estimation and maximization steps, DRO progressively improves the holistic RAG performance.

Theoretical analysis. DRO differs from prior work such as [23, 25, 51] by: (i) enabling *end-to-end optimization* for both knowledge selection and answer generation, rather than optimizing individual processes; and (ii) *directly estimating* the distribution of document permutations for optimization, relaxing the assumption of independent top-*k* marginalization posed in prior works; (iii) *iteratively aligning* of selection and generation models, which achieves a consistent improvement until convergence. To investigate the advantages of DRO, we provide a theoretical analysis of the learning objective and optimization process within our framework. We prove that DRO shares similarities with policy-based reinforcement learning approaches. In DRO, the selection module improves by reinforcing document permutations that enhance generation performance, while the generator, in turn, benefits from improved document permutations, creating a synergistic loop that optimizes the entire RAG process. Additionally, we provide theoretical analysis about the training convergence and stability of DRO. We reveal that importance sampling with normalized weights can guarantees variance reduction and non-decreasing ELBO across iterations.

Experiments. We conduct extensive experiments across a wide range of datasets, including Natural Questions [22], HotpotQA [69], 2WikiMultihopQA [14], MusiQue [59], and Wizard-of-Wikipedia [5]. The results show that the proposed DRO outperforms best baselines with 5–15% improvement in EM and F1 metrics. Additionally, the selection model trained using our method achieves an average precision improvement of 17.78% in identifying target documents. We further conduct fine-grained analyses to examine the variance, convergence, and stability of the DRO during the training process. We observe substantial variance decay with increased sampling size, and consistent improvements

(e.g., F1 score) over iterations, indicating stable and convergent optimization. These findings verify that DRO achieves not only strong performance but also robust training dynamics across datasets.

Contributions. The main contributions of this paper are: (i) We propose DRO, a direct retrieval-augmented optimization method that treats the document permutation as a latent variable to enable an end-to-end improvement; (ii) We provide theoretical analysis for the learning objective of the proposed method and demonstrate its convergence and training stability; and (iii) extensive experiments conducted on five datasets show the improvement of our method, e.g., 5%–15% improvement compared with state-of-the-art baselines.

2 Related work

2.1 Retrieval-augmented generation

Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) aims to integrate external knowledge into LLMs, improving their factuality [11]. Given an input query, the first process of RAG is to select relevant knowledge, which is typically done by retrieval [20] or ranking model [33]. Subsequently, an LLM generator incorporates these candidate documents to generate an answer. An active research question is how to improve the overall RAG performance. Some studies aim to improve the knowledge accuracy [6, 43], such as fine-tuning an answer-aware dense retriever [44, 48] or introducing additional modules for document filtering [63, 66]. Other work alternatively enhances the robustness of LLMs to irrelevant content, enabling LLMs to adaptively extract supporting facts from the retrieved documents [70, 76]. However, these methods either optimize the retrieval or the generation process without dual enhancement, potentially leading to sub-optimal performance [27]. Although existing work proposes the end-to-end training paradigm, they overly simplify a marginalization optimization through independent top-k approximation [43, 72], where they simply feed top-k documents into downstream LLMs one-by-one and re-score their relevance to optimize the retriever [23, 27]. This has been criticized far from the practical scenarios as the RAG system typically consumes multiple documents [72], while exhaustively enumerating all possible document permutations is cost-intensive and typically infeasible in practice. In this work, we propose DRO, which directly treats the document permutation as a latent variable and estimates its distribution for optimization.

2.2 Knowledge Selection for RAG

In RAG, the *knowledge selection* process aims to select target documents that can maximize LLM generation performance [12, 44]. To achieve this, prior work typically trains point-wise rankers (e.g., MonoT5 [33], BGE [65]) on conventional retrieval benchmarks (e.g., MS-MARCO [34]) and separately judges the relevance of each document to the input query. In contrast, our method applies a generative list-wise selection model [55], which selects target documents for the input query by generating corresponding document identifiers auto-regressively [37, 38]. Compared with pointwise ranking, our list-wise selection enables the comparison between multiple documents [30, 62], which can be inherently used to estimate the permutation distribution in our framework. Additionally, unlike previous ranking models trained with semantic relevance criteria [41], our selection model is jointly trained with the generator to maximize end-to-end RAG performance.

2.3 Variational approach for optimization

The variational approach has been widely applied in unsupervised scenarios and optimization involving latent variables [52, 56], such as GLEM in graph learning [75] and SSDM in speech modeling [26]. As a general principle, the variational approach such as the Expectation-Maximization algorithm (EM) [33], alternates between the *Expectation* step to compute the posterior distribution

and the *Maximization* step to update the model parameter, optimizing the marginalization progressively. Inspired by this principle, in our work, we treat the document permutation as a latent variable. Besides, we directly estimate the permutation distribution using a list-wise selection model through the importance sampling [21]. This strategy diverges from the standard EM algorithm by avoiding the exact computation of the posterior distribution, a process that is impractical due to the large-scale document permutation space.

3 Preliminaries

3.1 Task Definition

Given an input query *x*, the task of retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) typically consists of two processes: (i) *knowledge selection* to acquire a set of relevant documents; and (ii) *answer* generation to generate a correct answer *y* by referring to the acquired documents. In the proposed DRO, our first process starts by using an off-the-shelf retrieval model (e.g., ColBERT [46]) to recall relevant documents $d = \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{|d|}\}$ through semantic matching, thereby filtering the irrelevant contents to narrow down the candidates. Then, a generative re-ranking model θ_s reads these documents and selects a document permutation *z* by generating the corresponding document identifiers such as $[1] > [2] > \ldots > [k]$. Subsequently, an LLM generator θ_g predicts the answer *y* based on the input query *x* and selected documents d_z , which can be formulated as $p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g) = \prod_{t=1}^{|y|} p(y_t \mid y_{<t}, x, d_z; \theta_g)$.

3.2 Generative Knowledge Selection for RAG

The generative selection model identifies the target documents in a list-wise manner, directly taking the query x and the candidate documents d as input, and generates an ordered sequence of document *identifiers* auto-regressively:

$$p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}) = \prod_{t=1}^{K} p(\boldsymbol{z}_{t} \mid \boldsymbol{z}_{< t}, \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{d}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}).$$
(1)

Here, $z = \{z_t; t \in [K]\}$ represents the document permutation consisting of K tokens, where each token corresponds to a document identifier (e.g., [1] or [2]). By mapping the document permutations back to the original documents, we obtain K selected documents, denoted as $d_z = \{d_{z_t} \mid t \in [K]\}$. Compared with traditional point-wise ranking, which assigns each individual document a relevance score to the query, we use this generative selection model for two reasons: (i) it inherently enables the comparison of multiple candidate documents through the attention mechanism [54, 60]; and (ii) it allows the direct modeling of document permutations, ordered lists of documents that capture their interrelationships by autoregressively generating the docid list [31].

4 Direct RAG optimization

In this work, the proposed DRO method improves the holistic performance of RAG by synergizing (i) knowledge selection and (ii) answer generation processes. To achieve this, DRO enables the end-to-end training of (i) a list-wise generative selector with parameters θ_s to estimate the target document permutation for the input query x; and (ii) an LLM generator with parameters θ_g to generate accurate answers. For simplicity, we use $\theta = (\theta_s, \theta_g)$ to represent the overall tunable parameters of DRO throughout the paper. Below, we first derive the learning objective of DRO and then relate it to how to achieve the end-to-end optimization of the selection and generation model for such an objective.



Fig. 2. The overall framework for DRO alternates between the (i) E-step: document permutation estimation (Section 4.2); and (ii) M-step: re-weighted maximization (Section 4.3) to progressively optimize the holistic RAG performance.

4.1 Deriving the DRO objective

As pointed out by prior work, generating a correct answer grounded on reference knowledge is identified as one of the most crucial goals of RAG tasks [11, 23, 45]. In DRO, we define the optimization objective as maximizing the marginal log-likelihood of generating the correct answer y to the input query x using external documents d_z . This can be formulated as:

$$\log p(y|x;\theta) = \log \sum_{z} p(y, \boldsymbol{d}_{z}|x;\theta).$$
(2)

Since summing over all possible (y, z) is typically intractable, we employ a variational approach to construct a tractable lower bound for log $p(y|x; \theta)$ that we then maximize. Specifically, we introduce a variational distribution q(z|x) and apply *Jensen's inequality* to log $\sum_{z} p(y, d_{z}|x; \theta)$:

$$\log \sum_{z} q(z|x) \frac{p(y, d_{z}|x; \theta)}{q(z|x)} \ge \sum_{z} q(z|x) \log \frac{p(y, d_{z}|x; \theta)}{q(z|x)}$$
$$= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q(z|x)} \left[\log \frac{p(y, d_{z}|x; \theta)}{q(z|x)} \right]}_{Q(z|x)}.$$
(3)

Evidence Lower **BO**und (ELBO (q, θ))

Here, we define the $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q(z|x)} \left[\log \frac{p(y,d_z|x;\theta)}{q(z|x)} \right]$ as an evidence lower bound (ELBO) for $\log p(y|x;\theta)$. Based on Jensen's inequality, the ELBO $(q, \theta) = \log p(y|x; \theta)$ if and only if when the $\frac{p(y,d_z|x;\theta)}{q(z|x)} \equiv c$, where *c* is a constant.

