
Conv-CoA: Improving Open-domain Question Answering in Large Language Models via Conversational Chain-of-Action

Zhenyu Pan
Northwestern University
zhenyupan@u.northwestern.edu

Haozheng Luo
Northwestern University
RobinLuo2022@u.northwestern.edu

Manling Li
Northwestern University
manling.li@northwestern.edu

Han Liu
Northwestern University
hanliu@northwestern.edu

Abstract

We present a Conversational Chain-of-Action (Conv-CoA) framework for Open-domain Conversational Question Answering (OCQA). Compared with literature, Conv-CoA addresses three major challenges: (i) unfaithful hallucination that is inconsistent with real-time or domain facts, (ii) weak reasoning performance in conversational scenarios, and (iii) unsatisfying performance in conversational information retrieval. Our key contribution is a dynamic reasoning-retrieval mechanism that extracts the intent of the question and decomposes it into a reasoning chain to be solved via systematic prompting, pre-designed actions, updating the Contextual Knowledge Set (CKS), and a novel Hopfield-based retriever. Methodologically, we propose a resource-efficiency Hopfield retriever to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of conversational information retrieval within our actions. Additionally, we propose a conversational-multi-reference faith score (Conv-MRFS) to verify and resolve conflicts between retrieved knowledge and answers in conversations. Empirically, we conduct comparisons between our framework and 23 state-of-the-art methods across five different research directions and two public benchmarks. These comparisons demonstrate that our Conv-CoA outperforms other methods in both the accuracy and efficiency dimensions.

1 Introduction

This work proposes a conversational reasoning-retrieval framework to enhance both the efficiency and quality of Open-domain Conversational Question Answering (OCQA), tailored to surpass the architecture of traditional Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) methods. This work addresses three major challenges in applying RAG to answer conversational questions: (i) **weak reasoning**, where large language models (LLMs) struggle to acquire information from specific heterogeneous sources, (ii) **unfaithful hallucinations**, where the response may not align with real-time or domain-specific facts, and (iii) **unsatisfying retrieval**, where the traditional dense information retriever (IR) cannot get the intent of questions and fails in the conversational scenario.

To enhance the reasoning, faithfulness, and conversational IR, previous approaches such as chain-of-thought-based work [41, 52] prompt LLMs to answer complex questions step by step. The other work proposes RAG-based prompting frameworks such as agents [37]. However, they aim to solve single-round questions and fail in complex conversations. More recent work focuses on the retrieval phase and aims to improve the query quality and retriever capability. While CONQRR and ReExCQ [50, 33] are the representative query-reformulation methods to rewrite and expand the current query




Figure 1: Overview of Conv-CoA. It starts by injecting the initial question into a prompt, creating an action chain (AC) via the LLM. Each node in the AC represents a sub-question and an initial answer. Specific actions verify if the initial answer needs modification based on retrieved data. If the confidence in the initial answer is lower than in the retrieved data, an action prompts a change. The AC contents are stored in a contextual knowledge set (CKS) and updated at the end of each turn. In future turns, the CKS and the current question are combined to regenerate the AC, using different prompt templates to generate sub-questions for missing content, thus reducing information overlap.

with historical conversations, they need extra pre-trained model with much training expense. We argue that training a model for query reformulation is unnecessary; instead, prompting methods can harness the existing LLMs to serve this purpose. ConvSDG and CONVAUG [35, 6] try to enhance the conversational retriever by generating different levels of conversations. However, their performance still cannot be beyond the theoretical upper bound of traditional dense retrievers, and their consumption is still expensive. In summary, the key challenge of current OCQA lies in designing a framework tailored for conversational QA scenarios that integrates prompting with RAG and devises an innovative conversational retriever that surpasses traditional retriever architecture in efficacy.

To this end, we propose **Conv-CoA** framework, to deliver an accurate, faithful, and fast OCQA. In Conv-CoA, we design two actions: web-querying and info-searching. The former could search for the newest information from the Internet, while the latter could retrieve knowledge from storage (i.e., specific domain documents). Because we also need to rank the search results in the web-querying action, data retrieval is the most essential part of both actions. Inspired by the Modern Hopfield models showcasing fast convergence and exponential memory capacity in various domains [43, 47], we design a resource-efficiency Hopfield Retriever, tailored to surpass the traditional dense retriever architecture in searching with enhanced speed and precision. Meanwhile, we design a systematic prompting method to decompose a complex question into a reasoning chain with many subquestions. As shown in Figure 1, our method injects the first turn question into a designed prompt and then constructs an action chain (AC) by the LLM. Each node in the AC represents a sub-question and an initial answer generated by LLM. Then, we assign a specific action on each node to verify if the initial answer needs to change with the retrieved data. If the confidence of the initial answer is lower than that of retrieved data, the action requests to change. Finally, we store the contents of AC in a contextual knowledge set (CKS) and update it at each end of a future turn. At the same time, the LLM generates the final answer based on the updated CKS. In the following turns, we iterative combine the CKS and the current turn’s question to repeat the AC generation. In particular, the framework uses a different prompt template for it. We design a rule to generate the subquestions that we do not have relevant content yet based on the newest CKS. Therefore, it helps to decrease the overlap of the retrieved information by updating the CKS at the end of future turns.

In summary, Conv-CoA is the first work that enables a faithful, accurate, and fast OCQA by incorporating the prompting method and improved Hopfield retriever. Our main contributions are as follows:

- We propose a Conv-CoA framework that could decompose each question into many sub-questions to resolve by Hopfield-enhanced actions with verification by Conv-MRFS score.
- We propose a resource-efficiency Hopfield retriever to solve the limitations of traditional dense retrievers and speed up the retrieval, decreasing latency with no sacrifice in accuracy.
- We design a systematic prompting to construct the Action Chain of each turn based on the updating CKS, enabling less overlap of the retrieval to decrease the latency further.

