

---

# BRIGHT: A Realistic and Challenging Benchmark for Reasoning-Intensive Retrieval

---

Hongjin Su<sup>\*h</sup> Howard Yen<sup>\*p</sup> Mengzhou Xia<sup>\*p</sup> Weijia Shi<sup>w</sup> Niklas Muennighoff

Han-yu Wang<sup>h</sup> Haisu Liu<sup>h</sup> Quan Shi<sup>p</sup> Zachary S. Siegel<sup>p</sup> Michael Tang<sup>p</sup>

Ruoxi Sun<sup>g</sup> Jinsung Yoon<sup>g</sup> Sercan Ö. Arık<sup>g</sup> Danqi Chen<sup>p</sup> Tao Yu<sup>h</sup>

<sup>h</sup> The University of Hong Kong <sup>p</sup> Princeton University

<sup>w</sup> University of Washington <sup>g</sup> Google Cloud AI Research

{hjsu,tyu}@cs.hku.hk {hyen,mengzhou,danqic}@cs.princeton.edu

## Abstract

Existing retrieval benchmarks primarily consist of information-seeking queries (e.g., aggregated questions from search engines) where keyword or semantic-based retrieval is usually sufficient. However, many complex real-world queries require in-depth reasoning to identify relevant documents that go beyond surface form matching. For example, finding documentation for a coding question requires understanding the logic and syntax of the functions involved. To better benchmark retrieval on such challenging queries, we introduce **BRIGHT**, the first text retrieval benchmark that requires *intensive reasoning* to retrieve relevant documents. **BRIGHT** is constructed from the 1,398 real-world queries collected from diverse domains (such as economics, psychology, robotics, software engineering, earth sciences, etc.), sourced from naturally occurring or carefully curated human data. Extensive evaluation reveals that even state-of-the-art retrieval models perform poorly on **BRIGHT**. The leading model on the MTEB leaderboard [38], which achieves a score of 59.0 nDCG@10,<sup>2</sup> produces a score of nDCG@10 of 18.0 on **BRIGHT**. We further demonstrate that augmenting queries with Chain-of-Thought reasoning generated by large language models (LLMs) improves performance by up to 12.2 points. Moreover, **BRIGHT** is robust against data leakage during pretraining of the benchmarked models as we validate by showing similar performance even when documents from the benchmark are included in the training data. We believe that **BRIGHT** paves the way for future research on retrieval systems in more realistic and challenging settings. Our code and data are available at <https://brightbenchmark.github.io>.

## 1 Introduction

Retrieval is a commonly-used technology that helps users find relevant information from vast amounts of corpus data, such as documents, web pages, or logs. It has a wide range of applications across many industries, including retail, healthcare, and finance. Useful information may exhibit various relationships with the queries, sometimes with apparent matching patterns (e.g. similar keywords), and other times via intricate connections (e.g. reasoning from the broad context).

Existing datasets for benchmark retrieval methods, including Natural Questions [27], MS MARCO [6], BEIR [52], MTEB [38], or KILT [41], often focus on queries sourced from search engines. They are generally simple and direct, usually aiming at finding specific information (e.g., “the widest

---

\* Equal contribution.

<sup>2</sup>Retrieved from <https://hf.co/spaces/mteb/leaderboard?task=retrieval> on 2024-05-28.




Figure 1: Existing retrieval benchmarks focus on keyword-based retrieval (level 1), or semantic-based retrieval (level 2), e.g., NQ, MS MARCO datasets [27, 6]. **BRIGHT introduces level 3 retrieval, where the relevance between queries and documents requires intensive reasoning to determine.** Our data consists of natural user queries from diverse domains (e.g., economics, math, earth sciences, etc.). **BRIGHT** corpora also span across web data, such as blogs, syntax documentation, and STEM problem-solutions.

highway in North America” in Fig 1), which results in relevant documents sharing high lexical or semantic overlap with the queries [29, 26].

In many real-world scenarios, retrieval queries are more complex, and finding relevant documents can be challenging with simple keyword or semantic matching. For instance, an economist might want to find a story explained by the same economic theory as another story, or a programmer might want to use an error message to locate the corresponding syntax documentation. In these cases, keyword-based or semantic matching alone would not be sufficient to retrieve the most relevant documents, as they would require a deeper understanding of the context and relationships involved.

To better benchmark retrieval models on such challenging queries, we introduce **BRIGHT**, the first text retrieval benchmark that necessitates intensive reasoning to retrieve relevant documents. Specifically, the relevance between queries and documents in **BRIGHT** is not easily detectable through simple keyword or semantic matching, and requires intentional and deliberate reasoning, as illustrated in Figure 1 (level 3). **BRIGHT** comprises 12 datasets from diverse domains, sourced from naturally occurring or carefully curated human data. Specifically, seven datasets are constructed from StackExchange, where we pair real user questions with web pages linked from accepted or highly voted answers. We also adapt a code generation task in a rare programming language (Pony), which requires retrieving syntax documentation [50]. Finally, we include datasets that retrieve STEM theorems or examples using annotation tags in LeetCode,<sup>3</sup> AoPS,<sup>4</sup> and TheoremQA [11].

We evaluate 13 representative retrieval models of diverse sizes and architectures. Comprehensive experiments demonstrate the challenges of **BRIGHT**, where the best model, SFR-Embedding-Mistral [34], which scores 59.0 on the MTEB retrieval subset (based on BEIR [52]) only achieves 18.0 on **BRIGHT**. To further improve retrieval performance, we explore various strategies, including using LLMs to generate Chain-of-Thought reasoning steps [60] as queries and reranking with LLMs, resulting in up to 12.2 and 3.1 point improvements on average, respectively. We also show that **BRIGHT** is robust to potential data leakage for the large-scale pre-training of the benchmarked models,

<sup>3</sup><https://leetcode.com/>

<sup>4</sup><https://artofproblemsolving.com/>

with no significant performance improvement being observed even after continuing training models on documents from the benchmark data. Additionally, we develop a long-context retrieval setting by aggregating coherent short paragraphs into long documents, demonstrating that reasoning-intensive tasks are challenging in the long-context setting despite the reduced search space. We hope that this study can inspire innovative research directions to push the state-of-the-art in retrieval and contribute to its wider-spread adoption in real-world application scenarios.

## 2 Related Work

**Benchmarking retrieval.** Existing information retrieval (IR) datasets are typically constructed for information-seeking tasks, such as question-answering [54, 15, 27, 9, 33], claim verification [53, 18, 56], or entity retrieval [21, 41]. Recent works expand retrieval benchmarks with more scenarios, such as instruction following [50, 61, 39], multi-hop [66], and long-context retrieval [45, 72]. Comprehensive benchmarks like BEIR [52] evaluate retrieval systems on diverse domains and tasks, with relevant documents sharing high semantic overlap with the query. Closest to our work, BIRCO [58] is designed to evaluate retrieval systems based on multifaceted objectives by leveraging existing datasets. However, it is limited to the LLM re-ranking setting and uses only a small candidate pool ( $\sim 100$  documents) for each query. RAR-b [62] converts existing commonsense, mathematics, and code datasets to a retrieval setting [46, 69, 7, 13, 22, 36] to evaluate if retrieval models can directly retrieve answers to reasoning problems. However, such construction does not reflect realistic retrieval scenarios as the exact answers might not always exist in a document. In contrast, **BRIGHT** is the first benchmark that collects realistic user queries and matches them with relevant documents in large corpora through intensive reasoning.

**Dense retrieval models and retrieval augmented generation.** State-of-the-art retrieval systems often use dense models to encode text with rich representation. These models are trained on unsupervised data [29, 24], supervised data [50, 1, 35], as well as LLM-generated data [28, 57, 37]. In this work, we benchmark a diverse set of models across different axes: sparse and dense; small and large; open-source and proprietary. Additionally, as dense generative models continue to improve, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [3, 8, 2, 37, 4, 20, 47], which retrieves relevant documents to help generate coherent answers, has become an important application. In this work, we focus on retrieval and leave the exploration of RAG evaluations on **BRIGHT** for future work. We conduct initial analyses and demonstrate in Appendix D how retrieving relevant documents can help improve model generation for reasoning-intensive tasks.