From Eq. (3), we can derive the DRO objective as a progressive optimization process, which includes: (i) estimating the distribution of document permutation *z* to achieve $\log p(y|x;\theta) \approx \text{ELBO}$, and (ii) maximizing the ELBO to improve $\log p(y|x;\theta)$.

Expectation-Maximization for DRO training. To optimize the DRO objective, we adopt the expectation-maximization algorithm with an importance sample strategy. In more detail, we start by demonstrating the condition for the alignment in Eq. (3), which is formulated in the following lemma.

LEMMA 1. For ELBO $(q, \theta) = \log p(y|x; \theta)$, there exists a variational distribution q(z|x) such that $q(z|x) = p(z|x, y; \theta)$.

PROOF. This lemma can be proved by considering the case where the importance weight $\frac{p(y,z|x;\theta)}{q(z|x)}$ is constant, denoted as *c*, across all *z*. This is formulated as below:

$$\frac{p(y, z \mid x; \theta)}{q(z \mid x)} \equiv c \quad \forall x, y$$

Then, we can sum both sides over z and obtain: $\sum_{z} p(y, z \mid x; \theta) = c \sum_{z} q(z|x) \equiv c$. Here $q(z \mid x)$ is a probability distribution over z, i.e., it sums to 1. Therefore, we solve for $q(z \mid x)$ as:

$$q(z \mid x) = \frac{p(y, z \mid x; \theta)}{\sum_{z} p(y, z \mid x; \theta)} = p(z \mid x, y; \theta)$$
(4)

Therefore, the variational distribution $q(z \mid x)$ that matches the true posterior $p(z \mid x, y; \theta)$ achieves the exact ELBO = $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q(z|x)} \left[\log \frac{p(y, d_z|x; \theta)}{q(z|x)} \right]$.

The Lemma 1 shows an intuitive solution to achieve $\log p(y|x;\theta) \approx \text{ELBO}(q,\theta)$ by exactly computing the posterior distribution $p(z \mid x, y; \theta)$ for latent document permutation *z*. However, it is often impractical due to the large-scale permutation space. To address this challenge, we use an importance sampling strategy, where the q(z|x) is directly set to $p(z \mid x; \theta_s)$. Consequently, the training of DRO is achieved within an expectation-maximization principle, including:

- (i) E-step: *document permutation estimation* (Section 4.2) to estimate the distribution of document permutations by sampling from the selection model; and
- (ii) M-step: *re-weighted maximization* (Section 4.3) to jointly optimize the selection model and generator using the importance-weighted samples.

By iteratively alternating these two step, DRO progressively improves the holistic RAG objective $\log p(y|x; \theta)$.

4.2 E-step: Document permutation estimation

This step aims to estimate the distribution of document permutations. Specifically, at the *t*th iteration, we first assume $q(z \mid x) \approx p(z \mid y, x; \theta^t)$ and transform the ELBO(θ, θ^t) in Eq. (3) into:

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x, y; \theta^{t})} \left[\log p(y, z \mid x; \theta) - \log p(z \mid x, y; \theta^{t}) \right] \\= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x, y; \theta^{t})} \left[\log p(y, z \mid x; \theta) \right] + \mathcal{H} \left(p(z|x, y; \theta^{t}) \right),$$
(5)

where the *z* is ideally sampled from the posterior distribution $p(z \mid x, y; \theta^t)$ to compute the expectation. The $\mathcal{H}(p(z|x, \theta^t))$ indicates the entropy of $p(z|x, \theta^t)$, which is independent to θ and can be viewed as a constant. Since the posterior distribution $p(z|y, x; \theta)$ is intractable, we alternatively adopt an importance sampling strategy to directly sample the document permutation *z* from our selection model θ_s via $z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)$. To correct the bias introduced by the sampling shifting, we also employ an importance weight to calibrate the expectation. Formally, it is presented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ELBO}(\theta, \theta^t) &= \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)} \left[w(z) \log p(y, z \mid x; \theta) \right] + \text{constant} \\ w(z) &= \frac{p(z \mid x, y; \theta^t)}{p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)}. \end{aligned}$$
(6)

Here we denote the w(z) as the *importance weight*. According to Bayes' theorem, where $p(z \mid y, x; \theta^t) \propto p(z \mid x; \theta^t_s) \times p(y \mid d_z, x; \theta^t_a)$, we can then simplify the w(z) as:

$$w(z) \propto \frac{p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t) \times p(y \mid \boldsymbol{d}_z, x; \theta_g^t)}{p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)} = p(y \mid x, \boldsymbol{d}_z; \theta_g^t).$$
(7)

Intuitively, the weight w(z) reflects the utility of a set of documents d_z for the LLM generator θ_q in generating ground-truth answers. By sampling from the generative selection model θ_s ($z \sim$

Algorithm 1: The algorithm for DRO, which alternates between Estimation and Maximization steps to progressively improve the overall RAG performance.

Input: selection model θ_s ; LLM generator θ_g ; training iteration number *N*; training data \mathcal{T} . **for** t = 1 to *N* **do**

// Permutation Estimation (E-step)for each input query x in training set doSample document permutations: $z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)$ Compute importance weight: $w(z) = p(y \mid x, z; \theta_g^t)$ // Re-weighting (M-step) $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(x; \theta_s) := -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)} [w(z) \log p(z \mid x; \theta_s)]$ $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(x; \theta_g) := -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)} [w(z) \log p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g)]$ // Re-weighted Maximization (M-step) θ_g^{t+1} = arg max $\theta_g \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{T}} [-\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}}(x; \theta_s)]$ θ_g^{t+1} = arg max $\theta_g \mathbb{E}_{(x,y) \sim \mathcal{T}} [-\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}(x; \theta_g)]$ if no improvement on validation set then
 \Box Stop training Maximization // Early StopOutput: (θ_s, θ_g)

 $p(z \mid x; \theta_s)$ and calibrating the expectation with importance weights, we directly estimate the distribution of the latent variable z (i.e., the document permutation) for unbiased optimization, without explicitly computing the posterior distribution $p(z \mid x, y; \theta^t)$.

4.3 M-step: Re-weighted maximization

After the permutation estimation step, the maximization step aims to update the tunable parameter θ in the RAG system. Formally, the optimization objective is defined as:

$$\theta^{t+1} = \arg\max_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x;\theta_s^t)} \left[w(z) \log p(y, z \mid x; \theta) \right].$$
(8)

Here, the $\theta = (\theta_s, \theta_g)$ denotes the tunable parameters of knowledge selection model θ_s and LLM generator θ_g . Based on Bayes' theorem, we have $p(y, z \mid x; \theta) = p(z \mid x; \theta_s) \cdot p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g)$. Then, the ELBO (θ, θ^t) can be rewritten as a decomposition of two parts:

$$\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x;\theta_s^t)} \left[\underbrace{w(z) \log p(z \mid x; \theta_s)}_{\text{Learning to select}} + \underbrace{w(z) \log p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g)}_{\text{Learning to generate}} \right]. \tag{9}$$

Thus, we derive two loss functions, namely (i) selection optimization \mathcal{L}_{S} and (ii) generation optimization \mathcal{L}_{G} :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}} := -\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{z} \sim p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}^{t})} \left[w(\boldsymbol{z}) \log p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}) \right],$$
(10)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}} := -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x;\theta_s^t)} \left[w(z) \log p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g) \right].$$
(11)

Learning to select. The function \mathcal{L}_{S} optimizes the selection model θ_{s} for document permutation generation. Since \mathcal{L}_{S} is weighted by w(z) and $w(z) \propto p(y|x, d_{z}; \theta_{s}^{t})$, the model θ_{s} learns to generate the document permutation that maximizes the end-to-end performance. Based on Eq. (10), the gradient of \mathcal{L}_{S} with respect to θ_{s} is:

$$\nabla_{\theta_s} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{S}} = -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x;\theta_s^t)} \left[w(z) \nabla_{\theta_s} \log p(z \mid x;\theta_s) \right].$$
(12)

, Vol. 1, No. 1, Article . Publication date: May 2025.