- Experimental results demonstrate that our framework can outperform other methods in public benchmarks with a high degree of accuracy and efficiency.

2 Related Work

To enhance performance in OCQA, recent work mainly focuses on Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) methods. We categorize these methods into two distinct phases in alignment with the RAG life cycle: (1) Retrieval Phase: methods aim to enhance query quality and retrieval efficacy, facilitating the acquisition of more pertinent information to support LLM in generating answers. (2) Generation Phase: methods aim to propose prompting methods to aid LLM in conducting reasoning processes, thereby enabling more rational and precise answer generation.

Hence, we first introduce the work in the retrieval phase from two perspectives: query quality and retriever capability. Then, we explore various prompting methods designed to synergize with retrieval phase. In addition, we also introduce some hopfield-based methods that motivate us to propose our memory-enhanced conversational retriever.

2.1 Retrieval Phase

2.1.1 Query Reformulation Methods

Conversational Query Reformulation (CQR) uses query rewriting and query expansion based on a conversational context to improve conversational retrieval performance. Compared with other conversational retrieval methods, CQR could directly reformulate the original conversation-based query into a standalone query as input to off-the-shelf retrievers without fine-tuning. While previous CQR work addresses conversational retrieval by using human-rewritten queries or querying expansion methods [28, 29, 32], they always get a sub-optimal and require a separate model trained by collecting lots of human rewrites.

To address these drawbacks, CONQRR [50] directly optimizes the query rewriting model to the retrieval. More recently, IterCQR and IQR ([19, 54]) conduct query reformulation without relying on human rewrites by prompting the large language models (LLMs). ReExCQ ([33]) focuses on expanding the current query with selected relevant historical queries. However, they need a large storage capacity and training time when generating candidates during the training process.

2.1.2 Enhanced Retrieval Methods

Conversational Retrievers train previous information retrievers on conversational datasets using more complicated training strategies and loss functions. It aims to enhance the retriever’s ability to search for relevant information within conversational situations. LeCoRE [30] considering knowledge distillation, InstructorR [20] utilizing LLMs to predict the relevance score between the session and passages, and SDRConv [24] that includes mining additional hard negatives. In addition, ConvSDG and CONVAUG [35, 6] are the most recent work about utilizing LLM to generate conversations. ConvSDG explores the dialogue/session-level and query-level data generation separately. CONVAUG generates multi-level augmented conversations to capture the diverse nature of conversational contexts. HACONVDR [34] incorporating context-denoised query reformulation and automatic mining of supervision signals based on the actual impact of historical turns.

However, all of them focus on augmenting the training data for conversational dense retrievers. Despite these advancements, the performance upper limit of these methods still cannot break through the theoretical upper limit of conversational dense retrievers.

2.2 Prompting Methods

Prompting methods aim to direct the LLMs to follow given instructions. The commonly used method of few-shot prompting [21] facilitates in-context learning that guides LLMs to comply with directives and respond to queries using just a few examples. Methods like Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [46] and its enhanced versions [45, 41] seek to steer LLMs towards breaking down intricate tasks into logical sequences of reasoning, thereby improving performance. The Chain-of-Action (CoA) [37] integrates the reasoning capabilities of CoT with the information retrieval prowess of external retrievers, crafting

a collaborative design that culminates in a faithful and multimodal QA system. However, it lacks support for OCQA and does not overcome the limitations of traditional dense retrieval methods.

2.3 Modern Hopfield Models and Hopfield Memory

Classical Hopfield models [14, 13, 26] are pivotal in emulating the human brain’s associative memory, emphasizing memory pattern storage and retrieval. The resurgence in Hopfield model research is driven by enhanced memory storage capacities [26, 8], innovative architectural designs [48, 49, 12, 44, 11, 39], and their biological plausibility [25, 27]. Modern Hopfield models [16, 17, 49, 18, 5, 39] showcase fast convergence and exponential memory capacity, linking them to Transformer architecture as advanced attention mechanisms. Their application spans various domains, including drug discovery [43], immunology [47], and time series forecasting [49, 18, 3], signifying their influence on future large-scale model designs. Our research focuses on leveraging the rapid convergence and vast memory capacity of modern Hopfield models to efficiently retrieve knowledge from memory spaces. This approach aims to minimize latency in question-answer interactions within our Conversational CoA framework.

3 Methodology

3.1 Task Definition

Our framework aims to generate answers aligned with the current conversational question, denoted by q_n for the n -th turn. This QA process is historically contextual, leveraging previous dialogue turns denoted by $\mathcal{H} = \{q_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$. It is essential for the framework to optimize the formulation of each question q_i to accurately capture the user’s intended query content \mathcal{O}_n . Utilizing the reasoning capabilities of large language models (LLMs), the framework decomposes the optimized question into a chain of k sub-questions $\{\mathcal{R}_{n1}, \mathcal{R}_{n2}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{nk}\}$, each aimed at a specific aspect of the main query. For each sub-question \mathcal{R}_{ni} , the system retrieves the most relevant information passage \mathcal{I}_{ni} from a corpus of external data sources, culminating in a set $\{\mathcal{I}_{ni}\}_{i=1}^k$ that aids in generating the final answer a_n . Thus, the abilities to optimize questioning \mathcal{O} , to chain reasoning \mathcal{R} , and to retrieve pertinent information \mathcal{I} are pivotal. The goal of this paper is to propose a framework that integrates disparate external information sources, empowering the LLM to dissect queries effectively and retrieve related content swiftly, leading to the provision of the most precise answer A_n .