**Benchmarking reasoning.** Many benchmarks aim to evaluate the reasoning abilities of LLMs, especially focused on mathematics and coding. As for mathematics, for example, datasets include GSM8K [13] and its extensions GSM1K [70], TheoremQA [12], MATH [22], and LeanDojo [65]. As for coding, HumanEval [10], MBPP [5], and LiveCodeBench [25] are often used. These benchmarks contain question-answer pairs and are usually sourced from textbooks, online resources, competitions, or domain experts. We source queries from selected high-quality datasets and construct **BRIGHT** through additional annotations, creating a realistic reasoning-intensive retrieval benchmark.

## 3 The BRIGHT Benchmark

We introduce **BRIGHT**, a retrieval benchmark that tests whether retrieval systems can match queries and documents whose relevance requires intensive reasoning to solve, beyond just lexical and semantic similarities. In this section, we first formulate the task of reasoning-intensive retrieval (§3.1). Then, we detail the data collection process for the data from StackExchange (§3.2), coding datasets (§3.3), and theorem-based questions (§3.4, §3.5). In Table 1, we present the benchmark statistics.

### 3.1 Task formulation

Given a query  $Q$  and the retrieval corpus  $\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$ , retrievers are tasked to find relevant, or positive documents  $\mathcal{D}_Q^+ = \{D_{Q,1}^+, \dots, D_{Q,m}^+\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ , where  $m \ll n$ . Negative documents are defined as  $\mathcal{D}_Q^- = \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_Q^+$ . In reasoning-intensive retrieval (level 3),  $\mathcal{D}_Q^+$  relates to the query  $Q$  through a series of reasoning steps  $\mathcal{R}_Q = (R_{Q,1}, R_{Q,2}, \dots, R_{Q,s})$ . For example, common reasoning steps may involve first identifying the question’s intention, and then analyzing and modeling the problem,

Table 1: **Data statistics of BRIGHT.** For each dataset, we show the number of queries ( $\mathcal{Q}$ ) and documents ( $\mathcal{D}$ ), the average number of positive documents ( $\mathcal{D}^+$ ) per example, the average length of queries and documents (measured by the GPT-2 tokenizer [42]), and sources of queries and documents. Q&Sol refers to demonstration examples of question-solution pairs. TheoremQA-Q and TheoremQA-T refer to question retrieval and theorem retrieval based on TheoremQA respectively. Examples for each dataset can be found in Appendix C.

Dataset	Total Number			Avg. Length		Source		Examples
	Q	$\mathcal{D}$	$\mathcal{D}^+$	Q	$\mathcal{D}$	Q	$\mathcal{D}$	
<i>StackExchange</i>								
Biology	103	57,359	3.6	115.2	83.6	StackExchange post	Web pages: article, tutorial, news, blog, report ...	Tab. 19
Earth Science	116	121,249	5.3	109.5	132.6			Tab. 20
Economics	103	50,220	8.0	181.5	120.2			Tab. 21
Psychology	101	52,835	7.3	149.6	118.2			Tab. 22
Robotics	101	61,961	5.5	818.9	121.0			Tab. 23
Stack Overflow	117	107,081	7.0	478.3	704.7			Tab. 24
Sustainable Living	108	60,792	5.6	148.5	107.9			Tab. 25
<i>Coding</i>								
LeetCode	142	413,932	1.8	497.5	482.6	Coding question	Coding Q&Sol	Tab. 26
Pony	112	7,894	22.5	102.6	98.3	Coding question	Syntax Doc	Tab. 27
<i>Theorems</i>								
AoPS	111	188,177	4.7	117.1	250.5	Math Olympiad Q	STEM Q&Sol	Tab. 28
TheoremQA-Q	206	188,177	3.2	89.0	250.5	Theorem-based Q	STEM Q&Sol	Tab. 29
TheoremQA-T	78	23,839	2.0	88.0	354.8	Theorem-based Q	Theorems	Tab. 30

inferring sub-conclusions based on the descriptions, etc. The oracle reasoning steps  $\mathcal{R}_Q$  are not provided in the evaluation. Depending on the implementation methods,  $\mathcal{R}_Q$  could be both explicitly and implicitly incorporated to solve this level 3 retrieval.

### 3.2 StackExchange: Retrieving web pages that help answer questions

StackExchange<sup>5</sup> is a popular community-driven platform where users ask questions and receive answers from other users. Among its 170+ sites, we select 7 diverse and knowledge-intensive domains: Sustainable Living, Economics, Psychology, Robotics, Earth Science, Biology, and coding in Stack Overflow. Unlike short questions in traditional retrieval benchmarks, questions on StackExchange often contain long and technical descriptions of the problems and end with a logically-complex question, such as fixing an error. Responses often link to external web pages that contain relevant information to address the question. We construct query-document pairs based on user posts and documents referenced in the answers (see Figure 2). More details can be found in Appendix E.

**Selecting posts.** Human annotators<sup>6</sup> browse posts from newest to oldest and select a post with at least one answer that (1) is accepted by the user or receives  $> 5$  votes, and (2) contains one or more URL links. This process ensures that each dataset has a sufficient number of high-quality examples.

**Constructing query and positive documents.** For each selected post, we construct the query and positive documents as follows:

- Step 1: The annotator combines the title and content of the post to form the query  $Q$ .
- Step 2: The annotator visits web pages linked in the answers. A web page’s content is considered a positive document of the query if the annotator can specify: (1) how the query and the web page content are relevant, and (2) the reasoning steps required to determine this relevance. The annotator records reasoning steps for all positive documents.
- Step 3: If no web page is considered as positive, the post itself is discarded. For each collected web page, the annotator splits the content into passages and selects positives  $\mathcal{D}_{Q,i}^+$  following the criteria from Step 2.

<sup>5</sup><https://stackexchange.com/>

<sup>6</sup>authors and college students, more details are in Appendix E.1




Figure 2: **An overview of the data annotation process for StackExchange data.** The post content is used as the query. Positive documents are selected passages from web pages linked in the answer, while the remaining passages and those searched from Google and filtered by annotators are considered negatives. The web pages can include content from Wikipedia, blogs, articles, reports, and more.

**Constructing hard-negative documents.** To avoid models from relying solely on lexical or semantic similarities when positive documents  $\mathcal{D}_Q^+$  are in the same domain as  $Q$ , we extract *hard-negatives*  $\mathcal{D}_Q^{HN} \subset \mathcal{D}_Q^-$  for each query. These documents are gathered from Google Search and encompass similar topics, yet their focus diverges from the query’s requirements (for additional examples, see Appendix C). The collection procedure is as follows:

- Step 1: Annotators search Google using the posts’ title or LLM-summarized post keywords, and identifies web pages that are semantically similar but not relevant to answering the question.
- Step 2: Annotators collect up to 5 negative web pages for each query and splits them into hard negative passages, which consist of  $\mathcal{D}_Q^{HN}$ .

For each dataset, we consolidate all the collected passages into a retrieval corpus  $\mathcal{D}$ . For each query, other than the selected positive passages, all other passages in the corpus are considered negatives. In contrast to traditional retrieval tasks such as open-domain QA [19, 27], where the retrieval pool typically includes documents that directly answer the query, we simulate a realistic scenario where positive documents only provide useful information to help users derive an answer.

### 3.3 Coding: Retrieving documentation or similar solved problems

To solve a coding problem, programmers often need to refer to the documentation or find similar problems that share the same algorithmic design. However, given only a problem description, it is difficult to find relevant documentation or similar problems via simple keyword or semantic matching. We construct two retrieval datasets on coding, where the relevance between queries and documents is grounded in the syntax usage and algorithm design.