Learning to generate. The loss function for θ_g is defined as $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}} := -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z|x; \theta_s^t)} [w(z) \log p(y \mid x, z; \theta_g)]$, training the LLM generator to understand the selected documents and generate correct answers. The gradient of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}$ with respect to θ_g can be formulated as:

$$\nabla_{\theta_{q}} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}} = -\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{z} \sim \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{z} | \boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}^{t})} \left[\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{z}) \nabla_{\theta_{q}} \log \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{d}_{\boldsymbol{z}}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{g}) \right].$$
(13)

4.4 Upshot: Explanation for DRO with pseudo algorithm

To provide a more intuitive explanation of the overall optimization process, we present a pseudo algorithm in Algorithm 1. In DRO, the document permutation distribution is first estimated using the selection model θ_s (E-step). Subsequently, the model θ_s learns to select documents that maximize the generation performance while the generator θ_s , in turn, further learns to leverage the selected documents (M-step). These two steps are iteratively alternated, enabling the progressive improvement of the holistic RAG system.

5 Theoretical analysis

To further interpret DRO, we offer a theoretical analysis of its advantages and training stability, and prove its convergence.

5.1 What do the selector and generator learn?

The format of the optimization gradient in Eq. (12) and Eq. (13) is similar to classic policy gradient approaches [1, 57, 74] used in the reinforcement learning (RL). Generally, given an input task x and the action τ generated by the policy model π , the policy gradient objective $\mathcal{J}(\pi)$ to maximize an reward function $r(\tau)$ can be presented as:

$$\mathcal{J}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p(\tau \mid x; \pi)} [r(\tau)],$$

$$\nabla_{\pi} \mathcal{J}(\pi) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim p(\tau \mid x; \pi)} [r(\tau) \cdot \nabla_{\pi} \log p(\tau \mid x; \pi)].$$
(14)

Below, we make several comparisons to relate RL with our DRO.

- $w(z) \iff r(\tau)$: In our learning objectives, w(z) plays a role similar to the reward $r(\tau)$ in RL. It represents the importance of the document permutation z and serves as a weighting factor to evaluate the utility of documents to downstream tasks, analogous to how rewards $r(\tau)$ shape the policy model in RL.
- $p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t) \iff p(\tau \mid x; \pi_\theta)$: The sampling distribution over permutations $p(z \mid x; \theta_s^t)$ reflects the state of the selection model at iteration *t*, similar to how $p(\tau \mid x; \pi_\theta)$ represents the current policy distribution over trajectories in RL.
- $\log p(y, z \mid x; \theta) \iff \log p(\tau \mid x; \pi)$: The $\log p(y, z \mid x; \theta)$ in our Eq. 8 is analogous to the $\log p(\tau \mid x; \pi)$ in RL. In both cases, the gradient is updated to increase the likelihood of actions (or permutations *z*) that yield higher rewards (or weights w(z)).

From the RL perspective, the objective functions in Eq. (9) can be interpreted as a two-agent system collaborating within the RAG task. In the estimation step, directly sampling a document permutation from the selection model θ_s is essentially a Monte Carlo process, while $w(z) = p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g)$ in the maximization step serves as the reward. Similar to the RL, where policy models improve by reinforcing high-reward actions, the selection model θ_s improves by selecting documents that lead to better generation. The generator θ_g , in turn, learns to leverage the selected documents to generate correct answers, creating a synergistic loop that optimizes the entire RAG performance.

5.2 Impact of the importance sampling

In the permutation estimation step, we apply an importance sampling strategy to directly sample document permutations from the knowledge selection model (i.e., $z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta_s)$) instead of the posterior distribution $p(z \mid x, y; \theta)$. We analyze its impact on the expectation and variance of the training objective. For simplicity, we denote $\log p(y, z \mid x; \theta^t)$ in the ELBO as a function f(y, z).

Expectation is unchanged. In the permutation estimation step, we employ importance sampling to approximate the posterior distribution $p(z \mid x, y; \theta)$ with samples drawn from the proposal distribution $p(z \mid x; \theta_s)$, which is parameterized by the selection model. To compensate for the discrepancy between the target and proposal distributions, we apply an importance weight the weight $w(z) = p(y \mid d_z, x; \theta)$ adjusts for the different between the target distribution $p(z \mid x; \theta_s)$, which can be presented as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y};\boldsymbol{\theta}^{t})}[f(\boldsymbol{z})] = \mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\theta}^{t}_{s})} \left[\frac{p(\boldsymbol{y} \mid \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{d}_{z}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{t})}{p(\boldsymbol{z} \mid \boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{t}_{s})} f(\boldsymbol{z}) \right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{t}_{s})} \left[w(\boldsymbol{z}) f(\boldsymbol{z}) \right].$$
(15)

The key property of importance sampling is that it provides an unchanged estimator of the expectation under the true posterior. This fundamental property of importance sampling ensures that the expectation in the variational optimization objective remains unchanged.

Variance decreases. While importance sampling preserves the expectation, it crucially affects the *variance* of the estimator, which directly impacts the stability and efficiency of gradient-based training. We begin by formulating the *vanilla variance*, i.e., the variance before applying importance sampling.

Before using importance sampling, the vanilla variance $\operatorname{Var}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y};\theta^{t})}[f(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})]$ is formulated as:

$$\mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y};\boldsymbol{\theta}^{t})}\left[f(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})^{2}\right] - \left(\mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\theta}^{t}_{s})}\left[f(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})\right]\right)^{2}.$$
(16)

After using importance sampling, we denote the *new variance* as $\operatorname{Var}_{p(z|x;\theta_s^t)}[w(z)f(y,z)]$, which becomes:

$$\mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}^{t})}\left[\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{z})^{2}f(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})^{2}\right] - \left(\mathbb{E}_{p(\boldsymbol{z}|\boldsymbol{x};\boldsymbol{\theta}_{s}^{t})}\left[\boldsymbol{w}(\boldsymbol{z})f(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z})\right]\right)^{2}.$$
(17)

To evaluate the effect of importance sampling on variance, we derive the difference Δ Var between the new and old variances.

$$\Delta \operatorname{Var} = \operatorname{Var}_{p(z|x;\theta_{s}^{t})} \left[w(z)f(y,z) \right] - \operatorname{Var}_{p(z|x,y;\theta^{t})} \left[f(y,z) \right]$$
$$= \mathbb{E}_{p(z|x,y;\theta^{t})} \left[f(y,z)^{2} \left(w(z) - 1 \right) \right].$$
(18)

Since $w(z) \propto p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g^t)$ and the $0 \le p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g^t) \le 1$, it follows that $\Delta \text{Var} \le 0$ if w(z) is normalized. This expression reveals a key insight: if $w(z) \le 1$ for all z, then $\Delta \text{Var} \le 0$, indicating that the variance of the importance-weighted estimator is strictly *lower* than the original variance. o further guarantee numerical stability and prevent rare outlier samples with disproportionately large weights, we apply normalization to w(z) in practice:

$$w(z) = \frac{w(z)}{\sum_{z'} w(z')}.$$
(19)

This normalization step ensures bounded gradients and facilitates smoother convergence throughout the DRO training process.

Training process gradually stabilizes. From Eq. (16) and Eq. (17), we notice that the w(z) plays a key role in shaping the variance, which affects the training stability. Since $w(z) \propto p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g^t)$, we have the following analysis to demonstrate the training stability of our DRO: (i) initially, the generator θ_g^t is less optimized, which potentially results in high variance in $p(y \mid x, z; \theta_g^t)$; (ii) as generator θ_g^t is optimized through the loss function in Eq. (11), $p(y \mid x, z; \theta_g^t)$ stabilizes, which leads to a progressively reduced variance.

5.3 Convergence of the optimization process

To prove the convergence of DRO, we show the non-decreasing and upper-bounded property of $\log p(y|x, \theta^t)$ during the training.

We first prove that the log-likelihood $\log p(y \mid x, \theta^{t+1})$ is non-decreasing after each training iteration, which is formulated as: $\log p(y \mid x, \theta^{t+1}) \ge \log p(y \mid x, \theta^{t})$. Here $\theta = (\theta_s, \theta_g)$ consists of the parameters of the selection model θ_s and the LLM generator θ_g .