3.2 Overview

As shown in Figure 1, we utilize in-context learning to inject the initial user query into a structured prompt template, generating an Action Chain (AC) via a LLM. Each node within the AC includes a sub-question and a preliminary response, with specific actions executed to adjust these responses based on the confidence comparison between the initial answers and newly retrieved data. Concurrently, we maintain and iteratively update a Contextual Knowledge Set (CKS) at each conversation turn, which stores essential information and reduces redundancy in retrieved data. This dynamic updating supports the decomposition of subsequent queries into sub-questions using an adaptive prompt template, enhanced by our Hopfield-based retriever, which ensures rapid and accurate information retrieval, enriching the contextual understanding and response precision throughout the conversation.

3.3 Contextual Knowledge Set

The Contextual Knowledge Set (CKS) is a structured data format designed to store critical information from each round of a conversation. CKS is in JSON format, which facilitates easy integration and manipulation in data-driven applications. Each entry in the CKS records various components of the dialogue, including the original question posed during the round, the optimized question that refines or extends the original inquiry, detailed sub-questions that break down the main question into more reasonable parts, summarized information that has been retrieved in response to each sub-question, and the final answer concluded at the end of the discussion. This structure not only preserves the flow of conversation but also enriches the contextual understanding of each interaction. Below is an example of how CKS organizes and presents this information:

```

{
  "Contextual knowledge set": [
    {
      "round": 1,
      "original_question": "What is the process of ...?",
      "optimized_question": "Explain the steps involved ...",
      "sub_questions": {
        "sub1": "What are the light-dependent reactions ...",
        "sub2": "What are the light-independent reactions ...",
        "sub3": "How do plants convert sunlight into ..."
      },
      "information_summaries": {
        "infor1": "Light-dependent reactions use light ...",
        "infor2": "Light-independent reactions, or the ...",
        "infor3": "Plants convert sunlight into chemical ..."
      },
      "answer": "Photosynthesis is a process where..."
    },
    ...
  ]
}

```

Listing 1: Example of a Contextual Knowledge Set JSON Structure

3.4 Action chain generation

We have two different action chain generation stages, the initial and normal stages.

Initial stage: For the initial stage, we inject the first-round question and descriptions of actions into a prompting template. Then, we prompt LLM to decompose the question into sub-questions with guess answers. The prompting template is shown in A. After that, the actions retrieve the related information and correct these sub-questions. Finally, LLM generates the final answer from the processed action chain. In addition, the framework updates the CKS by the processed action chain.

Normal stage: In the normal stage, we design a prompt to let LLM extract the N-round intent question from the updated CKS and original N-round question, then decompose it into sub-questions. After that, actions do the retrieval and answer correction again. Finally, LLM generates the final N-round answer and updates the process into the CKS. The prompting template is shown in A:

3.5 Action Implementation

3.5.1 Action design

Web-querying. Our web-querying action leverages search engines such as Google Search, employing a query strategy to retrieve relevant Internet content. Initially, the action searches for keywords from the specified sub-question \mathcal{R}_{nk} , generating a list of results. If the "Missing_flag" is set to "True", we select the top-k results and extract the content directly from their web pages. Conversely, if the flag is "False", we collate the titles T and snippets S_n from the top M pages. Each title and snippet pair $\{T_m, S_{n_m}\}$ is then transformed into a 1536-dimension vector $Emb\{T_m|S_{n_m}\}$ using the OpenAI's text-embedding-ada-002 model [36]. We perform a similar vector transformation for the sub-question and its guess answer $\{\mathcal{R}_{nk}, \mathcal{G}_{nk}\}$. Subsequently, we compute the similarity between each vector $Emb\{T_m|S_{n_m}\}$ and $Emb\{\mathcal{R}_{nk}|\mathcal{G}_{nk}\}$, filtering out pages with similarity scores below 0.8. The contents from the pages with high similarity are then extracted and re-evaluated to rank and select the top-k final pages, from which we retrieve the ultimate information required for the action.

Knowledge-retrieval. In our framework, documents sourced from diverse platforms, including Wikipedia, are pre-processed using an encoder designed to transform textual content into embedding vectors. Each document is segmented into multiple chunks determined by their length, following which these segments are encoded into vectors. These vectors are subsequently cataloged in a vector database, indexed for efficient retrieval. For the retrieval process, we leverage our novel Hopfield retriever, which utilizes these pre-encoded vectors to respond to queries effectively, ultimately yielding

the top-k most relevant results based on similarity metrics. The details of the encoding and retrieval mechanisms will be further elaborated in the subsequent section of this paper 3.5.2.

Table 1: **Retrieval Performance on Conversation-Based Datasets** We conduct experiments on conversation-based datasets, testing 12 baselines in a conversational retrieval task using Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) and Recall@10 scores. We report average MRR and Recall@10 metrics, omitting variance as all values are $\leq 2\%$. The best results are highlighted in bold, while the second-best are underlined. Across most configurations, the Hopfield Retrieval (HR) with training outperforms all baselines, and HR without retrieval surpasses several of the retrieval methods.

Category	Model	QReCC		TopiOCQA	
		MRR	Recall@10	MRR	Recall@10
QR	T5QR	23.0	37.6	34.5	53.1
	CONQRR	24.3	39.8	41.8	<u>65.1</u>
	ConvGQR	25.6	41.8	42.0	63.5
	IterCQR	42.9	65.5	26.3	42.6
	IQR	45.0	67.3	31.3	49.8
RE	ReExCQ	18.5	28.9	10.8	24.1
	ConvSDG	39.8	43.7	21.4	37.8
	CONVAUG	52.7	75.6	35.0	57.9
RB	HACnvDR	48.5	72.4	30.1	50.8
	LeCoRE	51.1	73.9	32.0	54.3
	InstructorR	52.9	<u>77.7</u>	<u>38.5</u>	62.1
	SDRConv	<u>53.0</u>	<u>76.1</u>	-	-
HR	HR w/o Training	45.1 [†]	70.2 [†]	33.7 [†]	59.2 [†]
	HR w/ Training	68.7[†]	83.5[†]	60.3[†]	74.8[†]

3.5.2 Resource-Efficiency Hopfield Retriever

Based on the existing Hopfield model [51, 18, 5], we propose a resource- efficiency Hopfield memory retrieval model designed to extract top- k relevant information and solution paths from existing conversation turns and the knowledge base. This model aims to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of information retrieval by leveraging historical interactions and structured data sources.