**Pony.** When coding is considered for a rare programming language for which programmers and LLMs might lack knowledge of, it would be useful to refer to the language manual to learn about syntax and function usage. However, in such cases, the problem description would likely have low semantic similarity and lexical overlap with the relevant documentation. This discrepancy necessitates intensive reasoning to determine why a particular syntax or function is relevant to the problem at hand. We adapt a code generation dataset featuring the Pony programming language [48], considering it for retrieval setting. We use the instructions of coding problems as queries  $Q$ , the annotated documentation about the required syntax as the positive documents  $\mathcal{D}_Q^+$ , and the complete language manual as the retrieval pool of documents  $\mathcal{D}$ , where each  $D_i$  contains descriptions about syntax usage of Pony, such as conditionals, loops, and classes.

**LeetCode.** We also explore coding problems that deal with algorithms and data structures, where retrieving problems and solutions that share the same algorithmic design facilitates learning. fkjfhgri-

jiép[e]p[e]We source coding problems and solutions from LeetCode.<sup>7</sup> The problem descriptions are used as queries  $Q$ , and the positive documents  $\mathcal{D}_Q^+$  are solved problems that were annotated as similar problems by LeetCode. Each document  $D_i = (Q_i, A_i)$  from LeetCode contains a problem statement  $Q_i$  and a Python solution  $A_i$ . To increase difficulty, we only keep questions that are grounded in real-world scenarios, where arriving at the key algorithm or data structure requires intensive reasoning. We construct a large corpus  $\mathcal{D}$  by combining questions and solutions from LeetCode and Python code from CodeSearchNet [23]. See Appendix B.5 for more details on the dataset.

### 3.4 Theorem-based questions: Retrieving solved questions with same techniques

When encountering a new math or physics problem, users often reference problems that are solved with similar reasoning traces. Retrieving such similar problems can be challenging, because despite sharing similar logic, two problems may take on vastly different surface forms, as shown in Table 29. In this setting, the query  $Q$  is a theorem-based question, and the corpus  $\mathcal{D}$  consists of documents that are solved STEM problems  $D_i = (Q_i, A_i)$ , where  $Q_i$  is a problem statement and  $A_i$  is the answer with derivation steps. The documents are sourced from high-quality STEM datasets [13, 67, 22, 32, 12, 30], and this corpus is shared between TheoremQA and AoPS. For more details on corpus construction, refer to Appendix B.1. We consider  $D_i$  as a positive document if its solution uses the same technique as the query’s solution, and false negatives are minimized by excluding specific documents for each query  $Q$  based on metadata annotations. We detail the dataset construction below.

**TheoremQA.** Derived from textbooks, online resources, and experts, TheoremQA [11] contains questions that are based on specific mathematical or scientific theorems (e.g., the binomial theorems), and represent problems that students and other users might encounter in their studies. To ensure that the model does not simply rely on the surface-level wording of the questions, we use GPT-4<sup>8</sup> to rephrase the question into more concrete, applied scenarios while maintaining the same required theorem. The prompts used for rewriting the questions and an example are shown in Table 12. Human annotators carefully review the rewritten questions and make necessary revisions to ensure that they are valid and consistent with the original questions. A document  $D_i = (Q_i, A_i)$  is positive if  $A_i$  uses the same theorem as the query’s solution. Additional details are in Appendix B.2.

**AoPS.** Math competition problems have been widely used to evaluate the problem-solving skills of students and LLMs [22]. Sourced from American and International Math Olympiads, these problems often require the application of advanced mathematical theorems and techniques, such as Fermat’s Little Theorem and Ball and Urns. To practice for the competitions, students often learn by solving other problems that require the same problem-solving skills. To this end, we collect a new dataset of math competition problems, called AoPS, annotated with their respective problem-solving skills from AoPS Wiki<sup>9</sup>. The collected problem-solving skills are shown in Table 17. Similar to TheoremQA, we consider a solved math problem  $D_i = (Q_i, A_i)$  positive if its solution uses the same problem-solving skill as the query’s solution. From preliminary qualitative analysis, we find that competition problems are deliberately written in diverse ways such that it is challenging to identify the required techniques; thus, we do not rephrase the problem statements.

### 3.5 Theorem-based questions: Retrieving theorems

In addition to similar problems, a definition of the theorem that can be used in the problem can also be helpful. To this end, we consider the task of retrieving theorem statements. We use the queries from the aforementioned TheoremQA dataset with a different corpus  $\mathcal{D}$ , where each document  $D_i$  is a theorem statement from ProofWiki<sup>10</sup>. To match each theorem used in TheoremQA to ProofWiki documents, we first construct a candidate set of documents for each theorem using simple heuristics such as title matching. Then, we use GPT-4 to check if a candidate theorem statement is used in the solution for each query in TheoremQA, and only keep the queries with at least one useful theorem statement. Manual annotation of relevance between problems and documents also showed substantial agreement (Cohen’s  $\kappa = 0.62$ ) between human annotators and GPT-4. Details are in §B.3.

<sup>7</sup><https://leetcode.com/>

<sup>8</sup>GPT-4 refers to the version gpt-4-0125-preview throughout this work.

<sup>9</sup><https://artofproblemsolving.com/wiki/>

<sup>10</sup><https://proofwiki.org/>; a collection of over 20K formal definitions and proofs of mathematical theorems.

Table 2: **The performance of retrieval models in BRIGHT.** We report nDCG@10 for all datasets, which are Biology (Bio.), Earth Science (Earth.), Economics (Econ.), Psychology (Psy.), Robotics (Rob.), Stack Overflow (Stack.), Sustainable Living (Sus.), LeetCode (Leet.), Pony, AoPS, TheoremQA with question retrieval (TheoQ.) and TheoremQA with theorem retrieval (TheoT.). Avg. denotes the average score across 12 datasets. The best score on each dataset is shown in bold and the second best is underlined. We show that reasoning-intensive retrieval is challenging for current retrievers, where the best model only achieves an nDCG@10 score of 22.1 on average. Model details are in Appendix A.1

	StackExchange							Coding		Theorem-based			Avg.
	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
<i>Sparse model</i>													
BM25 [44]	19.2	27.1	14.9	12.5	13.5	16.5	15.2	24.4	7.9	6.2	9.8	4.8	14.3
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>													
BGE [63]	12.0	24.2	16.6	17.4	12.2	9.5	13.3	26.7	5.6	6.1	12.6	6.7	13.6
Inst-L [49]	15.6	21.5	16.0	21.9	11.5	11.2	13.2	20.0	1.3	7.9	20.1	8.3	14.0
SBERT [43]	15.5	20.1	16.6	22.6	8.4	9.5	15.3	26.4	6.9	5.3	18.5	9.9	14.6
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>													
E5 [57]	18.8	26.0	15.5	15.8	16.4	9.8	18.5	28.7	4.8	7.1	23.9	<u>25.1</u>	17.5
SFR [34]	19.5	26.6	17.8	19.0	16.7	12.7	<u>19.8</u>	27.4	2.0	7.4	23.1	24.3	18.0
Inst-XL [49]	21.9	<u>34.4</u>	<b>22.8</b>	27.4	<b>17.4</b>	<u>19.1</u>	18.8	27.5	5.0	8.3	14.6	6.2	18.6
GritLM [37]	<u>25.0</u>	32.8	19.0	19.9	<u>17.3</u>	11.6	18.0	<u>29.8</u>	<b>22.0</b>	8.9	23.3	19.8	<u>20.6</u>
Qwen [31]	<b>30.9</b>	<b>36.2</b>	17.7	24.6	13.5	<b>19.9</b>	14.9	<u>25.5</u>	<u>9.8</u>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>22.1</b>
<i>Proprietary models</i>													
Cohere [14]	19.0	27.5	<u>20.2</u>	21.8	16.2	16.5	17.7	26.8	1.8	6.5	15.1	7.1	16.3
OpenAI [40]	23.7	26.3	20.0	<u>27.5</u>	12.9	12.5	<b>20.3</b>	23.6	2.5	8.5	22.2	10.8	17.6
Voyage [55]	23.6	25.1	19.8	24.8	11.2	15.0	15.6	<b>30.6</b>	1.5	7.4	<u>26.1</u>	11.1	17.6
Google [28]	23.0	<u>34.4</u>	19.5	<b>27.9</b>	16.0	17.9	17.3	29.6	3.6	<u>9.3</u>	21.5	14.3	19.5