PROOF. At each iteration *t*, we start by estimating the distribution of the latent variable *z*, i.e., document permutation. Since we apply an importance sampling strategy to directly sample *z* from the selection model θ_s^t , the ELBO is transformed as in Eq. (6):

$$\text{ELBO}(\theta, \theta^t) := \mathbb{E}_{z \sim p(z \mid x; \theta^t_c)} \left[w(z) \log p(y, z \mid x; \theta) \right].$$

In the maximization step, we update θ by maximizing the ELBO: $\theta^{t+1} = \arg \max_{\theta} \text{ELBO}(\theta, \theta^t)$. This ensures that $\text{ELBO}(\theta^{t+1}, \theta^t) \ge \text{ELBO}(\theta^t, \theta^t)$. We further observe that the marginal log-likelihood in Eq. 3 satisfies:

$$\log p(y \mid x; \theta^{t+1}) \ge \text{ELBO}(\theta^{t+1}, \theta^{t})$$

$$\ge \text{ELBO}(\theta^{t}, \theta^{t}) = \log p(y \mid x; \theta^{t}).$$
(20)

Thus, we establish that $\log p(y \mid x; \theta^{t+1}) \ge \log p(y \mid x; \theta^t)$, demonstrating the non-decreasing nature of the optimization process. Next, we examine the boundedness of the log-likelihood. Given that $0 \le p(y \mid x; \theta) \le 1$, it follows that $-\infty \le \log p(y \mid x; \theta) \le 0$. Then, we introduce an existing theorem from [3] as follows.

THEOREM 5.1. Monotone Convergence Theorem: If a sequence $\{a_n\}$ is monotonic (either nondecreasing or non-increasing) and bounded, then it converges to a finite limit.

Applying Theorem 5.1, the non-decreasing and upper-bounded nature of $\{\log p(y \mid x; \theta^t)\}_{t=1}^{\infty}$ ensures that the sequence converges to a finite limit, proving the convergence of the DRO training. In practice, when the performance on the validation set shows no further improvement, the model is considered to have converged.

5.4 Upshot

Below, we summarize three key insights from the above theoretical analysis:

- (i) The objective of DRO can be interpreted as optimizing a collaborative two-agent system within the RAG framework. The selection model θ_s improves by identifying document permutations that enhance the generator's performance. In turn, the generator θ_g learns to better utilize the selected documents to produce correct answers. This mutual improvement forms a synergistic loop that jointly optimizes the overall RAG performance.
- (ii) The use of importance sampling in DRO preserves the expectation of the learning objective while reducing variance, particularly when the importance weights are normalized. This contributes to more stable and efficient training.

(iii) The convergence of DRO is theoretically guaranteed by the monotonic increase of the loglikelihood and its upper boundedness. In practice, this implies that the model either improves or maintains its performance over iterations, and training can be safely terminated when validation performance saturates, ensuring both convergence and training efficiency.

6 Experimental setup

6.1 Datasets

Following previous work [23, 24, 71, 72], we conduct experiments on *full development set* of five commonly used question-answering benchmarks: Natural Question (NQ) [22], HotpotQA [69], MuSiQue [59], 2Wikimultihopqa (2WikiQA) [14], and Wizard-of-Wikipedia (WoW) [5]. Table 1 presents the statistics of these datasets.

6.2 Evaluation metrics

In line with previous studies [25, 49, 64], we use F1 and *Exactly Match* (EM) metrics from KILT [36] for evaluation. The F1 score is used to measure the token-level overlap between the generated answer and the ground truth answer, which represents the harmonic mean of precision and recall, where the recall is determined by considering the number of overlaps with the correct answer tokens, while precision is determined by considering the number of overlaps with all generated tokens. The *EM* metric checks if the predicted strings exactly match the ground truth. Besides the end-to-ene evaluation, we also use the *Recall@K* (K=1,3,5) to evaluate the document re-ranking performance of our selection model following previous work [24, 36, 45], in which the Recall@K is set to 1 if and only if the top-K documents contains the ground-truth answer.

6.3 Baselines

We compare the proposed DRO with four categories of baselines based on how they integrate the knowledge selection process with the answer generation process.

Prompting-based methods. These methods guide LLMs to leverage external knowledge through prompt learning. We evaluate:

- (i) RetGen [47], which interleaves query formulation, retrieval, and answer generation iteratively;
- (ii) *GenGround* [49], which instructs a LLM to generate answers and then revise them using retrieved documents;
- (iii) *In-context RAG* [40], which truncates the top k retrieved documents as context for the LLM to generate answers.

For the first two baselines, we use GPT-3.5-turbo as the backbone, following their official implementations. For *in-context RAG*, we evaluate various LLMs with the same three in-context examples.

Retrieval Tuning. These methods improve the entire RAG performance by enhancing the retrieval process. We evaluate:

- (i) *REPLUG* [48] and *DPA-RAG* [6], which adapt a dense retriever or point-wise ranker to a frozen LLMs by re-scoring the relevance;
- (ii) FLICO [63] and RECOMP, which filter irrelevant content from retrieved documents; and
- (iii) *Re-ranking Models*, which re-rank retrieved documents, passing the top-*K* ranked results for LLMs.

We benchmark point-wise (MonoT5 [35] and BGE [65]) and list-wise rankers (RankVicuna [37] and RankZephyr [38]).

Experimental Benchmarks	Training Data Size	Query Length (Train)	Evaluation Data Size	Query Length (Evaluation)	Retrieval Corpus
Nature Question [22]	58,622	9.21	6,489	9.16	Wiki2018
Hotpot QA [69]	90,185	17.85	7,384	15.63	Wiki2018
MusiQue QA [59]	19,938	15.96	2,417	18.11	Wiki2018
2WikiMultiHopQA [14]	167,454	12.74	12,576	11.97	Wiki2018
Wizard-of-Wikipedia [5]	63,734	70.41	3,054	70.25	Wiki2018

Table 1. Statistics of our experimental datasets, where we provide the amount of training and evaluation dataset, the average length of input query (word) as well as the retrieval corpus.

LLM Fine-tuning. These methods fine-tune LLMs through instruction tuning, improving LLMs' ability to utilize retrieved documents. We evaluate:

- (i) Vanilla supervised fine-tuning (SFT), which train LLMs by maximizing the answer likelihood based on query and documents;
- (ii) ChatQA [29] and RankRAG [71], which post-train LLMs on diverse knowledge-grounded tasks;
- (iii) *RetRobust* [70], *InstructRAG* [64], *Self-RAG* [2] and *RAAT-7B* [10], which train LLMs to identify relevant content from retrieved documents for QA.

End-to-end training. These methods train RAG components with an end-to-end objective. We benchmark:

- (i) Atlas [17], a pre-trained retrieval-augmented LLM;
- (ii) *RA-DIT* [27], which initially trains a generator and subsequently fine-tune a dual-encoder retriever; and
- (iii) *DDR-RAG* [25], which employs DPO [39] (Direct Preference Optimization) to jointly train a point-wise ranker and an answer generator.

To ensure fairness, we set the size of retrieval documents as 20 for all the baselines and the K = 5, aligning with the implementation of DRO. Since the code or model checkpoints are unavailable for some baselines, we mark their incomplete results as "–". In such cases, we report results from the original papers but only for reference.

6.4 Implementation details

We use the Llama-3-8B [7] as the backbone model for both our ranker and LM generator. We also alternate it with another model, i.e., Mistral-7B [18], to evaluate the generalizability of DRO across different backbones. Given a query x, we initially use the off-the-shelf ColBERTv2.0 [46] to retrieve top 20 documents as input for the selection model θ_s , which selects a permutation containing K = 5 documents to the generator θ_g . Following previous work [20, 25, 67], the document corpus for the retrieval is based on the Wikipedia passage dump from Dec. 20, 2018. We set the maximum training iteration N = 5 (§ 4.3) and report the performance for each iteration checkpoint for a comprehensive analysis. The sampling number for document permutation is set to 8. We use the DeepSpeed ZeRO strategy [42] during training, with learning rates of $1e^{-5}$ and a weight decay coefficient of 0.01. The training of the DRO can be done within 20 hours with 8 NVIDIA A100-PCIE-80GB GPUs.

7 Experimental results

7.1 Overall performance

Single-hop QA benchmark. We first analyze the performance of the proposed DRO on opendomain QA and dialogue datasets, including NQ and WoW. The inputs in these datasets are complex, posing challenges for neural models to comprehend [22]. Table 2 presents the results, where we

Table 2. Experimental results on five benchmarks, where we highlight the best results in <u>bold</u>. We also compute the average EM or F1 across all datasets. *Scale* indicates the parameter size of the LLM generator. * denotes the baselines based on closed-source *gpt-3.5.*[†] and [‡] indicate significant improvements over best open-source baselines with p-value < 0.05 and 0.01.