Encoder. In this research, we employ separate BERT-based [10] networks for the question and passage encoders, using the [CLS] token representation as the output, with each representation being 768-dimensional. To enhance efficiency, we utilize an 8-bit quantized version [9] of the BERT-based model. Previous studies [4] have shown that large foundation models often suffer from numerous outliers that degrade efficiency and quantization performance due to attention-weight explosions caused by these outliers. In response, we adopt the OutEffHop [15] variant of BERT, which mitigates performance loss associated with these challenges.

Interface. During inference, we implement a speed-up strategy to enhance the adaptability of the Hopfield model in large-scale scenarios, achieving high speed with minimal impact on accuracy. As shown in B, given the extensive time required for querying a large-scale knowledge database, we adapt the SparseHopfield model to segment the memory pattern into several parts:

$$Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots, y_n\} \tag{3.1}$$

$$Z_i = \text{SparseHopfield}(R, y_i) = \text{Sparsemax}(\beta R W_Q W_K^T y_i^T) y_i W_K W_V. \tag{3.2}$$

This division allows for parallel processing, which does not degrade the performance of memory retrieval. Consequently, we evenly divide our Hopfield memory pattern into k parts, with each segment independently retrieving the most suitable memory pattern as its output.

Hopfield-based Retrieval. In our Hopfield-based memory retrieval model, we transition from retrieving standard memory patterns to directly extracting knowledge from conversations. It is crucial to train the model to refine the retrieval dynamics \mathcal{T} , ensuring accurate convergence on relevant

Table 2: **Performance of Question Answering Abilities** We conduct an experiment on question answering using 11 baselines of chain-of-thought methods, evaluated with the GPT Exact Match Score (GPT-EM). We report the average GPT-EM score, omitting variance since all values are $\leq 2\%$. The best results are highlighted in bold, while the second-best are underlined. Across most configurations, Conv-CoA achieves the best performance on the question-answering tasks in the TopiOCQA (Topi) and QReCC datasets.

	0-shot	Few	CoT	SC	ToT	LM	ToolF	SA	React	DSP	CoA	Ours
QReCC	18.4	18.4	30.6	67.4	20.4	22.4	50.0	34.5	37.3	38.1	<u>69.7</u>	71.2
Topi	23.2	28.2	35.4	<u>78.8</u>	22.4	48.0	30.7	51.0	40.8	28.6	56.9	83.7

question-passage pairs. Following the characteristics of Hopfield retrieval, we offer a training version and an interference-direct mode that retrieves and ranks the top-k relevant passages, enabling the generation of answers, akin to the approach described by [7]. In the training version, we adopt the loss function from the DPR model described by [22] to train our Hopfield-based retrieval system.

Let $D = \{q_i, y_{i,1}^+, y_{i,1}^-, y_{i,2}^-, \dots, y_{i,k}^-\}_{i=1}^m$ represent the training data, which comprises m instances. Each instance includes one question q_i , one relevant (positive) memory sets $y_{i,j}^+$, and with k irrelevant (negative) memory sets $y_{i,j}^-$. positive passages are paired with different questions from the training set to form negative pairs for retrieval. This method of using gold passages from other questions as negatives enhances computational efficiency and yields high performance.

3.5.3 Answering Verification

To verify conflicts between generated answers and retrieved information in conversations, we introduce the Conversational-Multi-Reference Faith Score (Conv-MRFS). This metric evaluates the consistency of generated answers with the conversation history (CKS).

Overview of Conv-MRFS: The Conv-MRFS framework involves extracting relevant segments from the conversation history to serve as references. The core of Conv-MRFS is the faith score, which measures alignment between the generated answer and each reference segment based on precision, recall, and average word length.

Components of the Faith Score: The faith score S is a composite metric incorporating three components: Precision (P), Recall (Rcl), and Average Word Length (AWL). These components are weighted to reflect their importance in the evaluation process: $S = \alpha \times P + \beta \times Rcl + \gamma \times AWL$. Here, α, β, γ are weights for precision, recall, and average word length, summing to 1 for normalization.

Precision and Recall: Precision (P) quantifies the fraction of relevant instances within the generated answer consistent with the conversation history and Recall (Rcl) measures the fraction of relevant instances from the conversation history captured by the generated answer:

$$P = \frac{\text{number of consistent items}}{\text{total number of items in } A_n}, Rcl = \frac{\text{number of consistent items}}{\text{total number of relevant items in } CH} \quad (3.3)$$

Average Word Length: Average Word Length (AWL) represents the mean length of words in the generated answer, indicating verbosity and informativeness:

$$AWL = \frac{\text{sum of lengths of all words in } A_n}{\text{total number of words in } A_n} \quad (3.4)$$

Faith Score Calculation: For each segment CH_i in the conversation, we compute the faith score $S(CH_i, A_n)$. The Conv-MRFS is the maximum faith score across all segments.

Threshold Decision: We set a threshold T for answer. If the Conv-MRFS exceeds T , the answer is considered faithful. Otherwise, the answer is revised to better align with the retrieved information.

4 Experiments

In this section, we first compare our Conversational CoA framework with recent state-of-the-art baselines across various public benchmarks, followed by an in-depth analysis of three aspects:

effectiveness of retrieval, efficiency of retrieval, and rate of misleading information. Note that **GPT-3.5-Turbo** serves as the LLM in all LLM-based methods and as the reader for all retrievers.

