

---

# Unveil the Duality of Retrieval-Augmented Generation: Theoretical Analysis and Practical Solution

---

Shicheng Xu<sup>1,2</sup>, Liang Pang<sup>1\*</sup>, Huawei Shen<sup>1,2</sup>, Xueqi Cheng<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CAS Key Laboratory of AI Safety,  
Institute of Computing Technology,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>2</sup>University of Chinese Academy of Sciences  
{xushicheng21s, pangliang, shenhuawei, cxq}@ict.ac.cn

## Abstract

Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) utilizes retrieved texts to enhance large language models (LLMs). However, studies show that RAG is not consistently effective and can even mislead LLMs due to noisy or incorrect retrieved texts. This suggests that RAG possesses a duality including both benefit and detriment. Although many existing methods attempt to address this issue, they lack a theoretical explanation for the duality in RAG. The benefit and detriment within this duality remain a “black box” that cannot be quantified or compared in an explainable manner. This paper takes the first step in theoretically giving the essential explanation of benefit and detriment in RAG by: (1) decoupling and formalizing them from RAG prediction, (2) approximating the gap between their values by representation similarity and (3) establishing the trade-off mechanism between them, to make them explainable, quantifiable, and comparable. We demonstrate that the distribution difference between retrieved texts and LLMs’ knowledge acts as “double-edged sword,” bringing both benefit and detriment. We also prove that the actual effect of RAG can be predicted at token level. Based on our theory, we propose a practical novel method, **X-RAG**, which achieves collaborative generation between pure LLM and RAG at token level to preserve benefit and avoid detriment. Experiments in real-world tasks based on LLMs including OPT, LLaMA-2, and Mistral show the effectiveness of our method and support our theoretical results.

## 1 Introduction

Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) has shown promising performance in enhancing LLMs via integrating retrieved texts Xu et al. [2023], Shi et al. [2023], Asai et al. [2023], Ram et al. [2023], which is actually the knowledge fusion between parameters and retrieved texts. However, studies show that this fusion is not consistently effective and can even mislead LLMs due to noisy or incorrect retrieved texts Xu et al. [2023], Ram et al. [2023], Xu et al. [2024a,b], Jin et al. [2024a], Xie et al. [2023], Jin et al. [2024b]. This implies that RAG has the duality including both benefit and detriment. Current methods attempt to address this by adding additional modules, prompt engineering, or fine-tuning LLMs. Asai et al. [2023], Xu et al. [2023, 2024a], Yoran et al. [2024], Ren et al. [2023], Feng et al. [2023], Mallen et al. [2022], Jiang et al. [2023]. Despite these efforts, there remains a lack of a theoretical and essential explanation for the benefit and detriment in RAG that could improve our understanding and find a more fundamental solution.

In this paper, we provide a theoretical explanation for the benefit and detriment in RAG and propose a novel practical method based on our theoretical results (Figure 1). From a theoretical perspective,

---

\* Corresponding authors




Figure 1: Theoretical results and practical method for real-world tasks in our paper.

this paper pioneers in giving the essential explanation of benefit and detriment by: (1) decoupling and formalizing them from RAG prediction, (2) approximating the gap between their values using representation similarity, and (3) establishing the trade-off mechanism between them, to make them explainable, quantifiable, and comparable. Specifically, inspired by previous methods that prove LLMs implicitly perform latent variable inference Xie et al. [2021], Wang et al. [2024], we propose to analyze RAG by Latent Variable Model, in which LLMs firstly infer the latent variable and then generate the texts conditioned on the latent variable. In this way, we decouple and formalize the benefit and detriment from RAG prediction as two terms in subtraction. Further derivation based on this shows that: (1) We essentially explain the occurrence of benefit and detriment in RAG. The distribution difference between the retrieved texts and the LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge is “double-edged sword”. The larger distribution difference can provide more out-of-distribution knowledge for LLMs but also runs the risk of misleading them. Consequently, it brings both benefit and detriment. (2) We prove that the actual effect of RAG, which is the trade-off between benefit and detriment, can be predicted at token level (right side in Figure 1 (a)). Specifically, we find benefit and detriment bound the similarity between RAG representation and retrieved representation ( $\text{Sim}(\text{RAG}, \text{IR})$ ), and the value of benefit minus detriment is positively correlated with this similarity. When benefit is equal to detriment, this similarity is equal to the similarity between RAG representation and pure LLM representation ( $\text{Sim}(\text{RAG}, \text{IR}) = \text{Sim}(\text{RAG}, \text{LLM})$ ). So the value order between  $\text{Sim}(\text{RAG}, \text{IR})$  and  $\text{Sim}(\text{RAG}, \text{LLM})$  indicates the value order between benefit and detriment in RAG without training.

Based on our theoretical results, we propose a practical novel method called **X-RAG** that can achieve collaborative generation between pure LLM and RAG at token level to preserve benefit and avoid detriment. In **X-RAG**, pure LLM and RAG generate the texts in parallel (Figure 1 (b)). At the generation step where LLM and RAG generate the different tokens, **X-RAG** uses our theoretical results to determine which token will be selected by comparing the values of benefit and detriment brought by RAG to the token. Experimental results in real-world tasks such as Q&A and Long-Form Q&A based on LLMs including OPT, LLaMA-2, and Mistral show the effectiveness of our method and support our theoretical results. Our method does not need any additional modules<sup>2</sup> or training but outperforms baselines that need additional modules and fine-tuning LLMs, which indicates that our theoretical results are essential and fundamental for RAG. The main contributions of this paper are:

- This paper takes the first step in theoretically giving the essential explanation of benefit and detriment in RAG to make them explainable, quantifiable, and comparable.
- We prove distribution difference between retrieved texts and LLMs’ knowledge is a “double-edged sword” that brings both benefit and detriment. Besides, we prove that the actual effect of RAG (i.e., the trade-off between benefit and detriment) can be predicted at token level, which is significant for fine-grained preserving benefit and avoiding detriment in practical applications of RAG.
- Based on the theoretical results, we propose a practical novel method to enable pure LLM and RAG to collaboratively generate at token level. Experimental results on real-world tasks across different LLMs show the effectiveness of our method and support our theoretical results.

<sup>2</sup>Collaborative generation does not need additional modules because it can be executed in parallel of a batch.

## 2 Understand the duality of RAG: benefit and detriment

RAG has the duality, although the retrieved texts can provide LLMs with external knowledge (benefit), it also contains the risk of misleading LLMs due to the noise in retrieved texts (detriment). This section aims to theoretically unveil this duality (i.e., benefit and detriment) in RAG. Firstly, we give our definition, analysis perspective and framework for benefit and detriment in RAG. Secondly, we decouple and formalize benefit and detriment from RAG prediction as the two terms in subtraction to make them explainable. Thirdly, which is also the ultimate goal of this paper, we prove that the actual effect of RAG (i.e., the trade-off between benefit and detriment) can be predicted at token level.

### 2.1 Definition and pre-analysis for benefit and detriment in RAG

**Definition.** From the perspective of correctness, the relationship between the knowledge generated by pure LLM and the knowledge generated by RAG can be classified into four categories: (1) the knowledge of both is correct, (2) the knowledge of both is wrong, (3) the knowledge of pure LLM is wrong while the knowledge of RAG is correct, (4) the knowledge of pure LLM is correct while the knowledge of RAG is wrong. Since the former two are consistent in correctness, this paper focuses on the latter two and defines (3) as **benefit** and (4) as **detriment**.

**Distribution difference brings the benefit and detriment.** The knowledge pre-trained in LLMs has the boundary Ren et al. [2023]. Retrieved texts bring new knowledge to LLMs and trigger the knowledge distribution difference between retrieved texts and LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge. In this paper, we propose that this distribution difference is a “double-edged sword”, which can be used to essentially explain the occurrence of benefit and detriment in RAG. Assuming that the retrieved texts are perfect, the larger the distribution difference between LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge and retrieved texts, the more out-of-distribution knowledge the retrieved texts can provide to LLMs, and the higher the benefit. However, the retrieved texts are not always perfect and may contain noisy even incorrect information, in this case, distribution difference will mislead the LLM, causing detriment. Therefore, benefit and detriment in RAG are essentially triggered by the distribution difference between LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge and retrieved texts. The following sections will illustrate this point theoretically.

**Analysis framework: formalizing RAG as latent variable model.** To begin the analysis, inspired by previous studies that prove LLMs implicitly perform latent variable inference Xie et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2023], Wang et al. [2024], we first propose to formalize RAG as the latent variable model. Specifically, given the token sequence  $x_{1:i-1} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}\}$  generated from time step 1 to  $i - 1$ , from the perspective of the latent variable model, the probability distribution of the token  $x_i$  at the  $i$ -th step can be described as this:

$$p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|x_{1:i-1}) dz, \quad (1)$$

in which  $\mathcal{Z}$  is the space of high dimensional concept variable,  $p(z|x_{1:i-1})$  is the probability that the model samples latent concept  $z$  from  $\mathcal{Z}$  given the input  $x_{1:i-1}$ , and  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}, z)$  means the probability for token  $x_i$  conditioned on the input  $x_{1:i-1}$  and the sampled latent concept  $z$ .  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  can be obtained by integrating over all latent concepts from the space  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Latent variable model has been applied in many methods such as LDA Blei et al. [2003]. Recent studies prove that in-context learning of LLMs can also be seen as the latent variable model, in which the LLMs sample the concept across the input examples Xie et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2023]. Inspired by this, we analyse RAG as sampling the *Retrieved Concept*  $z^*$  from the input retrieved texts list  $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$  ( $r_i$  is a retrieved passage), and then predicting  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ , which can be formalized as:

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz + p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*)p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Equation 2 describes the knowledge fusion in RAG. The first term is the prediction that marginalizes out all latent concepts except  $z^*$ , which is the knowledge within LLMs. The second term is the prediction that is only conditioned on  $z^*$ , which is the knowledge from retrieved texts.