Tasks		N	Q	Hotp	otQA	MuS	iQue	2Wil	kiQA	WoW	A	/g.
Metrics	Scale	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	EM	F1	F1	EM	F1
Prompting-based Method												
RetGen [*] [47]	175B	37.75	39.78	39.04	42.10	17.69	21.04	33.00	39.17	16.97	31.87	31.81
GenGround* [49]	175B	40.60	42.31	41.27	44.71	20.77	24.36	39.61	42.58	17.76	35.56	34.34
In-context RAG [40]												
- w/ Llama3-inst70B [7]	70B	39.38	47.26	37.38	39.62	16.43	21.16	37.26	41.46	17.06	32.61	33.31
- w/ Llama2-70B-chat [58]	70B	38.07	44.69	37.14	40.27	16.78	20.11	38.51	41.02	15.75	32.62	32.37
- w/ Mixtral-inst8x7B [19]	56B	39.34	46.34	39.63	42.53	16.65	20.73	37.03	38.50	16.66	33.16	32.95
- w/ Llama2-13B-chat [58]	13B	35.27	41.54	35.43	40.37	16.87	18.37	35.47	38.63	13.12	30.76	30.41
Retrieval tuning												
REPLUG [66]	65B	28.80	-	32.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RECOMP [66]	20B	37.47	42.67	38.72	42.72	17.34	24.96	32.17	38.26	15.11	31.43	32.74
DPA-RAG [6]	8B	37.29	44.31	37.15	40.53	18.45	20.36	39.02	39.66	14.73	32.98	31.92
FLICO [63]	7B	35.32	37.24	38.74	39.21	14.53	16.81	29.74	33.05	14.23	29.58	28.11
MonoT5 [35] w/ Mistral†	7B	31.78	37.68	32.38	38.76	14.31	19.16	35.96	37.11	14.27	28.61	29.40
RankVicuna [37] w/ Mistral†	7B	33.78	39.58	34.74	41.25	15.38	21.87	36.72	38.93	14.45	30.16	31.22
RankZephyr [38] w/ Mistral†	7B	34.77	45.22	36.08	42.77	16.03	21.75	35.07	38.31	14.94	30.49	32.60
BGE-ranker [65] w/ Mistral†	7B	35.21	40.50	37.61	38.10	16.61	21.37	37.16	38.49	14.77	31.65	30.65
LLM Fine-tuning												
RetRobust [70]	13B	37.03	43.82	35.59	40.54	18.11	18.16	38.65	39.11	17.04	32.34	31.73
ChatQA [66]	8B	23.64	34.54	33.40	44.60	16.64	17.05	26.80	31.90	16.22	25.12	28.86
RankRAG [66]	8B	-	_	35.30	46.70	-	-	31.40	36.90	_	-	-
InstructRAG [64]	8B	35.90	38.21	30.69	34.71	14.94	25.88	35.92	20.01	14.57	29.36	26.68
Vanilla SFT w/ Llama3 [58]	8B	35.25	38.46	25.07	32.57	14.35	17.82	30.65	30.43	13.91	26.33	26.64
Vanilla SFT w/ Mistral [18]	7B	34.65	37.52	25.75	30.65	13.35	17.97	30.43	30.65	13.83	26.05	26.12
Self-RAG [2]	7B	29.74	31.63	16.30	27.30	9.43	21.50	23.52	27.33	13.24	19.75	24.2
RAAT [10]	7B	33.53	37.85	33.01	31.67	17.08	21.793	29.69	32.68	15.37	28.33	27.87
End-to-end optimization												
RA-DIT [27]	65B	35.20	-	39.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Atlas [17]	11B	26.70	-	34.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DDR-RAG [25]	8B	40.74	28.76	31.71	40.04	13.54	10.57	35.44	38.40	16.21	30.36	26.80
DRO-Mistral-7B (Ours)	7B	42.41	51.01	40.37	47.87	<u>21.36</u>	25.32	42.12	43.65	18.31	36.56	37.23
DRO-Llama-3-8B (Ours)	8B	45.76	55.42	42.23	49.27 [±]	20.64	25.97	40.12^{\dagger}	44.12	18.76 [‡]	37.19	38.71

observe that our DRO achieves the best performance, such as pushing the EM from 40.74 to 45.76 in NQ dataset (12.32% relative improvements). To investigate the reasons for our superior performance, we conduct a coarse-to-fine analysis. We begin by identifying some evaluation cases that incorrectly answered by strong baselines (e.g., InstructRAG) while correctly answered by our method. Then we compare the outputs from both approaches for these cases. The selection model, trained collaboratively with the LLM generator in DRO, selects more useful documents for answer generation. This demonstrates that our selection model learns to understand utility-oriented document selection criteria in RAG tasks, contributing to holistic improvement.

Multi-hop QA benchmark. We further validate the superiority of the proposed method on multihop QA tasks, which are more challenging since they require the model to aggregate evidence from multiple documents to derive the answer. For example, based on our statistic, queries in HotpotQA





Fig. 3. Recall@K (k=1, 3, 5) score of the initial retrieval (Colbertv2.0), two re-ranking baselines (i.e., RankVicuna and RankZephyer) and our selection model θ_s , respectively.

involve at least 2.21 hops, while those in MuSiQue require an average of 2.65 hops. As shown in Table 2, our DRO substantially outperforms existing baselines, such as achieving a F1 score of 49.27 and an EM score of 42.23 in HotpotQA dataset. The reasons for this improvement are: (1) the weight w(z) in the selection model's learning objective severs as a reward function, reinforcing selecting documents that maximize end-to-end generation performance, and (2) the LLM generator is optimized synchronously, further enhancing overall effectiveness.

Document selection evaluation. In addition to the end-to-end evaluation presented in Table 2, we further evaluate the Recall@*K* of our selection models on documents re-ranking task. Following [20, 22], we set the Recall@K to 1 if the top-K documents contains the ground-truth answer. As shown in Figure 3, our selection model improves the recall of the initial retrieval of ColBERTv2.0 by on average 17.78%, such as pushing the accuracy@1 from 49.71 to 60.89 on NQ dataset. We also compared with the similar list-wise re-ranking baselines, where we find that the selection model, trained within DRO, achieves the highest recall. This validates the need to enable end-to-end supervision for knowled ge selection process.

Iteration	NQ	HotpotQA	MuSiQue	2WikiQA	Average Δ
DRO-Mis	tral-7B				
1	41.56	39.65	20.79	36.5	-
2	$47.19_{\uparrow 11.9\%}$	43.71 _{↑9.3%}	23.26 _{10.6%}	39.53 _{↑7.7%}	9.8%
3	49.98 _{↑5.6%}	46.03 _{↑5.0%}	24.87 _{↑6.9%}	$41.54_{18\%}$	5.5%
4	$50.82_{1.7\%}$	$47.24_{12.6\%}$	$25.07_{\uparrow 0.8\%}$	$41.75_{0.5\%}$	1.4%
5	50.97 _{↑0.3%}	47.87 _{↑1.3%}	25.32 _{↑1.0%}	42.12 _{↑0.9%}	0.9%
DRO-Lla	ma-3-8B				
1	44.84	41.07	21.43	38.43	-
2	$49.11_{18.7\%}$	44.73 _{↑8.2%}	24.06 _{↑10.9%}	41.27 _{↑6.9%}	8.7%
3	54.98 _{↑10.7%}	$48.24_{17.3\%}$	$25.24_{14.7\%}$	$43.02_{\uparrow 4.1\%}$	6.7%
4	$55.01_{0.1\%}$	$49.06_{\uparrow 1.7\%}$	$25.94_{12.7\%}$	$43.65_{1.4\%}$	1.5%
5	$55.42_{\uparrow 0.7\%}$	$49.27_{10.4\%}$	$25.97_{\uparrow 0.1\%}$	$44.12_{\uparrow 1.1\%}$	0.6%

Table 3. F1 score for checkpoints in each training iteration.



Fig. 4. Variance during the training process of our method (logarithmic scale).