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Experimental setup

We evaluate 13 representative retrieval models, ranging from traditional bag-of-words models to large dense retrieval models, including the top performers from the retrieval set of the MTEB leaderboard [38] (constructed from BEIR [52]). First, we employ BM25 [44] as our primary sparse retrieval model, which demonstrates strong performance on BEIR [52], comparable to that of larger trained dense retrieval models. We also evaluate a diverse set of open-source dense retrieval models: the small (<1B) models are SentenceBERT(109M) [43], BGE(335M) [63], and Instructor-Large(335M) [49], and the large (>1B) models are Instructor-XL(1.5B) [49], E5-Mistral(7.1B) [57], SFR-Embedding-Mistral(7.1B) [34], GritLM(7.1B) [37], and gte-Qwen1.5(7.7B) [31]. Notably, all large dense models and Instructor-Large are instruction-tuned. Lastly, we include proprietary models from Cohere [14], Voyage [55], OpenAI [40], and Google(1.2B) [28]. We provide details of each model in § A.1. Following prior work [52, 6, 54], we use nDCG@10 as the main metric.

### 4.2 Main results

**Existing retrieval systems perform poorly on BRIGHT.** Results in Table 2 show that **BRIGHT** is very challenging, with the best model achieving only 22.1 nDCG@10. Although BM25 matches the < 1B models, it significantly underperforms larger models. This suggests that traditional keyword matching (“level 1 search”) is insufficient for **BRIGHT**. Although larger models that have been trained on semantic-based retrieval datasets like MS MARCO (Figure 1), such as GritLM [37], perform better than BM25, they are still unable to solve **BRIGHT**. Proprietary models perform similarly to large open-source ones. Overall, the low performance indicates that the existing retrieval system cannot perform reasoning-intensive retrieval, and new methods are required to solve “level 3 search”.

**Querying with LLM reasoning steps improves performance.** One possible reason for the under-performance of current retrieval models on **BRIGHT** is the demanding reasoning process required. Given the strong reasoning capabilities of LLMs, we hypothesize that using LLM-generated reasoning




Figure 3: Average nDCG@10 score on BRIGHT when using the original query vs. reasoning steps generated by GritLM, Llama3-70B and GPT-4 for retrieval. Searching with LLM reasoning steps significantly improves performance. Surprisingly, BM25 achieves the best performance in the leaderboard using reasoning steps written by GPT-4 as new queries. Detailed scores are in Table 33 to 37.

Retriever	Reranker	$k$	nDCG@10
BM25	None	-	14.3
	MiniLM	10	13.1
	MiniLM	100	8.3
	Gemini	10	15.7
	GPT-4	10	17.4
	GPT-4	100	17.0
Google	None	-	19.5
	MiniLM	10	16.0
	MiniLM	100	9.4
	Gemini	10	20.1
	GPT-4	10	21.5
	GPT-4	100	22.6

Table 3: Average reranking performance on BRIGHT. We also include the retrieval results (reranker=None) for comparison. Detailed scores can be found in Table 40 and 41.

steps as queries can improve retrieval performance. To validate this hypothesis, we prompt LLMs to write reasoning steps given a query with the following prompt: “(1) Identify the essential problem in the post. (2) Think step by step to reason about what should be included in the relevant documents. (3) Draft an answer.”. We encourage LLMs to first understand the question by summarizing it, then use chain-of-thought reasoning [60] to identify relevant content, and finally write a candidate answer. We use these LLM reasoning steps as new queries to evaluate all retrieval models. We use GPT-4<sup>11</sup>, GritLM [37] and Llama-3-70B-Instruct<sup>12</sup> to generate reasoning steps. Figure 3 shows that using Llama-3-70B or GPT-4 reasoning steps as queries significantly improves performance compared to the original query (the detailed scores are in Tables 33 to 37). GritLM-generated reasoning steps improve BM25 performance but are less effective for other models likely due to having fewer parameters. Overall, BM25 improves the most, possibly because BM25 can adapt to different queries, while LLM-generated queries are out-of-distribution for trained models. With the best score still being below 30, significant room remains for improvement on BRIGHT.

## 5 Analysis

### 5.1 Reranking with LLMs enhances retrieval performance

A common approach for improving retrieval results is to utilize powerful rerankers capable of performing joint computation over both the query and the documents. To this end, we investigate if performance on BRIGHT can be improved through reranking. We test this with a classical cross-encoder, MiniLM<sup>13</sup>, and LLMs to rerank the top  $k = \{10, 100\}$  retrieved documents. The cross-encoder is trained on the MS MARCO reranking task and outputs a relevance score for each pair of query and document  $(Q, D_i)$ . Following Sun et al. [51], we also rerank with LLMs by including the query and top-k documents in the prompt and asking the LLMs to order the documents based on their relevance to the query (detailed prompts can be found in Table 42). Table 3 shows that the traditional cross-encoder negatively impacts retrieval quality, with performance declining as more documents are reranked, suggesting that training rerankers on MS MARCO does not transfer well to BRIGHT. On the other hand, reranking by LLMs generally enhances performance. Stronger LLMs provide more significant improvements; for instance, based on BM25 retrieval results, Gemini (Gemini-1.0) reranking increases the score by 1.4, and GPT-4 reranking enhances by 3.1 and continues to improve with higher  $k$ . LLMs can serve as an effective tool for reasoning-intensive retrieval, but the final results still highly depend on the underlying retrieval system.

<sup>11</sup>[gpt-4-0125-preview](https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-0125-preview/)

<sup>12</sup><https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-70B-Instruct>

<sup>13</sup><https://huggingface.co/cross-encoder/ms-marco-MiniLM-L-12-v2>



## 5.2 Robustness against data leakage from pretraining

Many current evaluation benchmarks lead to overestimated performance improvements due to large-scale pretraining that accidentally includes benchmark data [71, 64]. In this subsection, we demonstrate that **BRIGHT** is robust to such leakage, even when the retrieving documents are fully seen during pretraining. We simulate a scenario where language models are trained on data crawled from the internet, which may include StackExchange data. Specifically, we continue training GritLM [37] on the data in the StackExchange retrieval pool from **BRIGHT** using language modeling loss. To maintain the retrieval ability of GritLM, we also train it with a contrastive learning objective on StackExchange question and answer pairs (more training details in Appendix A.3). This exposes all the StackExchange data from **BRIGHT** to the model, but omits direct training on the mappings between queries and documents, which require intensive reasoning to resolve and do not naturally occur during pretraining. Table 4 shows a slight decrease in the average results of fine-tuned GritLM, indicating that the current data formats and training procedures may not significantly impact performance in **BRIGHT**. This indicates that **BRIGHT** is robust to data leakage from large-scale pretraining and calls for novel approaches to improve reasoning-intensive retrieval.

Table 4: **BRIGHT is robust to massive pre-training.** By continuing training GritLM on StackExchange data without showing the mapping between queries and documents, the model does not improve the average performance after learning the in-domain knowledge, indicating the importance of reasoning capabilities in the retrieval process.

	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Avg.
GritLM	25.0	32.8	19.0	19.9	17.3	11.6	18.0	20.5
Fine-tuned GritLM	21.1	25.5	18.8	30.7	12.7	12.1	21.9	20.4

## 5.3 Long-context retrieval with a reduced search space is challenging

Retrieving information from long documents is crucial for applications such as legal contracts, company financial documents, and patient notes [45, 72]. To evaluate retrieval models on reasoning-intensive tasks involving lengthy documents, we convert the StackExchange datasets to a long-context retrieval setting, where documents are complete web pages with significantly more tokens but fewer total number of documents (Table 39). With most datasets containing only a few hundred documents, nDCG@10, which evaluates the top 10 results, becomes more susceptible to randomness. Moreover, processing 10 long documents with an average length of up to 40,000 tokens is challenging for both humans and LLMs. Therefore, we decide to use recall@1 metric to provide a more reliable measure in this setting. Table 5 presents the average scores for 8 datasets from StackExchange and Pony. The highest recall achieved is 27.8, indicating that even with significantly reduced retrieval pools, the combination of long-context documents and intensive reasoning remains challenging for existing retrieval models.