## 2.2 Decouple and formalize benefit and detriment

Recapping the view that distribution difference brings both benefit and detriment in RAG we want to illustrate (Section 2.1), next, we derive the relationship between knowledge fusion and distribution difference from Equation 2 to decouple and formalize the benefit and detriment from RAG prediction. Inspired by Xie et al. [2021], the Equation 2 can be transformed as (detailed proof can be found in Appendix A):

$$p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \quad (3)$$

$$\propto \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z) dz \quad (4)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)\exp(r(z))p(z) dz, \quad r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \quad (5)$$

Define  $r_i$  is a passage in the retrieved texts list  $R$ , we can get (see detailed proof in Appendix B):

$$r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \approx \log \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z)}{\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z^*)} \quad (6)$$

$$\rightarrow n * \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{p(r_i|z)}{p(r_i|z^*)} = n * \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P_r} \left[ \log \frac{p(r_i|z)}{p(r_i|z^*)} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$\propto p_R(r) \log \frac{p(r|z)}{p(r|z^*)} = p_R(r) \log \frac{p_R(r)}{p(r|z^*)} - p_R(r) \log \frac{p_R(r)}{p(r|z)} \quad (8)$$

$$= - \underbrace{(\text{KL}(p_R(r) \| p(r|z)))}_{\text{benefit}} - \underbrace{(\text{KL}(p_R(r) \| p(r|z^*)))}_{\text{detriment}}, \quad (9)$$

$p_R(\cdot)$  is the distribution of the retrieved texts,  $p(\cdot)$  is the distribution of the LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge.  $r(z)$  is an important term in knowledge fusion because it reflects the proportion between the latent concept from the space of LLMs and from the retrieved texts. Details are in Appendix C.

**Discuss the benefit and detriment based on the theoretical results.** In Equation 9, the first term is the distribution difference between retrieved texts ( $p_R(r)$ ) and LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge ( $p(r|z)$ ) given the concept  $z$  that is sampled from  $\mathcal{Z}$  (full set of latent variables in LLMs). The second term is the distribution difference between the retrieved texts ( $p_R(r)$ ) and LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge given the concept  $z^*$  that is sampled from retrieved texts ( $p(r|z^*)$ ). Recapping our definition of benefit and detriment in Section 2.1, the first term is actually the **benefit** in RAG, the larger this value is, the more out-of-distribution knowledge the retrieved texts can provide to LLM. Considering that the retrieved texts may contain incorrect information and noise that contradicts the correct knowledge of LLMs, the second term measures this risk and can be seen as the **detriment** in RAG. It is because  $p(r|z^*)$  is the prediction made by LLM conditioned on the concept  $z^*$  sampled from the retrieved texts. If external knowledge in the retrieved texts contradicts LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge,  $p(r|z^*)$  will have a gap compared to  $p_R(r)$  (the actual distribution of the retrieved texts). Therefore, the difference between  $p(r|z^*)$  and  $p_R(r)$  primarily stems from the LLMs’ resistance to any external knowledge in the retrieved texts that contradicts LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge. The larger difference indicates the more intense resistance from LLMs, and the more confident the LLMs are in their pre-trained knowledge, which means the greater the potential detriment caused by the retrieved texts. This explains the occurrence mechanism and relationship between benefit and detriment in RAG.

**Corollary 1.** *Two terms about distribution difference in Equation 9 explain the occurrence mechanism of benefit and detriment respectively. A larger distribution difference not only indicates more out-of-distribution knowledge (benefit) but also implies the LLMs’ resistance to the retrieved texts that contradict the pre-trained knowledge (detriment). Subtraction between benefit and detriment illustrates the “double-edged sword” trade-off in knowledge fusion of RAG.*

## 2.3 Actual effect of RAG can be predicted at token level

Based on the above analysis, we successfully explain the occurrence of benefit and detriment in RAG from a distribution difference perspective. Besides, we decouple and formalize benefit and detriment as two terms in subtraction. Next, we further discuss the impact of benefit and detriment

on the prediction of RAG and find that *both benefit and detriment bound the similarity between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ , which can serve as an important signal indicating the value order between benefit and detriment at token level*. Specifically, recapping the Equation 2 that describes the knowledge fusion in RAG via latent variable model, we derive Theorem 1:

**Theorem 1.** Define  $\mathcal{D} = \|p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) - p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})\|_1$  to measure the difference between output distribution of RAG ( $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ ) and the distribution of retrieved texts conditioned on prefix  $x_{1:i-1}$  ( $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ ). Both benefit and detriment are important terms of the upper and lower bounds of  $\mathcal{D}$ , which can be described as:

$$\|\Phi\|_1 - \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))} \leq \mathcal{D} \leq \|\Phi\|_1 + \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}, \quad (10)$$

$$\Phi \approx \alpha \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp \left[ - \underbrace{(\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z))}_{\text{benefit}} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment}}) \right] p(z) dz,$$

in which  $\alpha$  is a constant. Our detailed proof of Theorem 1 can be found in Appendix D.

**Theorem 2.**  $\mathcal{D}$  is the difference, so  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$  can be treated as similarity between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ . The result of benefit minus detriment is approximately positively correlated with  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$ :

$$\underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z))}_{\text{benefit}} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment}} \propto \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (11)$$

Our detailed proof of Theorem 2 is in Appendix E. We successfully prove that the actual effect of RAG can be predicted at token level. The gap between values of benefit and detriment in Equation 11 indicates how much greater the benefit is than the detriment, which is the actual effect of RAG. This gap is approximately positively correlated with the representation similarity, which is the value that can be predicted (details in Section 3). Besides, Equation 11 is derived from the token level prediction ( $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ ), this shows that the actual effect of RAG can be predicted at token level by  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$ . Section 3 introduces our detailed method to achieve this in practical applications.

### 3 X-RAG: Improve RAG based on duality analysis

We aim to improve RAG by retaining tokens whose benefit is greater than detriment, and replacing tokens whose benefit is less than detriment. The key to achieving this is to determine the value order between benefit and detriment at token level. Section 2.3 shows that the result of benefit minus detriment is approximately positively correlated with  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$ . So the value of  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$  when benefit minus detriment is zero is an important dividing point. A  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$  greater than this value indicates that benefit is greater than detriment, and conversely, the benefit is less than detriment. We derive Theorem 3 to find this dividing point and map the value order between benefit and detriment of token  $x_i$  to the relationship between representation similarity that can be calculated in practical applications:

**Theorem 3.** Define  $\mathcal{M} = \|p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) - p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})\|_1$  to measure the difference between output distribution of RAG ( $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ ) and pure LLM ( $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ ), so  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  can be treated as the similarity between them.  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  is the dividing point in which benefit is equal to detriment, and the value order between  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  can indicate the value order between benefit and detriment as:

$$J = \begin{cases} \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) < \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)), \text{detriment outweighs benefit.} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} < \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}} \\ \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) = \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)), \text{detriment is equal to benefit.} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}} \\ \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) > \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)), \text{benefit outweighs detriment.} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} > \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Our detailed proof of Theorem 3 can be found in Appendix F. Equation 12 is a novel principle that can measure the value order between benefit and detriment in RAG at token level. It does not rely on additional modules or training but simply compares the similarity. Our **X-RAG**, a practical novel method that enables LLM and RAG to collaborate at token level for generation to preserve benefit and avoid detriment, is constructed based on this. X-RAG makes pure LLM and RAG generate the texts in parallel at token level. At the generation step where pure LLM and RAG generate the different tokens, **X-RAG** determines which token will be selected by comparing the values of benefit and detriment brought by RAG to the token according to Equation 12. Specifically, the key terms of Equation 12 consist of three parts: (1)  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  can be directly obtained from the prediction of RAG; (2)  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  can be directly obtained from the prediction of pure LLM; (3) however, the distribution of retrieved texts conditioned on the prefix  $x_{1:i-1}$ ,  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ , is hard to directly obtain, which is the main challenge that the following Section 3.1 aims to solve.




Figure 2: Attention score for  $x_i$  (blue line) and difference of word distribution change (yellow line) vary with layers. stage 1: Lexical and Syntactic. stage 2: Text Matching. stage 3: Knowledge Fusion.

### 3.1 Distribution prediction for retrieved texts

Based on our theoretical analysis in section 2.2 and the detailed proof in Appendix G, we find that: **Corollary 2.** *RAG is unsupervised In-context Learning that fuses the distribution from retrieved texts with LLMs’ pre-trained distribution. The distribution of retrieved passage  $r$  in RAG (i.e.,  $p_R(r)$ ) can serve as the unsupervised learning signal for LLMs learning from context, even without explicit input-output supervision like demonstrations in traditional In-context learning.*

Therefore, an intuitive idea is that the distribution  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  can be approximately predicted by capturing the signal from the retrieved texts in knowledge fusion. The main challenges to achieving it are: (1) how to determine where knowledge fusion occurs (2) how to capture the signal that fused from retrieved texts and transform it to distribution  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ . To address these, we explore the operating mechanism of RAG and propose a novel method to dynamically determine the layers where knowledge fusion occurs and use the signal from retrieved texts in these layers as  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ .

**Exploring the mechanism of RAG.** We find that the mechanism of RAG can be decomposed into two parts. The first is text matching, which means extracting information relevant to the generation of  $x_i$  from the retrieved texts  $R$ . The second is knowledge fusion, which means fusing the knowledge obtained from the retrieved texts with the knowledge in LLMs’ parameters. LLMs perform the former in the middle layers and perform the latter in the deep layers. We present these findings in detail with experiments based on LLaMA-2-7B with 32 layers and Natural Question dataset.