Datasets We select two public benchmarks. TopiOCQA [1], an open-domain conversational dataset with topic switches on Wikipedia, contains 3920 conversations with information-seeking questions and free-form answers. On average, a conversation in TopiOCQA spans 13 question-answer turns and involves four topics (documents). QReCC (Question Rewriting in Conversational Context) [2], an end-to-end open-domain question-answering dataset comprising 14K conversations with 81K question-answer pairs.

Baselines We compare our framework with three types of state-of-the-art approaches.

1. Query-reformulation-based approaches:

Query Rewriting (QR): T5QR [29], CONQRR [50], ConvGQR [32], IterCQR [19] and IQR [54].

Query Expansion (RE): ReExCQ [33], ConvSDG [35], and CONVAUG [6]

2. Ad-hoc search dense retriever-based approaches (**RB**)

HACnvDR [34] incorporating context-denoised query reformulation and automatic mining of supervision signals based on the actual impact of historical turns, LeCoRE [30] considering knowledge distillation, InstructorR [20] utilizing LLMs to predict the relevance score between the session and passages, and SDRConv [24] that includes mining additional hard negatives.

3. Prompting-based approaches

Prompting only (PO): Zero-shot Prompting, Few-shot Prompting (Few), Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [46], Self Consistency (SC) [45], Tree of Thought (ToT) [52], and Least-to-Most (LM) [55]

Prompting with RAG (PRAG): ToolFormer (ToolF) [42], Self-Ask (SA) [38], React [53], DSP [23], and CoA [37].

4. Ablation study about Hopfield-based baselines

Hopfield Retriever (HR): We initially evaluate our proposed resource-efficient Hopfield Retriever solely using the same reader (GPT-3.5-Turbo) as other conversational retriever-based baselines, demonstrating its promising performance in terms of efficiency and accuracy. We assess our retriever both with and without a training process. Subsequently, we test our comprehensive framework, Conv-CoA, which incorporates a Hopfield Retriever and utilizes systematic prompting based on an updated contextual knowledge set, alongside Conv-MRFS to verify conflicts. This framework is evaluated in versions with both trained and untrained retrievers.

Evaluation Metrics To evaluate the performance of the retrieval stage, we select the Mean Reciprocal Rank (**MRR**) and **Recall@10**. MRR is a metric that measures the average of the reciprocal ranks of the first relevant document returned by the retriever across all queries. And Recall@10 measures the proportion of relevant documents found in the top ten results returned by the retriever.

To evaluate the effectiveness of question answering, most of the work chooses cover-EM [40] to represent whether the generated answer contains the ground truth. However, we find it is insufficient for accurately judging the correctness of LLM-generated answers. Sometimes, the LLM generates lots of sentences that may cover the ground truth at first but provide the final wrong answer in the end. In this way, the cover-EM still takes it as a correct answer. In addition, even if we try to limit the output format, the outputs are always out of the format, making it difficult to deal with various answer types to evaluate the performance.

Motivated by recent work, they demonstrate the potential evaluation ability of GPT-4. We also follow the same strategy to establish an advanced pipeline and propose a new metric called **GPT-EM**. We design a prompt template to let GPT-4 evaluate whether the generated answer truly matches the ground truth. The template is shown in A.

Analysis on OCQA tasks In our evaluation, as detailed in Table 1 and Table 2, we observe that our Conv-CoA framework outshines baselines across the board for both the QReCC and TopiOCQA datasets. When examining the effectiveness of the proposed approach, it is evident that we achieves the highest Recall@10 scores, signifying its prowess in sourcing relevant information. In Table 3, a

Table 3: We perform a detailed analysis showing that external knowledge leads LLM astray in solving questions using baseline methods. Our study takes place in a context involving information retrieval tasks. The results, obtained through three separate runs, are displayed without including variance values (all $\leq 0.4\%$). The best results are highlighted in bold.

	React	SDRConv	CONVAUG	IQR	CoA	(Ours)
QReCC	19.6	6.7	7.3	9.1	13.5	4.8
TopiOCQA	41.6	17.3	18.9	23.6	22.9	16.2

Table 4: **Comparison of Retrievers Efficiency** We conduct an experiment on time usage in memory retrieval using two datasets, TopiOCQA and QReCC, with 5 baselines. We report the average time spent (in minutes) on memory retrieval, omitting variance since all values are $\leq 0.5\%$. The best results are highlighted in bold, while the second-best are underlined. Across most configurations, Conv-CoA is efficient in memory retrieval.

	HACnvDR	LeCoRe	InstructorR	SDRConv	ReExCQ	(Ours)
QReCC	44.25	38.23	32.01	75.87	47.23	<u>35.78</u>
TopiOCQA	50.72	47.68	<u>30.32</u>	55.39	38.23	29.65

meticulous analysis reveals that our framework significantly mitigates the LLM’s reliance on external knowledge, which can potentially lead it astray. This underscores CoA’s capacity for accurate internal knowledge representation and retrieval, a feature we meticulously assess over three independent runs to ensure robustness against variability.

Moreover, as elucidated in Table 4, we contrast the efficiency of different retrievers within our framework. Notably, Ours exhibits comparable retrieval time against established approaches, while markedly improving the training time, particularly on the TopiOCQA dataset. This enhanced efficiency does not compromise the quality of outcomes, as evidenced by our framework’s performance, achieving top-tier results.

The empirical data harvested from our evaluations suggests a breakthrough in question-answering systems, where our framework not only demonstrates a remarkable understanding of complex queries but also evidences advanced reasoning capabilities. Furthermore, its resilience against the influx of external misinformation marks a significant milestone in this domain. By outperforming existing models in precision and efficiency, our Conv-CoA sets a new benchmark in the realms of question-answering and fact-checking, underpinning its comprehensive superiority and viability as a robust solution in a broad spectrum of applications.