Table 5: **Long-context retrieval performance where retrievers retrieve from unsplit web pages.** The results are reported as the average recall@1 score of StackExchange and Pony datasets. More detailed numbers can be found in Table 38.

BM25	BGE	Inst-L	SBERT	E5	SFR	Inst-XL	GritLM	Qwen	Cohere	OpenAI	Voyage	Google
11.4	14.8	18.2	17.4	25.5	26.0	17.8	26.0	27.8	18.4	21.9	24.6	22.4

## 6 Conclusion

We introduce **BRIGHT**, the first retrieval benchmark that encompasses realistic retrieval scenarios requiring intensive reasoning steps to identify relevant documents. We utilize existing online document structures and dedicate substantial human effort to curate **BRIGHT** and verify its correctness. Through extensive evaluation, we find that existing retrieval models perform extremely poorly on **BRIGHT**, with a maximum nDCG@10 score of only 22.1. Augmenting retrieval queries with reasoning steps generated by LLMs improves performance, but even the best model still achieves a score below 30. In future work, we plan to explore approaches to develop efficient reasoning-enhanced retrieval models. We anticipate that **BRIGHT** will contribute to future research investigations to push the state-of-the-art in this direction.

## Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

We thank Qilin Liao, Yun Han, Xiaoru Teng, Cong Gao, Shengyu Wang, Xiaodong Wei, and Yan Pan for annotating and reviewing the datasets. We would also like to thank Kenny Huang for his helpful discussions on collecting data from the AoPS Wiki.

## References

- [1] Akari Asai, Timo Schick, Patrick Lewis, Xilun Chen, Gautier Izacard, Sebastian Riedel, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. [Task-aware Retrieval with Instructions](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 3650–3675, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. [Self-RAG: Learning to Retrieve, Generate, and Critique through Self-Reflection](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [3] Akari Asai, Zexuan Zhong, Danqi Chen, Pang Wei Koh, Luke Zettlemoyer, Hanna Hajishirzi, and Wen tau Yih. 2020. [Reliable, adaptable, and attributable language models with retrieval](#). 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:268248911>. Oprea, and Colin Raffel. [Extracting training data from large language models](#). In *USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX)*.
- [4] Akari Asai, Zexuan Zhong, Danqi Chen, Pang Wei Koh, Luke Zettlemoyer, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Wen tau Yih. 2024. [Reliable, Adaptable, and Attributable Language Models with Retrieval](#).
- [5] Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, et al. 2021. [Program synthesis with large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07732*.
- [6] Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Alina Stoica, Saurabh Tiwary, and Tong Wang. 2018. [MS MARCO: A Human Generated MACHine Reading COMprehension Dataset](#).
- [7] Yonatan Bisk, Rowan Zellers, Ronan Le Bras, Jianfeng Gao, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [PIQA: Reasoning about Physical Commonsense in Natural Language](#). In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [8] Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, Diego De Las Casas, Aurelia Guy, Jacob Menick, Roman Ring, Tom Hennigan, Saffron Huang, Loren Maggiore, Chris Jones, Albin Cassirer, Andy Brock, Michela Paganini, Geoffrey Irving, Oriol Vinyals, Simon Osindero, Karen Simonyan, Jack Rae, Erich Elsen, and Laurent Sifre. 2022. [Improving Language Models by Retrieving from Trillions of Tokens](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 162, pages 2206–2240.
- [9] Danqi Chen, Adam Fisch, Jason Weston, and Antoine Bordes. 2017. [Reading Wikipedia to Answer Open-Domain Questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1870–1879, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. 2021. [Evaluating large language models trained on code](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- [11] Wenhua Chen, Ming Yin, Max Ku, Pan Lu, Yixin Wan, Xueguang Ma, Jianyu Xu, Xinyi Wang, and Tony Xia. 2023. [Theoremqa: A theorem-driven question answering dataset](#). In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- [12] Wenhua Chen, Ming Yin, Max Ku, Pan Lu, Yixin Wan, Xueguang Ma, Jianyu Xu, Xinyi Wang, and Tony Xia. 2023. [TheoremQA: A Theorem-driven Question Answering Dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7889–7901, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- [13] Karl Cobbe, Vineet Kosaraju, Mohammad Bavarian, Mark Chen, Heewoo Jun, Lukasz Kaiser, Matthias Plappert, Jerry Tworek, Jacob Hilton, Reiichiro Nakano, Christopher Hesse, and John Schulman. 2021. [Training Verifiers to Solve Math Word Problems](#).
- [14] Cohere. 2022. [Cohere-embed-english-light-v3.0](#).
- [15] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, and Ellen M. Voorhees. 2020. [Overview of the TREC 2019 deep learning track](#).
- [16] Tri Dao. 2024. [FlashAttention-2: Faster Attention with Better Parallelism and Work Partitioning](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [17] Tri Dao, Daniel Y. Fu, Stefano Ermon, Atri Rudra, and Christopher Ré. 2022. [FlashAttention: Fast and Memory-Efficient Exact Attention with IO-Awareness](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- [18] Thomas Diggelmann, Jordan Boyd-Graber, Jannis Bulian, Massimiliano Ciaramita, and Markus Leippold. 2020. [Climate-fever: A dataset for verification of real-world climate claims](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.00614*.
- [19] Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. [ELI5: Long form question answering](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.09190*.
- [20] Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. [Enabling Large Language Models to Generate Text with Citations](#). In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- [21] Faegheh Hasibi, Fedor Nikolaev, Chenyan Xiong, Krisztian Balog, Svein Erik Bratsberg, Alexander Kotov, and Jamie Callan. 2017. [DBpedia-entity v2: a test collection for entity search](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1265–1268.
- [22] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring Mathematical Problem Solving With the MATH Dataset](#). In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*.
- [23] Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2019. [CodeSearchNet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09436*.
- [24] Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. [Unsupervised Dense Information Retrieval with Contrastive Learning](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- [25] Naman Jain, King Han, Alex Gu, Wen-Ding Li, Fanjia Yan, Tianjun Zhang, Sida Wang, Armando Solar-Lezama, Koushik Sen, and Ion Stoica. 2024. [LiveCodeBench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07974*.
- [26] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906*.
- [27] Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, et al. 2019. [Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:453–466.
- [28] Jinhyuk Lee, Zhuyun Dai, Xiaoqi Ren, Blair Chen, Daniel Cer, Jeremy R Cole, Kai Hui, Michael Boratko, Rajvi Kapadia, Wen Ding, et al. 2024. [Gecko: Versatile text embeddings distilled from large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20327*.
- [29] Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [Latent Retrieval for Weakly Supervised Open Domain Question Answering](#). In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 6086–6096.