For text matching, we quantify the relevance of the information in the retrieved texts to the generation of token  $x_i$  given  $x_{1:i-1}$  by attention score between token  $x_i$  and the tokens in the retrieved texts  $R$ . We explore how the sum of attention scores from token  $x_i$  to tokens in  $R$  changes with the layer. The blue line in Figure 2 shows that: (1) The value increases sharply to a peak in shallow layers (0-5), which is mainly because LLMs capture the low-level lexical and syntactic information on the entire input Tenney et al. [2019]. (2) The value first decreases and then increases to a maximum point in middle layers (5-23), which is mainly because LLMs select the semantic information that can be used to generate  $x_i$  from  $R$  and complete this selection at the maximum point. (3) The value decreases after the maximum point in deep layers (24-32). It is because, at this time, LLMs use the knowledge selected at the maximum point for knowledge fusion to predict  $x_i$ , the attention shifts from  $R$  to prefix  $x_{1:i-1}$ .

For knowledge fusion, since the occurrence of knowledge fusion is often accompanied by a change in word distribution, we represent the intensity of knowledge fusion by measuring the change in word distribution between layers. Chuang et al. [2023], Schuster et al. [2022] prove the language heads can be directly applied to the hidden states of middle layers, so we propose to obtain the word distribution of hidden states in each layer by language heads  $\phi$  as  $\phi(h_i^l)$ , in which  $h_i^l$  is the hidden states for token  $x_i$  in the  $l$ -th layer. Then we can measure the word distribution change in the  $l$ -th layer by calculating the Jensen-Shannon Divergence (JSD) between  $\phi(h_i^{l-1})$  and  $\phi(h_i^l)$  as:  $C = \text{JSD}(\phi(h_i^{l-1})||\phi(h_i^l))$ . We quantify the intensity of LLM fusing the knowledge from retrieved texts by comparing the difference in  $C$  of the same layer between pure LLM and RAG, which can be described as:

$$D^l = |\text{JSD}(\phi(\tilde{h}_i^{l-1})||\phi(\tilde{h}_i^l)) - \text{JSD}(\phi(h_i^{l-1})||\phi(h_i^l))|, \quad (13)$$

in which  $\tilde{h}_i^{l-1}$  and  $\tilde{h}_i^l$  are from RAG,  $h_i^{l-1}$  and  $h_i^l$  are from pure LLM. The yellow line in Figure 2 shows  $D^l$  is very small in the shallow and middle layers (0-23) and rises sharply in the deep layers (24-32). This suggests that knowledge fusion occurs in deep layers.

The above two results indicate that: When performing RAG, LLMs first perform text matching in the middle layers, extracting relevant knowledge from the retrieved texts. As the depth increases, the matching becomes more and more accurate, and it reaches a turning point. In the deep layers after this turning point, LLMs instead carry out knowledge fusion, and the attention shifts from  $R$  to  $x_{1:i-1}$ . Knowledge used for fusion comes from the matching information around the turning point (because matching decreases after the turning point). Recapping two challenges at the beginning of Section 3.1, for the first challenge, we can locate the layer where knowledge fusion starts by detecting the turning point in Figure 2. For the second challenge, we can use the matching information in the layer where knowledge fusion starts to approximate the distribution  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ .

**Dynamically locate the layer where knowledge fusion starts.** For  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ , the layer where knowledge fusion starts can be located by detecting the turning point in Figure 2. Specifically, we use  $f(l)$  to denote the attention score for  $x_i$  varies with layer  $l$  and  $g(l)$  to denote the difference of word distribution change in Equation 13 varies with layer  $l$ . The layer where knowledge fusion starts is:

$$l^* = \lfloor \frac{1}{2}(\arg \max_l f(l) + \min\{l : g(l) > a\}) \rfloor. \quad (14)$$

The first term is the  $l$  that maximizes  $f(l)$ , which is the third turning point in the blue line of Figure 2. The second term means the minimum  $l$  value for which  $g(l)$  is greater than  $a$  (hyperparameter, can be set to  $5e-7$  according to our statistics), which is the turning point in the yellow line of Figure 2. We take the average of the two values and round down as the layer  $l^*$  where knowledge fusion starts.

**Matching as distribution.** The matching information between  $R = [rt_1, rt_2, \dots, rt_m]$  ( $rt$  is the token in  $R$ ) and token  $x_i$  around turning point can be used to approximate the distribution  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  of the retrieved texts  $R$  conditioned on  $x_{1:i-1}$  at the  $l^*$ -th layer. The matching information consists of two parts, one is the attention score, which can measure the matching between retrieved tokens and current token  $x_i$  at the hidden state level. The other is the similarity of word embeddings, which can measure the matching between retrieved tokens and current token  $x_i$  at the word distribution level:

$$Att = \text{softmax} \left( \frac{(\tilde{h}_i^{l^*} W_q)(\tilde{h}_{1:m}^{l^*} W_k)^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right), \text{WordSim} = \text{softmax} \left( (x_i^{l'-l^*} A)(rt_{1:m}^{l^*} A)^T \right), \quad (15)$$

$W_q$  and  $W_k$  are matrices in attention Vaswani et al. [2017],  $\tilde{h}_i^{l^*}$  is the hidden state of token  $x_i$  and  $\tilde{h}_{1:m}^{l^*}$  are hidden states of  $R$ .  $A$  is word embedding matrix in LLMs,  $x_i^{l'-l^*}$  is the token with the largest logits increase in word distribution from layer  $l^*$  to the final layer  $l'$ ,  $rt_{1:m}^{l^*}$  are tokens in  $R$ .  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  is:

$$p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1}) = \text{softmax}(Att \odot \text{WordSim}), \odot \text{ is element-wise multiplication.} \quad (16)$$

### 3.2 Token-Level comparison between benefit and detriment

Equation 12 shows that the relationship between  $\text{Sim}(p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}), p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1}))$  and  $\text{Sim}(p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}), p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}))$  indicates the value order between benefit and detriment ( $\text{Sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the similarity). We propose to use the token semantics as the representation for  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ ,  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  and use cosine to compute the similarity. It not only follows the principle of Equation 12 but also takes into account the semantic similarity, which is more robust in practical applications. Specifically, we use word embedding matrix of LLMs to calculate the weighted word embedding for  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  as  $\mathbf{w}_{RAG} = \frac{1}{\sum p'}$   $\sum_{(p', \mathbf{w}) \in \mathbb{V}} p' \mathbf{w}$ , for each token in vocabulary  $\mathbb{V}$ ,  $p'$  is its logits from  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $\mathbf{w}$  is its word embedding. We can also use this to get the weighted word embedding  $\mathbf{w}_{LLM}$  for  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  and  $\mathbf{w}_{IR}$  for  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ . The similarity between them can be calculated via cosine similarity as:

$$\text{Sim}(p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}), p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})) = \cos(\mathbf{w}_{RAG}, \mathbf{w}_{IR}) \quad (17)$$

$$\text{Sim}(p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}), p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})) = \cos(\mathbf{w}_{RAG}, \mathbf{w}_{LLM}) \quad (18)$$

Combining our theoretical analysis of Theorem 1, 2 and 3, we can derive this principle to determine the value order between benefit and detriment brought by RAG to the token  $x_i$  in practical applications:

$$s = \begin{cases} \text{benefit win} & \text{if } \cos(\mathbf{w}_{RAG}, \mathbf{w}_{IR}) \geq \cos(\mathbf{w}_{RAG}, \mathbf{w}_{LLM}), \\ \text{detriment win} & \text{if } \cos(\mathbf{w}_{RAG}, \mathbf{w}_{IR}) < \cos(\mathbf{w}_{RAG}, \mathbf{w}_{LLM}), \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

LLMs	Methods	# Generation Times	Wikitext		ASQA		Bio		NQ	
			AUC	F1	AUC	F1	AUC	F1	AUC	F1
OPT-6.7B	Logprobs	2	65.25	64.33	68.96	67.55	65.24	64.59	55.31	51.41
	Uncertainty	2	64.12	63.50	66.14	63.96	65.78	64.60	56.03	52.15
	Consistency-Lexical	10	64.01	62.17	69.42	67.04	65.41	65.28	55.06	51.13
	Consistency-Semantic	10	65.93	64.22	70.11	69.50	65.76	64.37	56.24	52.88
	X-RAG (Ours)	2	<b>68.64<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>66.88<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>72.28<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>72.05<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>66.27<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>66.04<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>57.92<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>52.90<sup>+</sup></b>
Mistral-7B	Logprobs	2	73.52	72.90	68.05	66.86	65.22	64.39	57.04	57.23
	Uncertainty	2	73.72	72.71	67.47	65.63	65.59	65.83	57.19	57.10
	Consistency-Lexical	10	72.15	70.44	69.16	67.33	64.79	64.33	56.95	54.37
	Consistency-Semantic	10	73.98	72.26	70.05	69.54	65.68	65.12	57.43	56.12
	X-RAG (Ours)	2	<b>75.85<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>74.11<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>71.51<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>71.47<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>66.37<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>66.04<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>58.52<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>57.56<sup>+</sup></b>
LLaMA-2-7B	Logprobs	2	73.47	72.95	68.50	68.04	62.11	60.94	67.40	69.24
	Uncertainty	2	73.98	73.01	68.72	67.63	63.67	63.50	68.03	69.15
	Consistency-Lexical	10	73.51	71.62	70.09	68.45	62.49	61.98	68.17	70.09
	Consistency-Semantic	10	74.96	74.23	71.23	69.38	63.77	62.10	69.72	71.14
	X-RAG (Ours)	2	<b>81.89<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>80.42<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>76.96<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>76.80<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>64.08<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>64.19<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>70.50<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>72.45<sup>+</sup></b>

Table 1: Performance on determining the value order between benefit and detriment at token level. Significant test with p-value  $\leq 0.05$  compared with all baselines are denoted as ‘+’.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental details