5 Conclusions and Future Work

This paper presents the Conv-CoA framework, a novel approach to enhancing Open-domain Conversational Question Answering (OCQA). The framework addresses critical limitations of traditional Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) methods, such as poor reasoning, unfaithful responses, and inadequate retrieval in conversational contexts. By integrating a Hopfield-based retriever and a systematic prompting method, Conv-CoA improves retrieval speed and accuracy while reducing latency. This advanced retriever utilizes Modern Hopfield networks for efficient memory utilization and rapid convergence. The prompting strategy decomposes complex questions into a sequence of sub-questions managed through an Action Chain (AC), which updates a contextual knowledge set (CKS) to refine responses and minimize information overlap. Conv-CoA demonstrates superior performance on public benchmarks, showcasing its ability to deliver more accurate and efficient conversational question answering. Key contributions include the novel retrieval model, dynamic prompting method, and enhanced handling of conversational dynamics.

Future work involves exploring information extraction and analysis across additional data modalities, including visual data. The ultimate aim is to enhance the accuracy and multi-step reasoning capabilities for real-world question answering, ensuring comprehensive analysis aligns with external data sources. Additionally, we need to further accelerate the Hopfield retriever by compressing the model using techniques such as quantization.

Broader Impact

Our research methodology enhances understanding and problem-solving across various domains, including AI research, by producing clearer and more comprehensible results. However, this method might oversimplify complex issues by breaking them down into discrete parts, potentially overlooking nuances and interrelated elements. Additionally, relying heavily on this approach could limit creative problem-solving, as it encourages a linear and structured process that may impede unconventional thinking.

References

- [1] Vaibhav Adlakha, Shehzaad Dhuliawala, Kaheer Suleman, Harm de Vries, and Siva Reddy. 2022. Topiocqa: Open-domain conversational question answering with topic switching. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:468–483.
- [2] Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2020. Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.04898*.
- [3] Andreas Auer, Martin Gauch, Daniel Klotz, and Sepp Hochreiter. 2024. Conformal prediction for time series with modern hopfield networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- [4] Yelysei Bondarenko, Markus Nagel, and Tijmen Blankevoort. 2024. Quantizable transformers: Removing outliers by helping attention heads do nothing. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- [5] Johannes Brandstetter. 2021. Blog post: Hopfield networks is all you need. Accessed: April 4, 2023.
- [6] Haonan Chen, Zhicheng Dou, Kelong Mao, Jiongnan Liu, and Ziliang Zhao. 2024. Generalizing conversational dense retrieval via llm-cognition data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07092*.
- [7] Alexander Davydov, Sean Jaffe, Ambuj Singh, and Francesco Bullo. 2023. Retrieving k -nearest memories with modern hopfield networks. In *Associative Memory & Hopfield Networks in 2023*.
- [8] Mete Demircigil, Judith Heusel, Matthias Löwe, Sven Uppgang, and Franck Vermet. 2017. On a model of associative memory with huge storage capacity. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 168:288–299.
- [9] Tim Dettmers, Mike Lewis, Younes Belkada, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022. Gpt3. int8 (): 8-bit matrix multiplication for transformers at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:30318–30332.
- [10] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding.
- [11] Andreas Fürst, Elisabeth Rumetshofer, Johannes Lehner, Viet T Tran, Fei Tang, Hubert Ramsauer, David Kreil, Michael Kopp, Günter Klambauer, Angela Bitto, et al. 2022. Cloob: Modern hopfield networks with infoleob outperform clip. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:20450–20468.
- [12] Benjamin Hoover, Yuchen Liang, Bao Pham, Rameswar Panda, Hendrik Strobelt, Duen Horng Chau, Mohammed J Zaki, and Dmitry Krotov. 2023. Energy transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07253*.
- [13] John J Hopfield. 1982. Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 79(8):2554–2558.

- [14] John J Hopfield. 1984. Neurons with graded response have collective computational properties like those of two-state neurons. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 81(10):3088–3092.
- [15] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Pei-Hsuan Chang, Robin Luo, Hong-Yu Chen, Weijian Li, Wei-Po Wang, and Han Liu. 2024. Outlier-efficient hopfield layers for large transformer-based models.
- [16] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Bo-Yu Chen, Dennis Wu, Feng Ruan, and Han Liu. 2024. Nonparametric modern hopfield models.
- [17] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Thomas Lin, Zhao Song, and Han Liu. 2024. On computational limits of modern hopfield models: A fine-grained complexity analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04520*.
- [18] Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Donglin Yang, Dennis Wu, Chenwei Xu, Bo-Yu Chen, and Han Liu. 2023. On sparse modern hopfield model. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [19] Yunah Jang, Kang-il Lee, Hyunkyung Bae, Seungpil Won, Hwanhee Lee, and Kyomin Jung. 2023. Itercqr: Iterative conversational query reformulation without human supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09820*.
- [20] Zhuoran Jin, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. 2023. Instructor: Instructing unsupervised conversational dense retrieval with large language models. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- [21] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*.
- [22] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick 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)*, pages 6769–6781, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [23] Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Xiang Lisa Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. Demonstrate-search-predict: Composing retrieval and language models for knowledge-intensive NLP. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14024*.
- [24] Sungdong Kim and Gangwoo Kim. 2022. Saving dense retriever from shortcut dependency in conversational search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07280*.
- [25] Leo Kozachkov, Ksenia V Kastanenko, and Dmitry Krotov. 2022. Building transformers from neurons and astrocytes. *bioRxiv*, pages 2022–10.
- [26] Dmitry Krotov and John J Hopfield. 2016. Dense associative memory for pattern recognition. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.
- [27] Dmitry Krotov and John J. Hopfield. 2021. Large associative memory problem in neurobiology and machine learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [28] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. Contextualized query embeddings for conversational search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08707*.
- [29] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Rodrigo Nogueira, Ming-Feng Tsai, Chuan-Ju Wang, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Conversational question reformulation via sequence-to-sequence architectures and pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01909*.
- [30] Kelong Mao, Hongjin Qian, Fengran Mo, Zhicheng Dou, Bang Liu, Xiaohua Cheng, and Zhao Cao. 2023. Learning denoised and interpretable session representation for conversational search. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*, pages 3193–3202.
- [31] Andre Martins and Ramon Astudillo. 2016. From softmax to sparsemax: A sparse model of attention and multi-label classification. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1614–1623. PMLR.