- [30] Guohao Li, Hasan Abed Al Kader Hammoud, Hani Itani, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Bernard Ghanem. 2023. CAMEL: Communicative Agents for "Mind" Exploration of Large Language Model Society. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [31] Zehan Li, Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, and Meishan Zhang. 2023. Towards general text embeddings with multi-stage contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03281*.
- [32] Wang Ling, Dani Yogatama, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2017. [Program Induction by Rationale Generation: Learning to Solve and Explain Algebraic Word Problems](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 158–167, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [33] Macedo Maia, Siegfried Handschuh, André Freitas, Brian Davis, Ross McDermott, Manel Zarrouk, and Alexandra Balahur. 2018. Www’18 open challenge: financial opinion mining and question answering. In *Companion proceedings of the the web conference 2018*, pages 1941–1942.
- [34] Rui Meng, Ye Liu, Shafiq Rayhan Joty, Caiming Xiong, Yingbo Zhou, and Semih Yavuz. 2024. Sfembedding-mistral: enhance text retrieval with transfer learning. *Salesforce AI Research Blog*, 3.
- [35] Niklas Muennighoff. 2022. Sgpt: Gpt sentence embeddings for semantic search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.08904*.
- [36] Niklas Muennighoff, Qian Liu, Armel Zebaze, Qinkai Zheng, Binyuan Hui, Terry Yue Zhuo, Swayam Singh, Xiangru Tang, Leandro Von Werra, and Shayne Longpre. 2023. Octopack: Instruction tuning code large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.07124*.
- [37] Niklas Muennighoff, Hongjin Su, Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, Tao Yu, Amanpreet Singh, and Douwe Kiela. 2024. Generative representational instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09906*.
- [38] Niklas Muennighoff, Nouamane Tazi, Loic Magne, and Nils Reimers. 2023. [MTEB: Massive Text Embedding Benchmark](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2014–2037, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [39] Hanseok Oh, Hyunji Lee, Seonghyeon Ye, Haebin Shin, Hansol Jang, Changwook Jun, and Minjoon Seo. 2024. [INSTRUCTIR: A Benchmark for Instruction Following of Information Retrieval Models](#).
- [40] OpenAI. 2024. [New embedding models and API updates](#).
- [41] Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vladimir Karpukhin, Jean Maillard, Vassilis Plachouras, Tim Rocktäschel, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [KILT: a Benchmark for Knowledge Intensive Language Tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2523–2544, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [42] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- [43] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.10084*.
- [44] Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- [45] Jon Saad-Falcon, Daniel Y Fu, Simran Arora, Neel Guha, and Christopher Ré. 2024. Benchmarking and Building Long-Context Retrieval Models with LoCo and M2-BERT. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07440*.

- [46] Maarten Sap, Hannah Rashkin, Derek Chen, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [Social IQa: Commonsense Reasoning about Social Interactions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 4463–4473, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [47] Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen tau Yih. 2024. REPLUG: Retrieval-Augmented Black-Box Language Models.
- [48] Hongjin Su, Shuyang Jiang, Yuhang Lai, Haoyuan Wu, Boao Shi, Che Liu, Qian Liu, and Tao Yu. 2024. ARKS: Active Retrieval in Knowledge Soup for Code Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12317*.
- [49] Hongjin Su, Weijia Shi, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Yushi Hu, Mari Ostendorf, Wen-tau Yih, Noah A Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. 2022. One embedder, any task: Instruction-finetuned text embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09741*.
- [50] Hongjin Su, Weijia Shi, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Yushi Hu, Mari Ostendorf, Wen-tau Yih, Noah A. Smith, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Tao Yu. 2023. [One Embedder, Any Task: Instruction-Finetuned Text Embeddings](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1102–1121, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [51] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Xinyu Ma, Pengjie Ren, Dawei Yin, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Is chatgpt good at search? investigating large language models as re-ranking agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.09542*.
- [52] Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Beir: A heterogenous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08663*.
- [53] James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. FEVER: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and VERification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05355*.
- [54] Ellen M. Voorhees and Dawn M. Tice. 2000. [Building a question answering test collection](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '00*, page 200–207, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [55] Voyage AI. 2024. [Embeddings](#).
- [56] David Wadden, Shanchuan Lin, Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, Madeleine van Zuylen, Arman Cohan, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2020. Fact or fiction: Verifying scientific claims. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14974*.
- [57] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Linjun Yang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2023. Improving Text Embeddings with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00368*.
- [58] Xiaoyue Wang, Jianyou Wang, Weili Cao, Kaicheng Wang, Ramamohan Paturi, and Leon Bergen. 2024. BIRCO: A Benchmark of Information Retrieval Tasks with Complex Objectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14151*.
- [59] Zengzhi Wang, Rui Xia, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. [Generative AI for Math: Part I – MathPile: A Billion-Token-Scale Pretraining Corpus for Math](#).
- [60] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- [61] Orion Weller, Benjamin Chang, Sean MacAvaney, Kyle Lo, Arman Cohan, Benjamin Van Durme, Dawn Lawrie, and Luca Soldaini. 2024. FollowIR: Evaluating and Teaching Information Retrieval Models to Follow Instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15246*.

- [62] Chenghao Xiao, G Thomas Hudson, and Noura Al Moubayed. 2024. [RAR-b: Reasoning as Retrieval Benchmark](#).
- [63] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2023. [C-Pack: Packaged Resources To Advance General Chinese Embedding](#).
- [64] Ruijie Xu, Zengzhi Wang, Run-Ze Fan, and Pengfei Liu. 2024. Benchmarking benchmark leakage in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18824*.
- [65] Kaiyu Yang, Aidan M. Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan Prenger, and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. [LeanDojo: Theorem Proving with Retrieval-Augmented Language Models](#).
- [66] Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*.
- [67] Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Keming Lu, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. [Scaling Relationship on Learning Mathematical Reasoning with Large Language Models](#).
- [68] Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. 2023. [MAmmoTH: Building Math Generalist Models through Hybrid Instruction Tuning](#).
- [69] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2019. [HellaSwag: Can a Machine Really Finish Your Sentence?](#) In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4791–4800, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [70] Hugh Zhang, Jeff Da, Dean Lee, Vaughn Robinson, Catherine Wu, Will Song, Tiffany Zhao, Pranav Raja, Dylan Slack, Qin Lyu, et al. 2024. A careful examination of large language model performance on grade school arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00332*.
- [71] Kun Zhou, Yutao Zhu, Zhipeng Chen, Wentong Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Jiawei Han. 2023. Don’t Make Your LLM an Evaluation Benchmark Cheater. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01964*.
- [72] Dawei Zhu, Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Yifan Song, Wenhao Wu, Furu Wei, and Sujian Li. 2024. [LongEmbed: Extending Embedding Models for Long Context Retrieval](#).

## Checklist

1. For all authors...
  - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope? [\[Yes\]](#)
  - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix G
  - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix H
  - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [\[Yes\]](#)
2. If you are including theoretical results...
  - (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [\[N/A\]](#)
  - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [\[N/A\]](#)
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
  - (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [\[Yes\]](#) The code, data, and instructions will be in the supplemental materials
  - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix A
  - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [\[No\]](#) Our experiments on open-sourced models are deterministic, and it is expensive to run with large language models like GPT-4 multiple times.
  - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix A.2
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
  - (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [\[Yes\]](#) We establish the code and data from scratch, and cite every model evaluated in this paper.
  - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix A.1
  - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [\[Yes\]](#) We create a new benchmark and code base, which will be in the supplementary materials
  - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you’re using/curating? [\[No\]](#) All the models used in the paper allow research use
  - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix E.5
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...
  - (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [\[Yes\]](#) In Appendix F
  - (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [\[N/A\]](#)
  - (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [\[N/A\]](#)

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>3</b>

<b>3</b>	<b>The BRIGHT Benchmark</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Task formulation . . . . .	3
3.2	StackExchange: Retrieving web pages that help answer questions . . . . .	4
3.3	Coding: Retrieving documentation or similar solved problems . . . . .	5
3.4	Theorem-based questions: Retrieving solved questions with same techniques . . . . .	6
3.5	Theorem-based questions: Retrieving theorems . . . . .	6
<b>4</b>	<b>Experiments</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1	Experimental setup . . . . .	7
4.2	Main results . . . . .	7
<b>5</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1	Reranking with LLMs enhances retrieval performance . . . . .	8
5.2	Robustness against data leakage from pretraining . . . . .	9
5.3	Long-context retrieval with a reduced search space is challenging . . . . .	9
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Experiment Details</b>	<b>18</b>
A.1	Models and Instructions . . . . .	18
A.2	Machines . . . . .	18
A.3	Continual Training . . . . .	19
<b>B</b>	<b>Dataset Construction</b>	<b>20</b>
B.1	STEM question and solution corpus for TheoremQA and AoPS . . . . .	20
B.2	TheoremQA: Rephrasing questions into specific scenarios . . . . .	20
B.3	TheoremQA: Annotating relevant theorems . . . . .	21
B.4	AoPS: Connecting AoPS problems to the MATH dataset . . . . .	21
B.5	LeetCode . . . . .	21
<b>C</b>	<b>Data Examples</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Case Study: Retrieving Relevant Examples Improves Model Performance</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Dataset annotation</b>	<b>24</b>
E.1	Human annotators . . . . .	24
E.2	LLM usage . . . . .	24
E.3	Passage split . . . . .	25
E.4	False positive and false negative . . . . .	25
E.5	Sensitive information . . . . .	25
<b>F</b>	<b>Annotator instructions</b>	<b>25</b>
F.1	StackExchange . . . . .	25