**Experimental setup, metrics, and baselines.** The core of our **X-RAG** is determining the value order between benefit and detriment at token level. This can be viewed as a binary classification task to determine whether benefit is greater than detriment or not. Therefore, a primary experiment is to evaluate this binary classification task at token level (details can be found in Section 4.2). We use popular metrics for binary classification tasks such as AUC and F1. This task can also be viewed as predicting the correctness of the generated tokens. Therefore, baselines for this are the methods that detect the LLMs’ hallucination. We use these baselines to determine the value order between benefit and detriment by comparing the degree of hallucination at token level between RAG and pure LLM (details in Appendix H.1). Baselines include: (1) **Logprobs-based** Kuhn et al. [2023], we use the value order between top-1 log-probability of the tokens output by pure LLM and RAG to determine the value order between benefit and detriment. (2) **Uncertainty-based**, we use Length-normalized Entropy Malinin and Gales [2020] to measure the uncertainty of the tokens and compare it between pure LLM and RAG. (3) **Consistency-based**, we run LLMs multiple times and calculate consistency scores among multiple answers using Lexical and Semantic Similarity Lin et al. [2022], Chen et al. [2024] and compare scores between pure LLM and RAG. Another experiment is in a practical autoregressive generation setting for open-domain Q&A given retrieved texts with different qualities, it aims to evaluate the robustness of RAG methods in practical usage. We use Cover-EM Rosset et al. [2020] that indicates the accuracy in Q&A as the metric. Baselines include the methods that use additional modules to filter irrelevant passages (**NLI-RAG** Yoran et al. [2024]) or as action triggers (**CRAG** Yan et al. [2024]), fine-tune more robust LLMs for RAG (**RetRobust** Yoran et al. [2024] and **INFO-RAG** Xu et al. [2024a]) and fine-tune LLMs to dynamically retrieve and critique retrieved texts (**Self-RAG** Asai et al. [2023]).

**Datasets.** For the token level binary classification task in the primary experiment, we use three long-form generation tasks including long-form Q&A (**ASQA** Stelmakh et al. [2023]), people biographies generation (**Bio** Min et al. [2023]) and language modeling (**Wikitext103** Merity et al. [2016]) and one short-form task includes Q&A (**Natural Questions** Kwiatkowski et al. [2019]). For the second experiment, since long-form tasks are not conducive to objectively and accurately evaluating the factual correctness of the answers, we use three short-form Q&A tasks including WebQuestions (**WebQ**) Berant et al. [2013], **TriviaQA** Joshi et al. [2017] and **SQuAD v1.1** Rajpurkar et al. [2016].

**Implementation details.** As for retrieval in RAG, we follow Xu et al. [2023] to use ColBERTv2 Santhanam et al. [2021], an excellent generalizable model as the retriever, and use Wikipedia consisting of 21,015,324 passages Karpukhin et al. [2020] as retrieval database. **All baselines and X-RAG share the same retrieval setup and input.** We use OPT-6.7B, LLaMA-2-7B, and Mistral-7B-v0.1 as LLMs in the primary experiment and use greedy-decoding strategy for generation. More details of **X-RAG** and baselines are in Appendix H.



Methods	Train LLM	Add Module	TriviaQA							WebQ							Squad					
			Ratio of Hard Negative Passages							Ratio of Hard Negative Passages							Ratio of Hard Negative Passages					
			100%	80%	60%	40%	20%	0%	100%	80%	60%	40%	20%	0%	100%	80%	60%	40%	20%	0%		
Standard RAG	no ✓	no ✓	43.8	67.0	71.3	76.2	78.2	81.9	23.9	35.8	40.6	43.4	48.4	53.1	8.6	31.0	43.2	53.0	58.8	67.2		
NLI+RAG	no ✓	need ✗	50.8	61.2	68.2	73.0	76.4	79.1	30.7	40.3	44.5	47.5	50.9	52.8	9.9	21.1	33.7	43.4	51.7	60.5		
CRAG	no ✓	need ✗	48.2	68.3	72.5	76.7	81.5	82.2	25.6	37.4	41.9	46.2	51.5	54.9	7.4	28.7	39.6	50.7	53.2	61.1		
RetRobust	need ✗	no ✓	49.2	67.3	72.9	77.5	79.4	82.3	30.0	38.9	42.5	48.2	49.8	54.3	10.5	30.8	43.3	52.5	58.4	66.0		
Self-RAG	need ✗	no ✓	43.0	68.7	73.5	76.4	80.8	82.2	18.3	34.8	42.2	47.2	51.3	57.0	5.5	27.8	38.9	46.4	52.5	58.3		
INFO-RAG	need ✗	no ✓	49.7	68.4	73.2	77.9	80.0	82.5	29.7	38.0	43.9	48.1	49.4	54.8	10.7	30.1	43.5	53.7	59.2	67.5		
X-RAG (Ours)	no ✓	no ✓	<b>53.5</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>77.6</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>83.4</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>43.8</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>52.9</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>31.3</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>60.8</b>	<b>68.1</b>		

Table 2: Accuracy on open-domain Q&A given the retrieved texts containing different ratios (0% to 100%) of hard negative passages (irrelevant but are ranked in top-10 by retrieval model). Our X-RAG does not need any training or additional modules while baselines need.

## 4.2 Experimental results

**Primary experiment.** Table 1 shows that our X-RAG achieves better performance in determining the value order between benefit and detriment at token level in RAG than baselines across different tasks and LLMs. Baselines determine the value order by detecting the degree of hallucination while our X-RAG can directly compare the benefit and detriment based on our theoretical analysis, which is more fundamental so it performs better. In this experiment, we construct the test sample by selecting the token  $a$  generated by RAG that is different from the token  $b$  generated by pure LLM given the same and accurate prefix (Teacher-Forcing). If the token of RAG ( $a$ ) is correct and the token of pure LLM ( $b$ ) is wrong, the label is 1 means that the benefit is greater than the detriment. Otherwise, the detriment is greater than the benefit and the label is 0. We use this principle to traverse the second half of the tokens of each sample in the entire dataset to construct the test dataset.

**Experiment on Open-domain Q&A.** This experiment is under the practical autoregressive generation setting for open-domain Q&A. Table 2 shows that in RAG given the retrieved texts with various qualities, our X-RAG does not need any additional modules or training and outperforms the strong baselines that need additional filters or training LLMs. This means our X-RAG achieves a better trade-off between benefit and detriment in RAG, avoiding detriment while securing benefit. It is because our theoretical analysis helps us propose a more fundamental method in measuring value order between benefit and detriment at token level. Baselines do not have theoretical support, so they require more additional overhead. In this experiment, we adjust the radio of irrelevant passages in the retrieved passage list from 0% to 100%, which can simulate the degree of noise in the retrieved texts. Since Open-domain Q&A is a short-form task, we calculate the accuracy by judging whether the ground truth appears exactly in the generated texts (Cover-EM Rosset et al. [2020]). LLM in this is LLaMA-2-7B.

**Case study.** Figure 4 in Appendix I intuitively shows the collaborative generation between pure LLM and RAG in our X-RAG in open-domain Q&A. X-RAG is effective to preserve benefit and avoid detriment at token level by dynamically selecting suitable tokens among pure LLM and RAG.

**Ablation study.** Figure 3 shows the effectiveness of our dynamic layer selection strategy in Equation 14 and supports our finding that RAG performs matching in middle layers. Figure 3 shows the AUC when  $l^*$  in Equation 14 is set as a fixed value from 0 to 32. Our dynamic layer selection strategy (dashed line) is always better than any fixed layers (solid line). Besides, AUC is higher in middle layers, which supports that RAG performs matching in middle layers and the knowledge in retrieved texts is extracted in the turning point. After the turning point, LLMs instead perform knowledge fusion, the matching cannot reflect the distribution of retrieved texts, so AUC decreases.




Figure 3: AUC varies with layer.

## 5 Related work

**Robust RAG.** To make LLMs robust in RAG to avoid the detriment caused from noisy in retrieved texts, some methods use additional modules to filter out irrelevant documents Yoran et al. [2024], Yan et al. [2024]. Some methods train LLMs to make them robust to noisy in retrieved texts Xu

et al. [2024a], Yoran et al. [2024]. Some methods let LLMs dynamically determine whether the query needs RAG Asai et al. [2023], Xu et al. [2023], Ren et al. [2023], Feng et al. [2023], Mallen et al. [2022], Jiang et al. [2023]. All the previous works solve the contradiction between benefit and detriment in RAG from the perspective of application but lacking essential and theoretical analysis, which limits the understanding and cannot find the fundamental method to solve it. Therefore, they rely on additional modules or fine-tuning LLMs. Our paper explains the benefit and detriment in RAG by theoretical analysis and proposes a novel method to preserve benefit while avoiding detriment without any additional modules or training.

**Theoretical analysis of ICL.** Our paper is inspired by theoretical analysis of ICL. Some works explain ICL as one-step gradient descent Von Oswald et al. [2023], Akyürek et al. [2022], Dai et al. [2022]. Besides, there are other explanations of ICL such as Bayes inference Xie et al. [2021], Bayes model averaging Zhang et al. [2023], leaning topic structure Li et al. [2023] and kernel regression Han et al. [2023]. They focus on explaining why ICL occurs. Our contribution lies in analyzing the benefit and detriment in RAG and proposing a practical method to apply our theoretical results.

## 6 Conclusions and Discussion

This paper provides the essential understanding of benefit and detriment in RAG to make them explainable, quantifiable, and comparable. We theoretically elucidate that the distribution difference between retrieved texts and LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge is “double-edged sword” in RAG that brings both benefit and detriment. We prove that the actual effect of RAG can be predicted at token level by representation similarity. Based on our theoretical results, we propose a practical novel method that enables pure LLM and RAG to collaborate at token level, gaining benefit while avoiding detriment. Experiments show the effectiveness of our method and support our theoretical results.