- [32] Fengran Mo, Kelong Mao, Yutao Zhu, Yihong Wu, Kaiyu Huang, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2023. Convgqr: Generative query reformulation for conversational search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15645*.
- [33] Fengran Mo, Jian-Yun Nie, Kaiyu Huang, Kelong Mao, Yutao Zhu, Peng Li, and Yang Liu. 2023. Learning to relate to previous turns in conversational search. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 1722–1732.
- [34] Fengran Mo, Chen Qu, Kelong Mao, Tianyu Zhu, Zhan Su, Kaiyu Huang, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2024. History-aware conversational dense retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16659*.
- [35] Fengran Mo, Bole Yi, Kelong Mao, Chen Qu, Kaiyu Huang, and Jian-Yun Nie. 2024. Convsdg: Session data generation for conversational search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11335*.
- [36] OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report.
- [37] Zhenyu Pan, Haozheng Luo, Manling Li, and Han Liu. 2024. Chain-of-action: Faithful and multimodal question answering through large language models.
- [38] Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2022. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03350*.
- [39] Hubert Ramsauer, Bernhard Schafkl, Johannes Lehner, Philipp Seidl, Michael Widrich, Thomas Adler, Lukas Gruber, Markus Holzleitner, Milena Pavlovic, Geir Kjetil Sandve, et al. 2020. Hopfield networks is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.02217*.
- [40] Corby Rosset, Chenyan Xiong, Minh Phan, Xia Song, Paul Bennett, and Saurabh Tiwary. 2020. Knowledge-aware language model pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00655*.
- [41] Abulhair Saparov and He He. 2022. Language models are greedy reasoners: A systematic formal analysis of chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01240*.
- [42] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessi, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools.
- [43] Johannes Schimunek, Philipp Seidl, Lukas Friedrich, Daniel Kuhn, Friedrich Rippmann, Sepp Hochreiter, and Günter Klambauer. 2023. Context-enriched molecule representations improve few-shot drug discovery. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [44] Philipp Seidl, Philipp Renz, Natalia Dyubankova, Paulo Neves, Jonas Verhoeven, Jorg K Wegner, Marwin Segler, Sepp Hochreiter, and Gunter Klambauer. 2022. Improving few-and zero-shot reaction template prediction using modern hopfield networks. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 62(9):2111–2120.
- [45] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*.
- [46] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [47] Michael Widrich, Bernhard Schäfl, Milena Pavlović, Hubert Ramsauer, Lukas Gruber, Markus Holzleitner, Johannes Brandstetter, Geir Kjetil Sandve, Victor Greiff, Sepp Hochreiter, et al. 2020. Modern hopfield networks and attention for immune repertoire classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:18832–18845.
- [48] Dennis Wu, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Teng-Yun Hsiao, and Han Liu. 2024. Uniform memory retrieval with larger capacity for modern hopfield models.

- [49] Dennis Wu, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Weijian Li, Bo-Yu Chen, and Han Liu. 2023. Stanhop: Sparse tandem hopfield model for memory-enhanced time series prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17346*.
- [50] Zeqiu Wu, Yi Luan, Hannah Rashkin, David Reitter, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Mari Ostendorf, and Gaurav Singh Tomar. 2021. Conqrr: Conversational query rewriting for retrieval with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.08558*.
- [51] Chenwei Xu, Yu-Chao Huang, Jerry Yao-Chieh Hu, Weijian Li, Ammar Gilani, Hsi-Sheng Goan, and Han Liu. 2024. Bishop: Bi-directional cellular learning for tabular data with generalized sparse modern hopfield model.
- [52] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10601*.
- [53] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [54] Fanghua Ye, Meng Fang, Shenghui Li, and Emine Yilmaz. 2023. Enhancing conversational search: Large language model-aided informative query rewriting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09716*.
- [55] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. 2022. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*.

Supplementary Material

A Prompts

We use the following prompts in our Cov-CoA method and experiments. These include prompts for decomposing questions at the initial stage, evaluation prompts for GPT-4, and prompts for decomposing questions with CKS in the normal stage.

Prompt for Decomposing Questions in Initial Stage

Given a [Question]: “\$QUESTION”, construct an action reasoning chain for this question in JSON format. For each step of the chain, choose an action from [Web-querying Engine(search real-time news), Knowledge-encoding Engine (search existing knowledge in local knowledge base)] as the value of element "Action", and generate a sub-question for each action to get one of [web-search keywords, needed information description] as the value of element "Sub". Also, generate an initial answer for each Sub as the value of the element "Guess_answer" if you make sure it is correct. In addition, if you cannot answer some sub-questions, make the element “Missing_flag” value “True”, otherwise, make it “False” You need to try to generate the final answer for the [Question] by referring to the "Chain", as the value of the element "Final_answer".