7.2 Training Convergence

As illustrated in Algorithm 1, DRO iteratively optimizes the model parameters $\theta = (\theta_s, \theta_g)$ to improve performance. To analyze convergence, we evaluate the model checkpoint at each training iteration. Table 3 presents the results on four experimental results. For both DRO-Mistral-7B and DRO-LLaMA-3-8B, we observe a consistent and substantial increase in F1 scores during the first three iterations. From iteration 3 to 5, the gains begin to taper off, indicating the model has entered a convergence phase. Notably, DRO outperforms competitive baselines such as BGE and RankZephyr after just two iterations, demonstrating the promising performance of our method.

7.3 Training Stability

In our maximization step, we employ an importance weight w(z) to calibrate the optimization expectation. Our theoretical analysis in Section 5.2 shows that the training variance decreases as training progresses, since $w(z) \propto p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g)$. To validate this finding, we compute the variance of sampling from $p(y \mid x; d_z)$ at each training iteration. We vary the number of samples from 1 to 16 to compute the variance, respectively. See Figure 4. The variance substantially decreases with the optimization of model θ_g during training progress, validating the correctness of our theoretical analysis from Section 5.2. We also find that increasing the number of samples per iteration can reduces variance at each training step, which is an straightforward solution to improve the training stability. Besides, in our experiments, we observe that increasing the number of samples per iteration reduces variance at each training step, offering a straightforward strategy to improve training robustness, especially during early-stage training (See Section 8.1 from more details).

REMARK 7.1. The reduction of variance during training is a direct consequence of the improved confidence of the generator θ_g in predicting correct answers. As $p(y \mid x, d_z; \theta_g)$ stabilizes, the importance weight w(z) becomes less volatile, leading to lower variance and enhanced training stability. This



Fig. 5. Ablation study on five datasets to demonstrate the effectiveness of training the selection model θ_s and generator θ_q .

validates the use of importance weighting in DRO as not only theoretically sound but also practically stabilizing.

7.4 Ablation studies

The proposed DRO method enables end-to-end optimization of two tightly coupled components: the selection model θ_s and the LLM generator θ_g . To quantify the individual contributions of these components, we conduct an ablation study by isolating the training of each module while freezing the other. Formally, we compare the full DRO method against two ablated variants:

- (i) **DRO-w/o Selector**: only updates the generator θ_q , keeping θ_s fixed.
- (ii) **DRO-w/o Generator**: only updates the selector θ_s , keeping θ_q fixed.

Figure 5 reports the F1 scores across five datasets (NQ, HotpotQA, MuSiQue, 2WikiMultihopQA, and WoW) over five training iterations. We observe consistent and notable improvements of the full DRO method over both ablated variants. On the **NQ** dataset, the vanilla method achieves an F1 score of **51.01** at iteration 5, while the two variants, i.e., DRO-*w/o Selector* and DRO-*w/o Generator*, obtain 46.77 and 48.71 respectively, suffering from drops of 4.24 and 2.30 points. Similar patterns are observed in other datasets:

- (i) HotpotQA: DRO achieves 47.87 F1 vs. 44.60 (DRO-w/o Selector) and 43.11 (DRO-w/o Generator).
- (ii) MuSiQue: full model achieves 25.32, outperforming 22.59 and 21.77.
- (iii) 2Wiki: the full pipeline reaches 43.65 F1, compared to 40.12 and 39.01.
- (iv) WoW: DRO improves F1 to 18.31, surpassing 16.47 and 15.73.

These results demonstrate two key findings. First, training the selection model θ_s is critical for learning high-quality document permutations that benefit the generator. Second, optimizing the generator θ_g to better utilize selected documents further amplifies performance. The combined training of both components yields cumulative gains that neither alone can achieve.

REMARK 7.2. The ablation study highlights the necessity of joint optimization in DRO. It validates the design principle that the selector and generator must co-evolve during training to fully realize the benefits of retrieval-augmented generation.

7.5 Human evaluation

Considering the potential bias of automatic metrics [50], we conduct a human evaluation with three educated individuals assessing the *correctness* of 100 randomly sampled cases from five benchmarks, using a three-point scale. Each query is paired with the corresponding golden documents and ground truth answers from the original datasets, which serve as references for the human evaluators. We ask at least two annotators to evaluate the same case repeatedly. If there is a discrepancy between



Fig. 6. Performance under different sampling number (§ 8.1).

two annotators, and ask a third annotator to recheck it. The results are presented in Table 4. The DRO achieves a correctness score of 0.41, while strong open-source baselines only score between 0.32 and 0.37, demonstrating the advantage of our proposed method. The average Kappa statistic for our human evaluation is 0.751, indicating strong agreement.

Table 4. Human evaluation on 100 randomly sampled cases.

	DPA-RAG	RetRobust	DDR-RAG	DRO-Mistral
Correctness	37/100	32/100	33/100	41/100

8 Discussion

8.1 Impact of the Sampling Number

In our training procedure, for each input query, we sample m = 8 document permutations z from the selection model to construct the ELBO objective via importance sampling. To further examine the effect of this sampling number on training dynamics and model performance, we vary macross {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14} and evaluate the resulting models under the same experimental setup described in Table 2. Figure 6 summarizes the results. We derive several observations from the analysis: (i) Higher sampling improves performance. Overall, increasing the sampling number *m* consistently improves the final F1 score. This trend suggests that using more samples provides better approximation of the expected objective, thereby guiding the optimization process more accurately. (ii) **Sampling number affects convergence speed**. Larger values of *m* not only lead to better performance but also accelerate convergence. For example, when m = 14, the model reaches peak performance within just two training iterations. In contrast, with only m = 1, the model requires up to four iterations to achieve similar results. This aligns with our variance analysis in Section 5.2, as increased sampling reduces training variance and facilitates faster optimization. (iii) **Trade-off between cost and effectiveness.** While higher values of *m* yield better and faster results, they also incur greater computational overhead. In practice, we find that using m = 4strikes a good balance, offering competitive performance with reasonable training efficiency. These findings highlight the importance of sampling strategies in importance-weighted optimization and suggest practical guidelines for choosing sampling numbers based on resource availability and convergence requirements.



Fig. 7. Performance with different parameter sizes of selection model θ_s .

8.2 Performance with scaling-down parameter

In our experiment, we follow prior work (e.g., RankVicuna [37]) and employ a general-purpose LLM (e.g., Llama) as the backbone for list-wise selection. Recent studies typically scale up parameter sizes to explore performance upper bounds. However, since the document selection task involves long context sequences as input with a concern of increased latency, we investigate a more practical low bound by scaling down the size of selection model θ_s in DRO. Specifically, we implement our method using Llama-3-8B as the generator and pairing it with smaller LLMs as selection models. We evaluate the performance under the same conditions as Table 2 and present the results in Figure 7. We observe that as the parameter size of model θ_s increases from 1B to 8B, performance improves substantially. The Llama-3-8B generator, when paired with the smallest selector (Llama-3-1B), outperforms strong baselines such as RetRobust, pushing the F1 score from 43.82 to 46.83 on NQ dataset. Additionally, as an empirical suggestion, training a 3B model (e.g., Llama-3-3B) as the selection model offers a balanced trade-off between performance and computational cost in our method.

8.3 Case study

We conduct case studies to intuitively analyze the advantages and disadvantages of DRO. Below, we first show the system prompt to the document selection model θ_s and answer generation model θ_q . Then, we present the correctly completed cases and the bad cases, respectively, for comparison.

System prompt for document selection models. In the prompt for the selection model θ_s , we instruct the model to generate a ranked list of useful documents in a generative, auto-regressive manner, where document identifiers are produced in descending order of utility. Documents that contain the correct answer are considered more useful and are expected to be ranked higher.

You are RankLLM, an intelligent assistant that can rank passages based on their relevance and usefulness to the user's query.

```
Shi et al. (SDU, Baidu, CMU, UoB, UvA, Leiden)
```

```
I will provide you with {n_docs} passages. Please rank these passages
based on their usefulness in answering the user's search query: "{
question}".
A passage's usefulness is defined as:
1. Relevance to the question.
2. Contains necessary information to help the user.
The passages are listed below, each with a numerical identifier [].
{docs}
Rank the {n_docs} passages based on their usefulness in descending order.
Use the format [] > [], e.g., [2] > [1]. Only respond with the ranking
results; do not provide explanations.
Search Query: {question}
Your output:
```

System prompt for answer generation model. In the prompt for the answer generation model θ_g , we provide the documents selected by the selection model as references, and instruct the model to generate the final answer grounded in the information contained within these documents.