**Limitations and Societal Impact:** The main limitation of this paper is that due to immense resource cost, we do not evaluate our method on LLMs with 33B and 65B scales. Our paper deepens society’s understanding of LLMs’ usage of external retrieved knowledge through theoretical analysis. After careful consideration, we believe that our paper does not have any potential negative societal impact.

## References

- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Tat-seng Chua. Search-in-the-chain: Towards the accurate, credible and traceable content generation for complex knowledge-intensive tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14732*, 2023.
- Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12652*, 2023.
- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511*, 2023.
- Ori Ram, Yoav Levine, Itay Dalmedigos, Dor Muhlgay, Amnon Shashua, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Yoav Shoham. In-context retrieval-augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00083*, 2023.
- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Mo Yu, Fandong Meng, Huawei Shen, Xueqi Cheng, and Jie Zhou. Unsupervised information refinement training of large language models for retrieval-augmented generation, 2024a.
- Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Jun Xu, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. List-aware reranking-truncation joint model for search and retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02764*, 2024b.
- Zhuoran Jin, Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Kang Liu, Xiaojian Jiang, Jiexin Xu, Qiuxia Li, and Jun Zhao. Tug-of-war between knowledge: Exploring and resolving knowledge conflicts in retrieval-augmented language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14409*, 2024a.
- Jian Xie, Kai Zhang, Jiangjie Chen, Renze Lou, and Yu Su. Adaptive chameleon or stubborn sloth: Unraveling the behavior of large language models in knowledge conflicts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13300*, 2023.

- Zhuoran Jin, Pengfei Cao, Hongbang Yuan, Yubo Chen, Jiexin Xu, Huaijun Li, Xiaojian Jiang, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Cutting off the head ends the conflict: A mechanism for interpreting and mitigating knowledge conflicts in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18154*, 2024b.
- Ori Yoran, Tomer Wolfson, Ori Ram, and Jonathan Berant. Making retrieval-augmented language models robust to irrelevant context. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- Ruiyang Ren, Yuhao Wang, Yingqi Qu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Liu, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, Ji-Rong Wen, and Haifeng Wang. Investigating the factual knowledge boundary of large language models with retrieval augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11019*, 2023.
- Shangbin Feng, Weijia Shi, Yuyang Bai, Vidhisha Balachandran, Tianxing He, and Yulia Tsvetkov. Knowledge card: Filling llms’ knowledge gaps with plug-in specialized language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10511*, 2022.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. Active retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06983*, 2023.
- Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. An explanation of in-context learning as implicit bayesian inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02080*, 2021.
- Xinyi Wang, Wanrong Zhu, Michael Saxon, Mark Steyvers, and William Yang Wang. Large language models are latent variable models: Explaining and finding good demonstrations for in-context learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- Yufeng Zhang, Fengzhuo Zhang, Zhuoran Yang, and Zhaoran Wang. What and how does in-context learning learn? bayesian model averaging, parameterization, and generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19420*, 2023.
- David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022, 2003.
- Ian Tenney, Dipanjan Das, and Ellie Pavlick. Bert rediscovers the classical nlp pipeline. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.05950*, 2019.
- Yung-Sung Chuang, Yujia Xie, Hongyin Luo, Yoon Kim, James Glass, and Pengcheng He. Dola: Decoding by contrasting layers improves factuality in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03883*, 2023.
- Tal Schuster, Adam Fisch, Jai Gupta, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, Vinh Tran, Yi Tay, and Donald Metzler. Confident adaptive language modeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17456–17472, 2022.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Lorenz Kuhn, Yarin Gal, and Sebastian Farquhar. Semantic uncertainty: Linguistic invariances for uncertainty estimation in natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.09664*, 2023.
- Andrey Malinin and Mark Gales. Uncertainty estimation in autoregressive structured prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.07650*, 2020.
- Zi Lin, Jeremiah Zhe Liu, and Jingbo Shang. Towards collaborative neural-symbolic graph semantic parsing via uncertainty. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, 2022.

- Chao Chen, Kai Liu, Ze Chen, Yi Gu, Yue Wu, Mingyuan Tao, Zhihang Fu, and Jieping Ye. Inside: Lms’ internal states retain the power of hallucination detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03744*, 2024.
- Corby Rosset, Chenyan Xiong, Minh Phan, Xia Song, Paul N. Bennett, and Saurabh Tiwary. Knowledge-aware language model pretraining. *CoRR*, abs/2007.00655, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.00655>.
- Shi-Qi Yan, Jia-Chen Gu, Yun Zhu, and Zhen-Hua Ling. Corrective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15884*, 2024.
- Ivan Stelmakh, Yi Luan, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Ming-Wei Chang. Asqa: Factoid questions meet long-form answers, 2023.
- Sewon Min, Kalpesh Krishna, Xinxi Lyu, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Pang Wei Koh, Mohit Iyyer, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Factscore: Fine-grained atomic evaluation of factual precision in long form text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14251*, 2023.
- Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. Pointer sentinel mixture models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843*, 2016.
- 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. Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466, 2019. doi: 10.1162/tacl\_a\_00276. URL <https://aclanthology.org/Q19-1026>.
- Jonathan Berant, Andrew Chou, Roy Frostig, and Percy Liang. Semantic parsing on freebase from question-answer pairs. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1533–1544, 2013.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03551*, 2017.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250*, 2016.
- Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. Colbertv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01488*, 2021.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906*, 2020.
- Johannes Von Oswald, Eyvind Niklasson, Ettore Randazzo, João Sacramento, Alexander Mordvintsev, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Max Vladymyrov. Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 35151–35174. PMLR, 2023.
- Ekin Akyürek, Dale Schuurmans, Jacob Andreas, Tengyu Ma, and Denny Zhou. What learning algorithm is in-context learning? investigations with linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15661*, 2022.
- Damai Dai, Yutao Sun, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shuming Ma, Zhifang Sui, and Furu Wei. Why can gpt learn in-context? language models implicitly perform gradient descent as meta-optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10559*, 2022.
- Yuchen Li, Yuanzhi Li, and Andrej Risteski. How do transformers learn topic structure: Towards a mechanistic understanding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 19689–19729. PMLR, 2023.
- Chi Han, Ziqi Wang, Han Zhao, and Heng Ji. In-context learning of large language models explained as kernel regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12766*, 2023.

Kazuki Irie, Róbert Csordás, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. The dual form of neural networks revisited: Connecting test time predictions to training patterns via spotlights of attention. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9639–9659. PMLR, 2022.

Mark A Aizerman, Emmanuil M Braverman, and Lev I Rozonoer. Theoretical foundation of potential functions method in pattern recognition. *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika*, 25(6):917–936, 1964.

Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*, 2019.

Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel R Bowman. A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05426*, 2017.

Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, et al. Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.

## A Proof for Equation 5

*Proof.* The transformation is motivated by Xie et al. [2021] and we apply it to the analysis of RAG:

$$p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \quad (20)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1})} dz \quad (21)$$

$$\propto \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z) dz, \quad p(R, x_{1:i-1}) \text{ is a constant so we drop it} \quad (22)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} p(z) dz, \quad \frac{1}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \text{ is a constant so we add it} \quad (23)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz, \quad r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \quad (24)$$

□

## B Proof for Equation 6

*Proof.* For  $p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)$  in  $r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)}$ , we can make further derivation as:

$$p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z) = p(x_{1:i-1}|R, z)p(R|z) \quad (25)$$

According to the definition of latent variable model in the analysis of in-context learning from Xie et al. [2021] that views the latent variable inference as Hidden Markov Model (HMM) and the latent concept  $z$  determines the transition probability matrix in HMM hidden states  $h$ , we can get the following derivations :

$$p(x_{1:i-1}|R, z)p(R|z) = \sum_h p(x_{1:i-1}|h, z)p(h|R, z)p(R|z), \quad (26)$$

$$r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \quad (27)$$

$$= \log \frac{\sum_h p(x_{1:i-1}|h, z)p(h|R, z)}{\sum_h p(x_{1:i-1}|h, z^*)p(h|R, z^*)} + \log \frac{p(R|z)}{p(R|z^*)}. \quad (28)$$

Based on previous work Xie et al. [2021], Zhang et al. [2023], we make the following assumptions that:

**Assumption 1.** All tokens can be predicted, which means that for every token  $x$ , there is some hidden state  $h$  lower bounds it that  $p(x|h, z^*) > c_1 > 0$ .

**Assumption 2.** Delimiter is an important distinguishing signal between each passage  $r$  in the retrieved texts  $R$ . For any delimiter hidden state  $h^d$  and other hidden state  $h$ , there are upper and lower bounds on the transition probability from  $h$  to  $h^d$ :  $0 \leq c_2 \leq p(h^d|h, z) \leq c_3$ .