---

F.2	TheoremQA . . . . .	25
F.3	AoPS . . . . .	26
F.4	LeetCode . . . . .	26
<b>G</b>	<b>Limitations and Future Work</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>Potential social impacts</b>	<b>26</b>

## A Experiment Details

### A.1 Models and Instructions

For each model used in this paper, Table 6 provides information on the size, architecture, maximum context length of queries and documents, whether we include instructions and the specific version we use in the experiments. All parameters are set by following the official tutorial. The only exceptions are Inst-L and Inst-XL, where we empirically find that extending the maximum context length to 2048 significantly enhances the performance. In Table 7, 8, 9 and 10, We specify the instructions used for BGE, Inst-L, Inst-XL, E5, GritLM, Qwen and SFR in each dataset. For the embedding model from Google, we use the parameter "task" with the values "RETRIEVAL\_QUERY" and "RETRIEVAL\_DOCUMENT" to distinguish queries from documents and use the parameter "input\_type" with the values "query" and "document" for the embedding model from Voyage.

Table 6: **All 13 models benchmarked in experiments.** We report the number of parameters of each model except the sparse model BM25 and proprietary models without public information. Regarding the model architecture, we distinguish between sparse and dense models and further classify dense models as encoders or decoders if known. Max  $|Q|$  and Max  $|D|$  denote the maximum context length we use for each model in the experiments. The instruction column indicates whether we include instructions in the retrieval. The version column denotes the specific checkpoint or implementation.

	Size	Architecture	Max $ Q $	Max $ D $	Instruction	Version	License
<i>Sparse model</i>							
BM25 [44]	N/A	Sparse	$\infty$	$\infty$	No	gensim <sup>14</sup>	LGPL-2.1-only
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>							
SBERT [43]	109M	Encoder	512	512	No	all-mpnet-base-v2	Apache-2.0
BGE [63]	335M	Encoder	512	512	No	bge-large-en-v1.5	MIT
Inst-L [49]	335M	Encoder	2048	2048	Yes	instructor-large	Apache-2.0
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>							
Inst-XL [49]	1.5B	Encoder	2048	2048	Yes	instructor-xl	Apache-2.0
E5 [57]	7.1B	Decoder	4096	4096	Yes	e5-mistral-7b-instruct	MIT
GritLM [37]	7.1B	Decoder	256	2048	Yes	GritLM-7B	Apache-2.0
SFR [34]	7.1B	Decoder	4096	4096	Yes	SFR-Embedding-Mistral	CC-BY-NC-4.0
Qwen [31]	7.7B	Decoder	8192	8192	Yes	gte-Qwen1.5-7B-instruct	Apache-2.0
<i>Proprietary models</i>							
Cohere [14]	N/A	Dense	512	512	No	Cohere-embed-english-v3.0	Company
Google [28]	1.2B	Dense	2000	2000	Yes	text-embedding-preview-0409, dimension=768	Company
OpenAI [40]	N/A	Dense	8191	8191	No	text-embedding-3-large	Company
Voyage [55]	N/A	Dense	16000	16000	Yes	voyage-large-2-instruct	Company

Table 7: **Instructions used for benchmarking StackExchange datasets.** {domain} is one of Biology, Earth Science, Economics, Psychology, Robotics, Stack Overflow and Sustainable Living.

Models	Instructions
BGE	<b>Query:</b> Represent this {domain} post for searching relevant passages:
Inst-L, Inst-XL	<b>Query:</b> Represent the {domain} post for retrieving relevant paragraphs: <b>Doc:</b> Represent the {domain} paragraph for retrieval:
E5, GritLM, Qwen, SFR	<b>Query:</b> Given a {domain} post, retrieve relevant passages that help answer the post

### A.2 Machines

We run all experiments on NVIDIA V100, A100, or H100 GPUs. The amount of time that it takes to complete one round of experiments is dependent on the model. For the sparse model, BM25, the evaluation takes less than 1 hour on CPU-only machines. For the open-sourced dense models (< 1B), the evaluation requires about 8 hours on one H100 GPU. For the open-sourced dense models

Table 8: **Instructions used for benchmarking the LeetCode dataset.**

Models	Instructions
BGE	<b>Query:</b> Represent this Coding problem for searching relevant examples:
Inst-L, Inst-XL	<b>Query:</b> Represent the Coding problem for retrieving relevant examples: <b>Doc:</b> Represent the Coding example for retrieval:
E5, GritLM, Qwen, SFR	<b>Query:</b> Given a Coding problem, retrieve relevant examples that help answer the problem

Table 9: **Instructions used for benchmarking the Pony dataset.**

Models	Instructions
BGE	<b>Query:</b> Represent this Pony question for searching relevant passages:
Inst-L, Inst-XL	<b>Query:</b> Represent the Pony question for retrieving relevant paragraphs: <b>Doc:</b> Represent the Pony paragraph for retrieval:
E5, GritLM, Qwen, SFR	<b>Query:</b> Given a Pony question, retrieve relevant passages that help answer the question

Table 10: **Instructions used for benchmarking Math datasets (AoPS and TheoremQA).**

Models	Instructions
BGE	<b>Query:</b> Represent this Math problem for searching relevant examples:
Inst-L, Inst-XL	<b>Query:</b> Represent the Math problem for retrieving relevant examples: <b>Doc:</b> Represent the Math example for retrieval:
E5, GritLM, Qwen, SFR	<b>Query:</b> Given a Math problem, retrieve relevant examples that help answer the problem

(> 1B), the evaluation takes up to 36 hours on one H100 GPU. We leverage FlashAttention [17, 16] for speedup when evaluating the dense models. For the proprietary models, the evaluation speed is dependent on the API bandwidth, but we found that one round of experiments can be completed within 2 days.

### A.3 Continual Training

In Section 5.2, we introduce the continual training method GritLM on StackExchange data to evaluate whether training on in-domain data enhances the performance of **BRIGHT**. Detailed experimental settings are described in this section. Specifically, we follow GritLM to train models with two distinct objectives: a contrastive loss to maintain the model’s retrieval capability and a language modeling loss to preserve the model’s language generation ability. For training with the contrastive loss, we collect 3,200 (post, answer) pairs from the Biology, Earth Science, Economics, Psychology, Robotics, and Stack Overflow sections of StackExchange, and 1,538 pairs from Sustainable Living. Each post’s answer is used as a positive example, with other answers serving as in-batch negatives. For training with the language modeling loss, we use both positive and negative documents from each domain within the StackExchange subsection of **BRIGHT**. These documents are split into chunks of 2048 tokens, and we sample up to 3,200 chunks for training. We use a small batch size of 64 to ensure sufficient learning steps, while following the other hyperparameters as outlined in Muennighoff et al. [37]. We continue training GritLM for 10 epochs, benchmarking the checkpoint from each epoch on the StackExchange datasets of **BRIGHT**. The detailed scores are in Table 11, where we copy the scores of GritLM to epoch=0 for easier reference. The results indicate no significant improvement across the 10 epochs, suggesting that even with intensive inclusion of StackExchange data or relevant domain knowledge in the training data of language models or retrievers, performance may not increase substantially without enhancing incorporating reasoning into the retrieval process.