You are an artificial intelligence assistant. You should gives helpful and precise answers to the user's questions based on the context. The context here refer to external passages related to user's questions. Please answer the question: "{question}" using provided passages. Each passage is indicated by a numerical identifier []. Here are the related passages for your reference. {docs} Question: {question} Your answer:

Correctly completed cases. Below, we provide a case in which the input query asks: *Which games, Strange Synergy or Qwirkle, is a card game published by Steve Jackson Games?*, with the ground truth being *Strange Synergy*. To answer this question, it is essential to retrieve not only detailed descriptions of Strange Synergy but also background information about Qwirkle for comparative analysis.

Among the initially retrieved documents, document [1], [2], and [17] are all individually necessary to resolve the query. Specifically, passages [1] and [2] provide overlapping but essential descriptions of Strange Synergy, consistently identifying it as a card game published by Steve Jackson Games. Meanwhile, passage [17], though it offers necessary contrastive information about Qwirkle, ranked much lower initially. In DRO, the selection model successfully identifies [1], [2], and [17] as the top-ranked passages, demonstrating its ability to select the most relevant target information. Based on these selected passages, the generator compares the publisher information from [1] and [17], accurately associating Strange Synergy with Steve Jackson Games as the correct answer. This example highlights the strength of our DRO in enabling the cooperation between the selection and generation models.

INPUT QUERY: Which games, Strange Synergy or Qwirkle, is a card game published by Steve Jackson Games? (Ground truth: Strange Synergy)

20

INITIALLY RETRIEVED DOCUMENTS: [0] Title: Strange Synergy. Content: Strange Synergy Strange Synergy is a card game published by Steve Jackson Games in which players build a team of super heroes to battle an opponent's team. The game supports up to four players... [1] Title: Strange Synergy. Content: enemies for three turns in a row, or capture an opposing team's flag. Strange Synergy Strange Synergy is a card game published by Steve Jackson Games in which players build a team of super heroes to battle an opponent's team. The game supports up to four players . However, there are bases and flags for two more players. [2] ... [3] ... [4] ... [5] ... [6] ... [7] ... [8] ... [9] ... [10] ... [11] ... [12] ... [13] ... [14] ... [15] ... [16]... [17] Title: Qwirkle. Content: Qwirkle Qwirkle is a tile-based game for 2 to 4 players, designed by Susan McKinley Ross and published by MindWare. Qwirkle shares some characteristics with the games Rummikub and Scrabble. It is distributed in Canada by game and puzzle company, Outset Media. Qwirkle is considered by MindWare to be its most awarded game of all time. [18] ... [19] ... OUTPUT OF SELECTION MODEL: [1] > [2] > [17] OUTPUT OF GENERATOR MODEL: Strange Synergy

Bad case of DRO. We also investigate the bad case of DRO to analyze potential disadvantages of our method. The Table 5 summarize two key type of errors: incorrect selection and generation mismatch. First, the *incorrect selection* indicates that the selector fails to comprehensively include all documents that are necessary for answer the question. Without such contrastive evidence, the generator tends to produce incorrect answers, even when relevant documents are present in the retrieved pool. This suggests the need for diversity-aware selection strategies that explicitly promote comparative reasoning. Second, the *generation mismatch* indicates that the generator model produce a incorrect answer though the ground truth documents have been incorporated into the context. This often occurs when the input contains partially relevant or distracting content, i.e., the noise. These cases highlight the challenge of robust generation.

Case Type	Description	Observed Behavior	Potential Reme- dies	
Selector misses con- trastive document	The selector fails to comprehensively in- clude documents (e.g., different publishers), which are necessary for disambiguation.	The generator outputs an incorrect answer due to the lack of comparative evidence.	Incorporate multi- view selection or contrastive supervi- sion to enforce di- versity in document selection.	
Generator is misled by noisy content	Although the selector provides useful docu- ments, the generator fail to generate the correct answer.	The LLM misun- derstands the input documents and predicts incorrect answer	Introduce answer verification module chain-of-thought reasoning process for LLM before generating the final answer.	

Table 5. Representative failure cases of DRO. We summarize two typical types of failure, i.e., selection and generation mismatch, and suggest potential remedies.

9 Conclusion

We have presented DRO, a direct retrieval-augmented optimization method for the RAG task that (i) treats document permutations of the retriever as latent variables, and (ii) enables the co-training of a list-wise document selection model and an LLM generator through an expectation-maximization approach. Specifically, DRO alternates between two steps: (1) directly estimating the distribution of document permutations from the selection model using an importance sampling strategy; and (2) maximizing the importance-weighted evidence lower bound to jointly train the selection model and the LLM generator. Through theoretical analysis, we have proven that the learning objectives in DRO are analogous to policy-gradient reinforcement learning, reinforcing the selection and generation models with an end-to-end training reward. Extensive experiments conducted on five datasets have validated the superiority of our DRO. For future work, we aim to extend this approach to multi-modal RAG scenarios. We also plan to explore the co-training of additional retrieval modules within DRO, such as a query re-writer.

References

- [1] Arash Ahmadian, Chris Cremer, Matthias Gallé, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, Olivier Pietquin, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. 2024. Back to Basics: Revisiting REINFORCE-Style Optimization for Learning from Human Feedback in LLMs. In Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2024. Self-RAG: Learning to Retrieve, Generate, and Critique through Self-Reflection. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024.* OpenReview.net.
- [3] John Bibby. 1974. Axiomatisations of the average and a further generalisation of monotonic sequences. Glasgow Mathematical Journal 1 (1974). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089500002135
- [4] Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Mojtaba Komeili, Jing Xu, Roberta Raileanu, Xian Li, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Jason Weston. 2023. Chain-of-verification reduces hallucination in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11495 (2023).
- [5] Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2018. Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01241 (2018).
- [6] Guanting Dong, Yutao Zhu, Chenghao Zhang, Zechen Wang, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024. Understand what llm needs: Dual preference alignment for retrieval-augmented generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18676 (2024).
- [7] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783 (2024).
- [8] Víctor Elvira and Luca Martino. 2021. Advances in importance sampling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.05407 (2021).
- [9] Wenqi Fan, Yujuan Ding, Liangbo Ning, Shijie Wang, Hengyun Li, Dawei Yin, Tat-Seng Chua, and Qing Li. 2024. A survey on rag meeting llms: Towards retrieval-augmented large language models. In Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining.
- [10] Feiteng Fang, Yuelin Bai, Shiwen Ni, Min Yang, Xiaojun Chen, and Ruifeng Xu. 2024. Enhancing Noise Robustness of Retrieval-Augmented Language Models with Adaptive Adversarial Training. In Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [11] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. 2023. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997 (2023).
- [12] Jiafeng Guo, Yixing Fan, Liang Pang, Liu Yang, Qingyao Ai, Hamed Zamani, Chen Wu, W Bruce Croft, and Xueqi Cheng. 2020. A deep look into neural ranking models for information retrieval. *Information Processing & Management* 6 (2020).
- [13] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. 2020. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR.
- [14] Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2020. Constructing A Multi-hop QA Dataset for Comprehensive Evaluation of Reasoning Steps. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- [15] Sebastian Hofstätter, Jiecao Chen, Karthik Raman, and Hamed Zamani. 2023. Fid-light: Efficient and effective retrievalaugmented text generation. In Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval.
- [16] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. 2023. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. ACM Transactions on Information Systems (2023).
- [17] Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. 2023. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 251 (2023).
- [18] Albert Qiaochu Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L'elio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. Mistral 7B. ArXiv (2023).
- [19] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. 2024. Mixtral of experts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088 (2024).
- [20] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense Passage Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2020, Online, November 16-20, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [21] Teun Kloek and Herman K Van Dijk. 1978. Bayesian estimates of equation system parameters: an application of integration by Monte Carlo. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* (1978).
- [22] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural Questions: A Benchmark for Question Answering Research. Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics (2019).
- [23] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandara Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Kuttler, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [24] Xiaoxi Li, Zhicheng Dou, Yujia Zhou, and Fangchao Liu. 2024. CorpusIm: Towards a unified language model on corpus for knowledge-intensive tasks. In Proceedings of the 2024 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval.
- [25] Xinze Li, Sen Mei, Zhenghao Liu, Yukun Yan, Shuo Wang, Shi Yu, Zheni Zeng, Hao Chen, Ge Yu, Zhiyuan Liu, et al. 2024. RAG-DDR: Optimizing Retrieval-Augmented Generation Using Differentiable Data Rewards. arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.13509 (2024).
- [26] Jiachen Lian, Xuanru Zhou, Zoe Ezzes, Jet Vonk, Brittany Morin, David Baquirin, Zachary Mille, Maria Luisa Gorno Tempini, and Gopala Krishna Anumanchipalli. 2024. Ssdm: Scalable speech dysfluency modeling. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16221 (2024).
- [27] Xi Victoria Lin, Xilun Chen, Mingda Chen, Weijia Shi, Maria Lomeli, Rich James, Pedro Rodriguez, Jacob Kahn, Gergely Szilvasy, Mike Lewis, et al. 2023. Ra-dit: Retrieval-augmented dual instruction tuning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01352 (2023).
- [28] Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. 2024. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2024).
- [29] Zihan Liu, Wei Ping, Rajarshi Roy, Peng Xu, Chankyu Lee, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2024. Chatqa: Surpassing gpt-4 on conversational qa and rag. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10225 (2024).
- [30] Xueguang Ma, Xinyu Zhang, Ronak Pradeep, and Jimmy Lin. 2023. Zero-shot listwise document reranking with a large language model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.02156 (2023).
- [31] Sewon Min, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Kristina Toutanova, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2021. Joint Passage Ranking for Diverse Multi-Answer Retrieval. ArXiv (2021).
- [32] Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10645* (2020).
- [33] Todd K Moon. 1996. The expectation-maximization algorithm. IEEE Signal processing magazine 6 (1996).
- [34] Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. MS MARCO: A Human Generated MAchine Reading COmprehension Dataset. In Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Computation: Integrating neural and symbolic approaches 2016 co-located with the 30th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS 2016), Barcelona, Spain, December 9, 2016. CEUR-WS.org.
- [35] Rodrigo Nogueira, Zhiying Jiang, Ronak Pradeep, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Document Ranking with a Pretrained Sequence-to-Sequence Model. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [36] Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vladimir Karpukhin, Jean Maillard, Vassilis Plachouras, Tim Rocktäschel, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. KILT: a Benchmark for Knowledge Intensive Language Tasks. In Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [37] Ronak Pradeep, Sahel Sharifymoghaddam, and Jimmy Lin. 2023. Rankvicuna: Zero-shot listwise document reranking with open-source large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15088 (2023).
- [38] Ronak Pradeep, Sahel Sharifymoghaddam, and Jimmy Lin. 2023. RankZephyr: Effective and Robust Zero-Shot Listwise Reranking is a Breeze! arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02724 (2023).
- [39] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2024).
- [40] Ori Ram, Yoav Levine, Itay Dalmedigos, Dor Muhlgay, Amnon Shashua, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Yoav Shoham. 2023. In-Context Retrieval-Augmented Language Models. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (2023).