Then we can get:

$$r(z) \leq \log \frac{\sum_h 1 \cdot p(h|R, z)}{\sum_h c_1 \cdot p(h|R, z^*)} + \log \frac{p(R|z)}{p(R|z^*)} \quad (29)$$

$$= \log \frac{\sum_h 1 \cdot p(h|R, z)}{\sum_h c_1 \cdot p(h|R, z^*)} + \log \frac{p(R|z)}{p(R|z^*)} \quad (30)$$

$$= -\log c_1 + \log \frac{p(R|z)}{p(R|z^*)} \quad (31)$$

$$= -\log c_1 + \log \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n p(r_i|r_{1:i-1}, z)}{\prod_{i=1}^n p(r_i|r_{1:i-1}, z^*)}. \quad (32)$$

So we can get:

$$p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z) = p(x_{1:i-1}|R, z)p(R|z) \approx \prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|r_{1:i-1}, z) \quad (33)$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|r_{1:i-1}, z) = \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{h_{i-1}^d \in \mathcal{D}} p(r_i|h_{i-1}^d, z)p(h_{i-1}^d|r_{1:i-1}, z), \quad (34)$$

$r_i$  is a passage in the retrieved texts list  $R$ ,  $h_{i-1}^d$  is the hidden state for the delimiter between  $r_{i-1}$  and  $r_i$  in  $R$ . According to the Assumption 2,  $p(h_{i-1}^d|r_{1:i-1}, z) = O(1)$ , then Equation 34 is approximately equal to  $\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z)$ , which means that  $p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z) \approx \prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z)$ , so we can get that:

$$r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \approx \log \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z)}{\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z^*)} \quad (35)$$

$$\rightarrow O(1) + n * \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{p(r_i|z)}{p(r_i|z^*)} = O(1) + n * \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P_r} \left[ \log \frac{p(r_i|z)}{p(r_i|z^*)} \right] \quad (36)$$

$$\propto p_R(r) \log \frac{p(r|z)}{p(r|z^*)} = p_R(r) \log \frac{p_R(r)}{p(r|z^*)} - p_R(r) \log \frac{p_R(r)}{p(r|z)} \quad (37)$$

$$= -(\underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r) \| p(r|z))}_{\text{benefit, denote as } \Omega} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r) \| p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment, denote as } \Upsilon}), \quad (38)$$

$p_R(\cdot)$  is the distribution of the retrieved texts,  $p(\cdot)$  is the distribution of the LLMs' pre-trained knowledge. □

## C Effect of $r(z)$ in Knowledge Fusion

Recapping the Equation 38, we find  $r(z)$  actually regulates the proportion between LLMs' pre-trained knowledge and retrieved knowledge in knowledge fusion of RAG prediction:

- The more benefit outweighs detriment,  $r(z) \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $\exp(r(z)) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $z \neq z^*$ , this indicates that concepts  $z$  sampled from LLMs' space contribute little to  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$ . When  $z = z^*$ ,  $\exp(r(z^*)) = 1$ , which means that latent variable model concentrates more on  $z^*$  sampled from retrieved texts. As  $r(z)$  decreases, the proportion of retrieved knowledge in becomes larger and larger in fusion.

- The more detriment outweigh benefit,  $r(z) \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\exp(r(z)) \rightarrow +\infty$  for all  $z \neq z^*$  and when  $z = z^*$ ,  $\exp(r(z^*)) = 1$ . This indicates that concepts  $z$  sampled from LLMs' space contribute more and more than  $z^*$  sampled from retrieved texts as  $r(z)$  increases.

## D Proof for Theorem 1

*Proof.* Recapping the Equation 2 that describes the knowledge fusion in RAG via latent variable model:

$$p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) = \underbrace{\int_{z-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz}_{\text{denote as } \Phi} + \underbrace{p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*)p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1})}_{\text{denote as } \Lambda}. \quad (39)$$

Since latent concept  $z^*$  determines the hidden states  $h$ ,  $\Lambda$  can be transformed as:

$$p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*)p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1}) = \sum_h p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}, h, z^*)p(h|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*)p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1}). \quad (40)$$

Let  $p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1}) = \beta$ :

$$p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) = \Phi + \beta \sum_h p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}, h, z^*)p(h|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*) \quad (41)$$

$$p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1}) = \sum_h p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}, h, z^*)p_R(h|x_{1:i-1}) \quad (42)$$

$$p_R(h|x_{1:i-1}) \propto p(x_{1:i-1}|h, z^*)p_R(h) \quad (43)$$

$$p(h|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*) \propto p(x_{1:i-1}|h, z^*)p(h|R, z^*) \quad (44)$$

let probabilities  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}, h, z^*)p(x_{1:i-1}|h, z^*)$  in Equation 40 is represented as matrix  $W \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{X}| \times |\mathcal{H}|}$  for all possible  $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $p(h|R, z^*)$  in Equation 44 is matrix  $B$ ,  $p_R(h)$  in Equation 43 is  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{H}|}$ . We use 1-norm to calculate the difference between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ , which can be formalized as:

$$\|p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) - p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})\|_1 = \|\Phi + \beta WB - Wu\|_1. \quad (45)$$

Then, according to the triangle inequality of 1-norm, the difference between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  is bounded by:

$$\|\Phi\|_1 - \|\beta WB - Wu\|_1 \leq \|\Phi + \beta WB - Wu\|_1 \leq \|\Phi\|_1 + \|\beta WB - Wu\|_1. \quad (46)$$

We consider to further analyze  $\|\beta WB - Wu\|_1$ :

$$\|\beta WB - Wu\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} |W_i^T(\beta B - u)|_i \quad (47)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{H}|} W_{ij}(\beta B - u)_j \right| \quad (48)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{H}|} W_{ij}|(\beta B - u)_j| \quad (49)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{H}|} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{X}|} W_{ij} \right) |(\beta B - u)_j| \quad (50)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{H}|} |(\beta B - u)_j| \quad (51)$$

$$= \|\beta B - u\|_1 \quad (52)$$

Then:

$$\|\beta B - u\|_1 = 2TV(p_R(\cdot), \beta p(\cdot|R, z^*)) \quad \text{TV is Total Variation Distance.} \quad (53)$$

$$\leq 2\beta TV(p_R(\cdot), p(\cdot|R, z^*)) \quad (54)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(\cdot)\|p(\cdot|R, z^*))} \quad \text{Pinsker's Inequality.} \quad (55)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(\cdot)\|p(\cdot|z^*))} \quad (56)$$

$$\approx \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}, \quad (57)$$

in which  $r$  is the passage in  $R$ ,  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))$  is actually the **detriment** in Equation 9. Recapping Equation 46, we can get:

$$\|\Phi + \beta WB - Wu\|_1 \leq \|\Phi\|_1 + \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))} \quad (58)$$

Since  $0 \leq \|\beta WB - Wu\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(\cdot)\|p(\cdot|z^*))}$  and  $\|\Phi + \beta WB - Wu\|_1 \geq \|\Phi\|_1 - \|\beta WB - Wu\|_1$ , then the lower bound for  $\|\Phi + \beta WB - Wu\|_1$  is included in:

$$\left[ \|\Phi\|_1 - \sqrt{2\text{KL}(p_R(\cdot)\|p(\cdot|z^*))}, \|\Phi\|_1 \right], \quad (59)$$

we take the minimum value as the lower bound. Define  $\mathcal{D} = \|p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) - p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})\|_1$  is the difference between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ , according to Equation 45 and 46, the lower and upper bound for  $\mathcal{D}$  is:

$$\|\Phi\|_1 - \sqrt{\underbrace{2\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment}}} \leq \mathcal{D} \leq \|\Phi\|_1 + \sqrt{\underbrace{2\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment}}}, \quad (60)$$

For ease of description, we denote benefit  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z))$  as  $\Omega$  and denote detriment  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))$  as  $\Upsilon$ . Recapping Equation 5 and 9:

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) &= \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz}_{\text{denote as } \Phi} + \underbrace{p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*)p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1})}_{\text{denote as } \Lambda} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1})} dz \\ &\propto \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z) dz, \quad p(R, x_{1:i-1}) \text{ is a constant so we drop it} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} p(z) dz, \quad \frac{1}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \text{ is a constant so we add it} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz, \quad r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \\ r(z) &= \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \approx - \left[ \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z))}_{\text{benefit, denote as } \Omega} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment, denote as } \Upsilon} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$\Phi$  in Equation 60 can be transformed as:

$$\Phi = \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \quad (61)$$

$$= \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1})} \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz \quad (62)$$

$$= \alpha \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz, \quad (p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*) \text{ and } p(R, x_{1:i-1}) \text{ are constants}) \quad (63)$$

$$\approx \alpha \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) p(z) dz \quad (\text{Equation 9}). \quad (64)$$



Now the Theorem 1 has been proven. □

## E Proof for Theorem 2

In this section, we try to prove that the gap between values of benefit and detriment is approximately positively correlated with the similarity ( $\frac{1}{D}$ ) between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ . To achieve this, we can start from Equation 60 to prove that the gap between values of benefit and detriment is negatively correlated with the difference ( $D$ ) between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$ , which is actually the reciprocal of similarity ( $\frac{1}{D}$ ). Specifically, we want to prove that the gap between values of benefit and detriment ( $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*))$ ) is negatively correlated with both lower and upper bound in Equation 60. For ease of description, we denote benefit  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z))$  as  $\Omega$  and denote detriment  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*))$  as  $\Upsilon$ .