For example:

```
{"question": "Is it good to invest in Dogecoin now?"
"chain": [
{"action": "knowledge-encoding", "Sub": "what is Dogecoin", "guess_answer":
"Dogecoin is one cryptocurrency.", "missing_flag": "false"}
{"action": "Web-querying", "Sub": "Dogecoin news", "guess_answer": "",
"missing_flag": "True"} ,
"final_answer": "Dogecoin is one of the cryptocurrencies that is risky
to invest. And its news prompts Bitcoin. So, it is a good time to
invest now."}
```

Evaluation Prompt of GPT-4

Given (question, ground truth answer, LLM-generated answer), you need to check whether the generated answer contains the ground truth by their meaning, not individual word only. If correct, the output is 1, otherwise, 0. For example:

[Question]: What should I do when I drink spoiled milk? (A) drink more (B) drink coffee (C) take some medicine.

[Ground truth]: (C) take some medicine

[Generated answer]: when you drink spoiled milk, you can not drink more or even drink coffee. You should go to the hospital and check if you need to take some medicines or not.

[Output]: 1

[Question]: {QUESTION}

[Ground truth]: {GROUND_TRUTH}

[Generated answer]: {GENERATED_ANSWER}

[Output]:

Prompt for Decomposing Question with CKS in Normal Stage

Given a [Contextual Knowledge Set]:"\$CKS" and [Question]: "\$QUESTION", help me to extract the real intent and provide an optimized question for this round. Then, construct an action reasoning chain for this question in JSON format. For each step of the chain, choose an action from [Web-querying Engine(search real-time news), Knowledge-encoding Engine (search existing knowledge in local knowledge base)] as the value of element "Action", and generate a sub-question for each action to get one of [web-search keywords, needed information description] as the value of element "Sub". Also, generate an initial answer for each Sub as the value of the element "Guess_answer" if you make sure it is correct. In addition, if you cannot answer some sub-questions, make the element "Missing_flag" value "True", otherwise, make it "False" You need to try to generate the final answer for the [Question] by referring to the "Chain", as the value of the element "Final_answer".

For example:

```
{
  "question": "Is it good to invest in it now?"
  "optimized_question": "Is it good to invest in Bitcoin now?"
  "chain": [
    {
      "action": "knowledge-encoding",
      "Sub": "what is bitcoin",
      "guess_answer": "Bitcoin is one cryptocurrency.",
      "missing_flag": "false"
    },
    {
      "action": "Web-querying",
      "Sub": "bitcoin news",
      "guess_answer": "",
      "missing_flag": "True"
    },
    {
      "final_answer": "Bitcoin is one of the cryptocurrencies that is risky to invest. And its news prompte Bitcoin. So, it is a good time to invest now."
    }
  ]
}
```

B SparseHopfield Layers

Building on the insights from [18], we establish a link between the single-update approximation of Hopfield Network and sparsemax attention [31]. Specifically, this relationship becomes apparent when the retrieval dynamics \mathcal{T} are limited to a single iteration.

Consider some hidden states R and Y within a deep learning model. We establish the *query* and *memory* associative (or embedded) spaces via transformations: $X^T = RW_Q := Q$ and $\Xi^T = YW_K := K$, with matrices W_Q and W_K . By adapting the retrieval dynamics from [18] and transposing, followed by multiplication with W_V (where we define $V := KW_V$), we obtain:

$$Z := Q^{\text{new}}W_V = \text{Sparsemax}(\beta QK^T)V \tag{B.1}$$

This equation mirrors the structure of an attention mechanism, albeit utilizing a Sparsemax activation. By substituting the initial patterns R and Y , we introduce the SparseHopfield layer:

$$Z = \text{SparseHopfield}(R, Y) \tag{B.2}$$

$$= \text{Sparsemax}(\beta RW_Q W_K^T Y^T) Y W_K W_V. \tag{B.3}$$

This layer can be easily integrated into deep learning architectures.

Specifically, the SparseHopfield layer accepts matrices R and Y , along with weight matrices W_Q , W_K , and W_V . The way it operates is defined by its configuration:

1. **Memory Retrieval:** In a mode where learning is not necessary, the weight matrices W_K , W_Q , and W_V are set as identity matrices. Here, R serves as the query, and Y holds the

retrieval patterns: $\mathbf{W}_K = \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{W}_Q = \mathbf{I}$, $\mathbf{W}_V = \mathbf{I}$ This configuration facilitates direct interaction between the query and retrieval patterns without transformation.

2. **SparseHopfield:** Here, \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{Y} are inputs, designed to serve as an alternative to the conventional attention mechanism. The matrices \mathbf{W}_K , \mathbf{W}_Q , and \mathbf{W}_V are adaptable. Additionally, \mathbf{R} , \mathbf{Y} , and \mathbf{Y} act as the sources of the query, key, and value respectively. To emulate a self-attention mechanism, we set $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Y}$.
3. **SparseHopfieldPooling:** In this configuration, where only \mathbf{Y} is taken as input, \mathbf{Q} functions as a static prototype pattern and is thus learned within the Hopfield pooling layer.
4. **SparseHopfieldLayer:** With only \mathbf{R} as the query pattern, the adaptive matrices \mathbf{W}_K and \mathbf{W}_V function as repositories for stored patterns and their projections. This setup implies that keys and values are independent of the input, suggesting that \mathbf{Y} could be interpreted as an identity matrix.

C System

All experiments are carried out on a High Performance Computing cluster. There are 34 GPU nodes where 16 nodes each have 2 NVIDIA 40GB Tesla A100 PCIe GPUs, 52 CPU cores, and 192 GB of CPU RAM while 18 nodes are each equipped with 4 NVIDIA 80GB Tesla A100 SXM GPUs, 52 CPU cores, and 512 GB of CPU RAM. The driver version 525.105.17 on these nodes is compatible with CUDA 12.0 or earlier. The operating system is Red Hat Enterprise Linux 7.9.