- [41] Jinfeng Rao, Linqing Liu, Yi Tay, Wei Yang, Peng Shi, and Jimmy Lin. 2019. Bridging the gap between relevance matching and semantic matching for short text similarity modeling. In Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP).
- [42] Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. DeepSpeed: System Optimizations Enable Training Deep Learning Models with Over 100 Billion Parameters. In Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [43] Devendra Sachan, Mostofa Patwary, Mohammad Shoeybi, Neel Kant, Wei Ping, William L. Hamilton, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2021. End-to-End Training of Neural Retrievers for Open-Domain Question Answering. In Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [44] Devendra Singh Sachan, Mike Lewis, Mandar Joshi, Armen Aghajanyan, Wen-tau Yih, Joelle Pineau, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Improving passage retrieval with zero-shot question generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07496 (2022).
- [45] Alireza Salemi and Hamed Zamani. 2024. Evaluating Retrieval Quality in Retrieval-Augmented Generation. In Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [46] Keshav Santhanam, O. Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei A. Zaharia. 2021. ColBERTv2: Effective and Efficient Retrieval via Lightweight Late Interaction. In North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [47] Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. Enhancing Retrieval-Augmented Large Language Models with Iterative Retrieval-Generation Synergy. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023.*
- [48] Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12652 (2023).
- [49] Zhengliang Shi, Weiwei Sun, Shen Gao, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, and Zhaochun Ren. 2024. Generate-then-ground in retrieval-augmented generation for multi-hop question answering. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14891 (2024).
- [50] Zhengliang Shi, Weiwei Sun, Shuo Zhang, Zhen Zhang, Pengjie Ren, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. RADE: Reference-Assisted Dialogue Evaluation for Open-Domain Dialogue. ArXiv (2023).
- [51] Devendra Singh, Siva Reddy, Will Hamilton, Chris Dyer, and Dani Yogatama. 2021. End-to-end training of multidocument reader and retriever for open-domain question answering. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [52] Alessandro Sordoni, Eric Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Matheus Pereira, Adam Trischler, Ziang Xiao, Arian Hosseini, Friederike Niedtner, and Nicolas Le Roux. 2024. Joint prompt optimization of stacked llms using variational inference. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2024).
- [53] Weihang Su, Yichen Tang, Qingyao Ai, Changyue Wang, Zhijing Wu, and Yiqun Liu. 2024. Mitigating entity-level hallucination in large language models. In Proceedings of the 2024 Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval in the Asia Pacific Region.
- [54] Weiwei Sun, Pengjie Ren, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Generative Knowledge Selection for Knowledge-Grounded Dialogues. In EACL Findings.
- [55] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Shuaiqiang Wang, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is ChatGPT Good at Search? Investigating Large Language Models as Re-Ranking Agents. In Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [56] Zhiqing Sun and Yiming Yang. 2020. An em approach to non-autoregressive conditional sequence generation. In International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR.
- [57] Richard S Sutton, David McAllester, Satinder Singh, and Yishay Mansour. 1999. Policy gradient methods for reinforcement learning with function approximation. Advances in neural information processing systems (1999).
- [58] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288 (2023).
- [59] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2022. MuSiQue: Multihop Questions via Single-hop Question Composition. In *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics: TACL.*
- [60] A Vaswani. 2017. Attention is all you need. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2017).
- [61] Shuting Wang, Jiongnan Liu, Shiren Song, Jiehan Cheng, Yuqi Fu, Peidong Guo, Kun Fang, Yutao Zhu, and Zhicheng Dou. 2024. Domainrag: A chinese benchmark for evaluating domain-specific retrieval-augmented generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05654 (2024).

- [62] Shuting Wang, Xin Yu, Mang Wang, Weipeng Chen, Yutao Zhu, and Zhicheng Dou. 2024. Richrag: Crafting rich responses for multi-faceted queries in retrieval-augmented generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12566 (2024).
- [63] Zhiruo Wang, Jun Araki, Zhengbao Jiang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Learning to filter context for retrieval-augmented generation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08377 (2023).
- [64] Zhepei Wei, Wei-Lin Chen, and Yu Meng. 2024. InstructRAG: Instructing Retrieval-Augmented Generation via Self-Synthesized Rationales. (2024).
- [65] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2023. C-Pack: Packaged Resources To Advance General Chinese Embedding. arXiv:2309.07597 [cs.CL]
- [66] Fangyuan Xu, Weijia Shi, and Eunsol Choi. 2023. Recomp: Improving retrieval-augmented lms with compression and selective augmentation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04408 (2023).
- [67] Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024. Search-in-the-Chain: Towards Accurate, Credible and Traceable Large Language Models for Knowledge-intensive Tasks. In WWW.
- [68] Diji Yang, Jinmeng Rao, Kezhen Chen, Xiaoyuan Guo, Yawen Zhang, Jie Yang, and Yi Zhang. 2024. Im-rag: Multi-round retrieval-augmented generation through learning inner monologues. In Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval.
- [69] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A Dataset for Diverse, Explainable Multi-hop Question Answering. In Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP).
- [70] Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. 2023. Making retrieval-augmented language models robust to irrelevant context. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01558 (2023).
- [71] Yue Yu, Wei Ping, Zihan Liu, Boxin Wang, Jiaxuan You, Chao Zhang, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2024. Rankrag: Unifying context ranking with retrieval-augmented generation in llms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02485 (2024).
- [72] Hamed Zamani and Michael Bendersky. 2024. Stochastic rag: End-to-end retrieval-augmented generation through expected utility maximization. In Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval.
- [73] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. 2023. Siren's song in the AI ocean: a survey on hallucination in large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219 (2023).
- [74] Hanyang Zhao, Wenpin Tang, and David Yao. 2024. Policy optimization for continuous reinforcement learning. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (2024).
- [75] Jianan Zhao, Meng Qu, Chaozhuo Li, Hao Yan, Qian Liu, Rui Li, Xing Xie, and Jian Tang. 2022. Learning on large-scale text-attributed graphs via variational inference. arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14709 (2022).
- [76] Junda Zhu, Lingyong Yan, Haibo Shi, Dawei Yin, and Lei Sha. 2024. ATM: Adversarial Tuning Multi-agent System Makes a Robust Retrieval-Augmented Generator. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.18111 (2024).