*Proof.* Recapping Equation 5 and 9:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) &= \underbrace{\int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz}_{\text{denote as } \Phi} + \underbrace{p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*)p(z^*|R, x_{1:i-1})}_{\text{denote as } \Lambda} \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1})} dz \\
&\propto \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)p(z) dz, \quad p(R, x_{1:i-1}) \text{ is a constant so we drop it} \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} p(z) dz, \quad \frac{1}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \text{ is a constant so we add it} \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz, \quad r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \\
r(z) &= \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \approx - \left[ \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z))}_{\text{benefit, denote as } \Omega} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment, denote as } \Upsilon} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$\Phi$  in Equation 60 can be transformed as:

$$\Phi = \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z)p(z|R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \quad (65)$$

$$= \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1})} \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz \quad (66)$$

$$= \alpha \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz, \quad (p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*) \text{ and } p(R, x_{1:i-1}) \text{ are constants}) \quad (67)$$

$$\approx \alpha \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) p(z) dz \quad (\text{Equation 9}). \quad (68)$$

Therefore, the lower bound of Equation 60 is:

$$\|\Phi\|_1 - \sqrt{2\Upsilon} \approx \alpha \left\| \int_{\mathcal{Z}-\{z^*\}} p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) p(z) dz \right\|_1 - \sqrt{2\Upsilon} \quad (69)$$

$$\propto \exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) - \sqrt{2\Upsilon} \quad (70)$$

and the upper bound of Equation 60 is:

$$\|\Phi\|_1 + \sqrt{2\Upsilon} \propto \exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) + \sqrt{2\Upsilon} \quad (71)$$

Due to both  $\Omega$  and  $\Upsilon$  being variables, analyzing the result of subtraction between  $\Omega$  and  $\Upsilon$  under their simultaneous changes is complex. Therefore, we use the ‘‘Separation of variables’’ to simplify our analysis. Specifically, we first assume that one is constant, and then analyze the changes caused by the variation of another:

- Assume  $\Omega$  is constant, as the value of  $\Omega - \Upsilon$  increases,  $\Upsilon$  decreases and the upper bound  $\exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) + \sqrt{2\Upsilon}$  also decreases. In the lower bound  $\exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) - \sqrt{2\Upsilon}$ , since the first term is an exponential function and the second term is a square root function, a decrease of  $\Upsilon$  leads to the decrease in the entire lower bound. Therefore, both lower and upper bounds in Equation 60 decrease as  $\Omega - \Upsilon$  increases.
- Assume  $\Upsilon$  is constant, as the value of  $\Omega - \Upsilon$  increases,  $\Omega$  increases and the upper bound  $\exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) + \sqrt{2\Upsilon}$  decreases. In the lower bound  $\exp(-(\Omega - \Upsilon)) - \sqrt{2\Upsilon}$ , since the first term is an exponential function and the second term is a square root function, an increase of  $\Omega$  leads to the decrease in the entire lower bound. Therefore, both lower and upper bounds in Equation 60 decrease as  $\Omega - \Upsilon$  increases.

On behalf of the analysis above, we can derive that both lower and upper bounds in Equation 60 are approximately negatively correlated with the gap between values of benefit and detriment. Therefore, the difference  $\mathcal{D}$  between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  is approximately negatively correlated with the gap between values of benefit and detriment. In other words,  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$  can be treated as the similarity between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  and it is approximately positively correlated with the gap between values of benefit and detriment.:

$$\underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z))}_{\text{benefit}} - \underbrace{\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*))}_{\text{detriment}} \propto \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}. \quad (72)$$

So we have proved that the gap between values of benefit and detriment is approximately positively correlated with  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$ . □

### F Proof for Theorem 3

This section aims to prove:

$$J = \begin{cases} \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) < \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)), & \text{detriment outweighs benefit.} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} < \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}} \\ \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) = \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)), & \text{detriment is equal to benefit.} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}} \\ \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) > \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)), & \text{benefit outweighs detriment.} & \text{if } \frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} > \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}} \end{cases} \quad (73)$$

in which  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  is the similarity between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  (LLMs’ pre-trained knowledge),  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$  is the similarity between  $p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1})$  and  $p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})$  (distribution of retrieved texts)

*Proof.* When benefit is equal to detriment:

$$\text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)\|p(r|z^*)) = 0, \quad (74)$$

which means that:

$$p_R(r) \log \frac{p(r|z)}{p(r|z^*)} = 0, \quad (75)$$

since  $p_R(r)$  cannot be 0, then:

$$\log \frac{p(r|z)}{p(r|z^*)} = 0, \quad (76)$$

$$\frac{p(r|z)}{p(r|z^*)} = 1, \quad (77)$$

$$p(r|z) = p(r|z^*), \quad (78)$$

Recapping Equation 2 that  $z^*$  is sampled from retrieved texts and  $z$  is sampled from LLMs' pre-trained knowledge, Equation 78 indicates that the knowledge of retrieved texts has been involved in LLMs' pre-trained knowledge, so:

$$p(x_i|x_{1:i-1}) = p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1}), \quad (79)$$

then:

$$\|p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) - p(x_i|x_{1:i-1})\|_1 = \|p(x_i|R, x_{1:i-1}) - p_R(x_i|x_{1:i-1})\|_1, \quad (80)$$

which means that  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  is an important dividing point. When  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$ , we can get that benefit is equal to detriment and  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*)) = 0$ . Equation 72 indicates that the gap between values of benefit and detriment ( $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*))$ ) is approximately positively correlated with  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}}$ . Therefore, when  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} > \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  we can get that benefit outweighs detriment ( $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*)) > 0$ ). When  $\frac{1}{\mathcal{D}} < \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}}$  we can get that detriment outweighs benefit ( $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*)) < 0$ ). Now the proof of Theorem 3 has been finished.  $\square$

## G Proof for RAG is actually unsupervised In-context Learning

This section aims to prove that RAG is actually unsupervised ICL from two perspectives. One is that previous studies find that ICL performs gradient descent as meta-optimizer Von Oswald et al. [2023], Akyürek et al. [2022], Dai et al. [2022]. We prove that in this perspective, the distribution of texts in context drives the learning even without explicit input-output supervision. Therefore, the distribution of unsupervised retrieved texts in RAG, which is actually the distribution of context for query, can also drives the learning. Then we can prove that RAG is actually unsupervised in-context learning. The specific proof is:

*Proof.* From the perspective that ICL performs gradient descent as meta-optimizers, ICL can be formalized as the following:

Gradient descent in optimization of linear layers have a dual form of linear attention Irie et al. [2022], Aizerman et al. [1964], define a liner layer as:

$$f(x) = W_0x, \quad (81)$$

in which  $W_0$  is the initial weight matrix. Given a sequence of historical input vectors  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{in}}$  and corresponding error signals  $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{out}}$ ,  $i \in [1, N]$  obtained by gradient descent, the update of the weight matrix can be represented as:

$$W' = W_0 + \Delta W = W_0 + \sum_i^N \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{x}_i. \quad (82)$$

Recap that the linear attention can be formulated as:

$$\text{LinearAttn}(V, K, \mathbf{q}) = \sum_i \mathbf{v}_i (\mathbf{k}_i^T \mathbf{q}). \quad (83)$$

Then the dual form of updated linear layer with new input  $\mathbf{x}_{N+1}$  is:

$$f'(x) = (W_0 + \Delta W)\mathbf{x}_{N+1} \quad (84)$$

$$= (W_0 + \sum_i^N \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{x}_{N+1} \quad (85)$$

$$= W_0\mathbf{x}_{N+1} + \sum_i^N (\mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{x}_{N+1} \quad (86)$$

$$= W_0\mathbf{x}_{N+1} + \sum_i^N \mathbf{e}_i \otimes (\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{x}_{N+1}) \quad (87)$$

$$= W_0\mathbf{x}_{N+1} + \text{LinearAttn}(E, \mathbf{x}_{1:N}, \mathbf{x}_{N+1}) \quad (88)$$

In in-context learning, the attention of a head is:

$$f_{ICL}(\mathbf{q}) = \text{Attn}(V, K, \mathbf{q}) \quad (89)$$

$$= W_V[B' : B] \text{softmax} \left( \frac{W_K[B' : B]^T \mathbf{q}}{\sqrt{d}} \right), \quad (90)$$

in which  $\mathbf{q} = W_Q \mathbf{b}$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$  is the input  $t$ -th token in query,  $W_Q, W_K, W_v$  are projection matrices,  $B'$  is demonstrations of the context and  $X$  is the prefix for  $\mathbf{b}$  of the query. To simplify qualitative analysis, we follow Dai et al. [2022] to estimate the standard attention as relaxed linear attention, achieved by eliminating the softmax function and the scaling factor:

$$f_{ICL}(\mathbf{q}) \approx W_V[B' : B](W_K[B' : B])^T \mathbf{q} \quad (91)$$

$$= W_V B (W_K B)^T \mathbf{q} + W_V X' (W_K B')^T \mathbf{q} \quad (92)$$

$$= W_V B (W_K B)^T \mathbf{q} + \text{LinearAttn}(W_V B', W_K B', \mathbf{q}) \quad (93)$$

According to Equation 88, the dual form of the Transformer attention is:

$$f_{ICL}(\mathbf{q}) \approx W_V B (W_K X)^T \mathbf{q} + \text{LinearAttn}(W_V B', W_K B', \mathbf{q}) \quad (94)$$

$$= W_V B (W_K B)^T \mathbf{q} + \sum_i W_V \mathbf{b}'_i ((W_K \mathbf{b}'_i)^T \mathbf{q}) \quad (95)$$

$$= W_V B (W_K B)^T \mathbf{q} + \sum_i ((W_V \mathbf{b}'_i) \otimes (W_K \mathbf{b}'_i)) \mathbf{q}. \quad (96)$$

Based on above derivation, we have this finding: comparing Equation 86 with Equation 96, we find that  $W_V B (W_K B)^T$  is equal to the initial weight matrix  $W_0$ , which is zero-shot prediction give query prefix  $B$  without demonstrations in the context. Besides,  $W_V \mathbf{b}'_i$  is equal to  $\mathbf{e}_i$ . which is the meta-gradient used to update the weighted matrix.  $W_K \mathbf{b}'_i$  is equal to the historical input vectors:

$$W_V \mathbf{b}'_i = \mathbf{e}_i \quad (97)$$

$$W_K \mathbf{b}'_i = x_i. \quad (98)$$

In the standard gradient descent with loss  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mathbf{e}_i = -\eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial y_i}$  and  $\eta$  is the learning rate and  $y_i = W_i x_i$  is the output of the linear layer using the weight matrix  $W_i$  at step  $t$  Irie et al. [2022]. So we can get:

$$\mathbf{e}_i = -\eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial y_i} = -\eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_i x_i} \quad (99)$$

$$= -\eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_i W_K \mathbf{b}'_i}. \quad (100)$$

Therefore:

$$-\eta \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial W_i W_K \mathbf{b}'_i} = W_V \mathbf{b}'_i. \quad (101)$$

So the loss  $\mathcal{L}$  ca be represented as:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{\eta} \int W_V \mathbf{b}'_i d(W_i W_K \mathbf{b}'_i) \quad (102)$$

Equation 97 and 102 show that the supervision signal, both loss and gradient, are directly related to the semantic representation of the tokens ( $b_i$ ) in the demonstration of context. This suggests that the distribution of the text in context is a direct learning signal for in-context learning, without the need for explicit input-output pairs in the demonstration. From the perspective that ICL performs gradient descent as meta-optimizer, the proof has been finished.

The other perspective is from our theoretical results in Equation 5 and 9 that:

$$p(x_i | R, x_{1:i-1}) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i | R, x_{1:i-1}, z) p(z | R, x_{1:i-1}) dz \quad (103)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Z} - \{z^*\}} p(x_i | R, x_{1:i-1}, z) p(z | R, x_{1:i-1}) dz + p(x_i | R, x_{1:i-1}, z^*) p(z^* | R, x_{1:i-1}). \quad (104)$$

$$\propto \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i | R, x_{1:i-1}, z) p(R, x_{1:i-1} | z) p(z) dz \quad (105)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} p(x_i | R, x_{1:i-1}, z) \exp(r(z)) p(z) dz, \quad r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1} | z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1} | z^*)} \quad (106)$$

$$r(z) = \log \frac{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z)}{p(R, x_{1:i-1}|z^*)} \approx \log \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z)}{\prod_{i=1}^n O(1)p(r_i|z^*)} \quad (107)$$

$$\rightarrow O(1) + n * \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{p(r_i|z)}{p(r_i|z^*)} = O(1) + n * \mathbb{E}_{r \sim P_r} \left[ \log \frac{p(r_i|z)}{p(r_i|z^*)} \right] \quad (108)$$

$$\propto p_R(r) \log \frac{p(r|z)}{p(r|z^*)} = p_R(r) \log \frac{p_R(r)}{p(r|z^*)} - p_R(r) \log \frac{p_R(r)}{p(r|z)} \quad (109)$$

$$= -(\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z)) - \text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*))), \quad (110)$$

We explain Equation 110 from the perspective of the loss function in gradient descent to explain the learning from retrieved texts of LLMs in RAG.  $p_R(r)$  is the distribution of retrieved texts and it can serve as ground truth distribution in loss functions.  $p(r|z)$  and  $p(r|z^*)$  are distribution estimated by LLMs. Two KL-divergence between ground truth distribution  $p_R(r)$  and estimated distribution  $p(r|z)$  and  $p(r|z^*)$  respectively are loss functions.  $r$  is the retrieved passage that invariant in generation process, so what contributes to the change of loss function is sampling more and more accurate *retrieved concept*  $z^*$  from the retrieved texts. So  $\text{KL}(p_R(r)||p(r|z^*))$  is the actual loss that can be meta-optimized in RAG, in which  $p_R(r)$  is the ground truth distribution and  $p(r|z^*)$  is the estimated distribution. As this loss decreases, the value of  $r(z)$  when  $z$  is not equal to  $z^*$  also decreases, which means that in Equation 104, the ratio of the knowledge from LLMs’ pre-trained distribution decreases and meanwhile the ratio of knowledge from the retrieved texts increases. Lower loss means that the output of RAG is closer to the distribution of retrieved texts, which is actually that LLMs learning the distribution from retrieved texts in input context. Since  $p_R(r)$  is the ground truth in this learning but dose not have any explicit input-output supervision like demonstrations in in-context learning, RAG is the **unsupervised** in-context learning and distribution of retrieved texts ( $p_R(r)$ ) is the unsupervised learning signal.

Based on the above two perspectives, we successfully prove that: *The distribution of retrieved passage  $r$  in RAG (i.e.,  $p_R(r)$ ) can serve as the unsupervised learning signal for LLMs learning from context, even without explicit input-output supervision. RAG is actually unsupervised in-context Learning that fuses the distribution from retrieved texts with LLMs’ pre-trained distribution.*  $\square$

## H Experimental details

### H.1 Baselines

For primary experiment that needs methods to determine the value order between benefit and detriment for each token, it is actually a binary classification task (benefit outweigh detriment or not). The mainstream methods in this area are detecting and comparing the degree of hallucination between tokens generated by LLMs (w/o RAG) and RAG. Below we will describe in detail how we apply these baselines to this task.

**Logprobs.** Logprobs can indicate the confidence for LLMs in generating the tokens Kuhn et al. [2023]. We use the value order between top-1 log-probability of the tokens output by pure LLM and RAG to determine the value order between benefit and detriment for these tokens. If the logprobs of tokens generated by RAG is greater than the logprobs of tokens generated by pure LLM, the benefit outweigh the detriment, otherwise the detriment outweigh the benefit.

**Uncertainty.** We use Length-normalized Entropy Malinin and Gales [2020] to measure the uncertainty of the tokens generated by pure LLM and RAG respectively. If the uncertainty of tokens generated by RAG is lower than the uncertainty of tokens generated by pure LLM, the benefit outweigh the detriment, otherwise the detriment outweigh the benefit.

**Consistency-Lexical Lin et al. [2022].** Consistency-based methods make LLMs perform multiple generations for a question and calculate consistency score among multiple answers. If the consistency score of tokens generated by RAG is greater than the consistency score of tokens generated by pure LLM, the benefit outweigh the detriment, otherwise the detriment outweigh the benefit. Lexical-based consistency means calculating consistency score by lexical-similarity among multiple answers. Since the experiment is at token level, we use the number of tokens that are completely consistent in multiple generations as the consistency score.

**Consistency-Semantic Chen et al. [2024].** We follow Chen et al. [2024] to use EigenScore to calculate the semantic similarity among hidden states of tokens in multiple generations and use it as the consistency score.

For open-domain Q&A under practical autoregressive generation setting, baselines for this include the methods that introduce additional modules to filter irrelevant passages (**NLI+RAG** Yoran et al. [2024]) or as action triggers (**CRAG** Yan et al. [2024]), train more robust LLMs for RAG (**RetRobust** Yoran et al. [2024] and **INFO-RAG** Xu et al. [2024a]) and train LLMs to dynamically retrieve and critique retrieved texts (**Self-RAG** Asai et al. [2023]).

**NLI+RAG.** This method use a Natural Language Inference model to filter the possible irrelevant documents in retrieved results and provide the remaining documents to LLMs for generation. We follow Yoran et al. [2024] to use a BART-Large model Lewis et al. [2019] with 407 million parameters trained on the MNLI dataset Williams et al. [2017]. We consider a query-document pair as entailed if the probability for the entailment label is  $\geq 0.5$  and filter the documents with probability for the entailment label  $< 0.5$ .

**CRAG.** This method uses a retrieval evaluator to assess the correctness of retrieved texts trigger different actions based on the evaluation results. One of the actions is using additional google search API for web search, which is unfair for baselines and our method. So we remove this action and use its knowledge refinement strategy for document filtering Yan et al. [2024].

**RetRobust.** This method fine-tunes LLMs to properly leverage retrieved passages with a mix of relevant and irrelevant contexts Yoran et al. [2024].

**INFO-RAG.** This method uses unsupervised method to make LLMs learn to use the retrieved texts robustly. It enables LLMs to judge the correctness of the retrieved texts, extract the correct content and revise the wrong content Xu et al. [2024a].

**Self-RAG.** This method trains LLMs to dynamically retrieve and critique retrieved texts. Self-RAG first decodes a retrieval token to evaluate the utility of retrieval and control a retrieval component. If retrieval is required, LLM calls an external retrieval module to find top relevant documents, using input query and previous generation. If retrieval is not required, LLM continues generation. If retrieval is needed, LLM first generates critique token evaluating whether retrieved documents are relevant and support generation, and then generates continuation conditioned on the retrieved passages Asai et al. [2023].

## H.2 Implementation details

All models are run on a V100 GPU with Pytorch Paszke et al. [2019] and accelerated by DeepSpeed<sup>3</sup>. As for retrieval for RAG, we follow Xu et al. [2023, 2024a] to use ColBERTv2 Santhanam et al. [2021], an excellent generalizable model as the retriever, and use Wikipedia consisting of 21,015,324 passages Karpukhin et al. [2020] as retrieval database. **All baselines and X-RAG share the same retrieval setup and prompt.** We use OPT-6.7B, LLaMA-2-7B and Mistral-7B-v0.1 as LLMs in primary experiment and use greedy-decoding strategy for generation.

## I Case Study

Figure 4 shows the case study for collaborative generation between pure LLM and RAG at token level in our **X-RAG**. At the step that pure LLM and RAG generates the different tokens, **X-RAG** use our theoretical results in Theorem 3 to compare the benefit and detriment. If benefit is greater than detriment, the token from RAG is selected, otherwise, the token from pure LLM is selected. The selected tokens are marked by green color and bold. Then discarded tokens are marked by gray. The orange arrow represents the direction of token selection and usage. The selected tokens are used for the next step generation of both pure LLM and RAG. This case study visually demonstrates that our **X-RAG** effectively enables pure LLM and RAG for collaborative generation to preserve benefit and avoid detriment.

---

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed>



Figure 4: Case study for collaborative generation between pure LLM and RAG at token level in our X-RAG. Pure LLM and RAG generate the texts in parallel at token level. At the step that pure LLM and RAG generate the different tokens, X-RAG use our theoretical results in Theorem 3 to compare the benefit and detriment. If benefit is greater than detriment, the token from RAG is selected, otherwise, the token from pure LLM is selected. The selected tokens are marked by green color and bold. The discarded tokens are marked by gray. The orange arrow represents the direction of token selection and usage. The selected tokens are used for the next step generation of both pure LLM and RAG.