<sup>14</sup>Specifically, we use the LuceneBM25Model from `gensim` and the text analyzer from `pyserini`

Table 11: **Scores of finetuned GritLM of every epoch on StackExchange datasets of BRIGHT.** Epoch=0 indicates the performance of GritLM without further training.

Epoch	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Avg.
0 (GritLM)	25.0	32.8	19.0	19.9	17.3	11.6	18.0	20.5
1	22.2	25.4	17.6	28.1	11.1	9.8	19.6	19.1
2	18.7	23.8	13.5	19.3	10.7	10.2	16.5	16.1
3	20.9	23.6	16.9	25.2	11.1	8.5	16.6	17.5
4	24.3	28.0	18.3	26.9	13.4	13.3	20.0	20.6
5	23.1	28.5	18.4	26.1	14.6	11.7	21.6	20.6
6	19.9	26.4	16.0	27.9	9.6	9.3	19.3	18.3
7	24.3	25.4	16.5	28.1	11.0	9.8	17.0	18.9
8	21.6	28.7	19.2	28.7	11.1	11.8	22.4	20.5
9	21.3	29.0	20.0	28.7	11.4	14.3	22.0	21.0
10	21.1	25.5	18.8	30.7	12.7	12.1	21.9	20.4

## B Dataset Construction

### B.1 STEM question and solution corpus for TheoremQA and AoPS

In this subsection, we describe the construction of the STEM question and solution corpus, which is used for both TheoremQA Questions and AoPS. We source the documents (pairs of problem statements and solutions)  $D_i = (Q_i, A_i)$  from existing datasets—GSM8K [13], GSM8K-RFT [67], MATH [22], AQuA-RAT [32], TheoremQA [12], and CAMEL-Math [30]. To reduce the likelihood of false negatives among the STEM corpus, we leverage the metadata from the original datasets to exclude specific documents from the corpus for each test query. For example, CAMEL-Math contains problem-solution pairs labeled with the category “Calculus”, which covers different questions that involve derivatives and integrals. Therefore, for queries in TheoremQA that uses “derivative chain rule” or “integral rules”, we excluded CAMEL-Math pairs in the category “Calculus” to reduce possible false negatives. Thus, for each test query in TheoremQA-Q and AoPS, we manually decide which labels in the other datasets to exclude based on the metadata. We do not exclude any problem-solution pairs from GS8K, GSM8K-RFT, or AQuA-RAT due to the relative elementary difficulty (mostly basic algebra questions) in comparison to our test queries, which leverages more advanced theorems and techniques. The mapping from the test query category to the excluded problem-solution categories can be found in Table 13, 14, and 15.

An alternative approach to excluding false negatives from the corpus for each test query is to inspect every problem-solution pair and annotate if they are relevant to test query. Although this would yield harder negatives and additional positives, we opt to not to use this approach due to its expensive cost to conduct annotation between every test query and possible candidates.

### B.2 TheoremQA: Rephrasing questions into specific scenarios

TheoremQA is a dataset consisting of theorem-driven questions in mathematics, physics, finance, and computer science and electrical engineering [12]. For each question in TheoremQA, we refer it to MathInstruct dataset<sup>15</sup> [68], as each question in this dataset is annotated with the reasoning steps and final answers.

From preliminary analysis, we found that TheoremQA questions are often written in a way such that the theorem used to solve the problem is explicitly mentioned in the question. As a result, questions that use the same theorem can have high keyword overlap, which means retrievers can easily retrieve the correct document by matching the keywords. Thus, we rewrite the questions in TheoremQA by grounding them in real-world scenarios or applications, which makes the reasoning steps less explicit and provides more diverse questions. We leverage GPT-4 with manually written instructions and in-context demonstrations to rewrite the queries  $Q$ . We provide the prompt used to rewrite TheoremQA questions and an example in Table 12. After rewriting the question, the authors manually inspect each rewritten question to ensure that the question is solvable and consistent with the original

<sup>15</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/TIGER-Lab/MathInstruct>

question (i.e., the reasoning steps and final answer still hold). When applicable, we manually edit the rewritten question to improve the fluency and coherence of the question, and discard the query if the rewritten question is not solvable or consistent with the original question. Consequently, we obtain 206 rewritten questions in TheoremQA from the original set of 800 questions.

### B.3 TheoremQA: Annotating relevant theorems

For TheoremQA-Theorems, we use the test queries from TheoremQA-Questions and annotate them with useful theorem proofs and definitions. We source mathematical theorem proofs and definitions from ProofWiki, which is community-driven effort with more than 20K formal definitions and proofs of mathematical theorems. ProofWiki is preprocessed and provided by MathPile [59]. We opt to map the original theorem names to the documents in ProofWiki so that the gold documents have consistent forms with other documents in the corpus.

For each test query, we first construct a candidate set of useful documents from ProofWiki using the theorem name and definition provided by the original TheoremQA dataset. Specifically, we construct the candidate set with the following steps:

1. Find documents where the theorem name exists as a substring. We discard this set if there are more than 100 such documents, which typically means that the theorem name is too common.
2. Using the theorem name and definition from the original dataset as the query, we use BM25 to retrieve the top  $k = 10$  documents from ProofWiki.

Then, we prompt GPT-4 (gpt-4-0125-preview) to check if each document’s described theorem are used in the problem solutions, which labels each candidate as either a positive or negative document. The prompt for this step can be found in Table 16. The authors manually annotated 50 instances and found a substantial agreement of Cohen’s  $\kappa = 0.62$  with the model judgments. Finally, we keep test queries with at least one positive document.

### B.4 AoPS: Connecting AoPS problems to the MATH dataset

AoPS Wiki is a community-driven platform where users can post problems and solutions to math competition problems. These math competitions include, but are not limited to the American Mathematics Competitions (AMC), the American Invitational Mathematics Examination (AIME), and the International Mathematical Olympiad (IMO). In addition to problems, the AoPS Wiki also contains articles on various topics in mathematics, such as Fermat’s Little Theorem and Ball and Urns. These articles not only describe the theorem or technique but also link to problems that can be solved by them. We browse the AoPS Wiki and collect the topics and the linked problems. The topics are listed in Table 17.

Although math competition problems are used in previous datasets, such as MATH [22], they lack the necessary annotations on the problem-solving skills to construct positive documents. Thus, we opt to collect these annotations from AoPS Wiki instead.

Furthermore, since MATH examples are used in the STEM corpus, we deduplicate them by matching the collected problems with the MATH instances. Specifically, for each question  $Q$  we collected from AoPS, we find the closest problem statement in MATH using n-gram overlap, and manually check if they are the same problem. If the same problems are found, we merge them into one instance, otherwise, we create a new instance and insert it into the corpus.

### B.5 LeetCode

We first obtain the publicly available LeetCode<sup>16</sup> questions from HuggingFace<sup>17</sup>. Our retrieval pool is sourced from a combination of LeetCode and CodeSearchNet, including a problem description and a solution in each example. In the following sections, we outline the process for constructing positive examples and performing additional checks to minimize the likelihood of false negatives while ensuring the use of a large retrieval pool.

<sup>16</sup><https://leetcode.com/>

<sup>17</sup><https://huggingface.co/datasets/greengr0ng/leetcode>

**Using similar questions as positive examples.** For each question, we obtain the gold pair annotations from the “Similar Questions” field, which contains links to other LeetCode questions that are similar to the problem. While the website does not explicitly describe the guidelines behind how this field is populated, our qualitative analysis showed that these questions have a high overlap in terms of the data structure, algorithms, and/or logical reasoning used to solve the problem.

**Select problems based on real-world scenarios to avoid false negatives from CodeSearchNet.** From a preliminary qualitative analysis, we discovered that some questions in LeetCode are frequently found in CodeSearchNet due to the popularity of certain algorithms and the simplicity of their problem statements. Examples include implementing sorting algorithms or merging two linked lists, which could unexpectedly introduce false positives into this retrieval setup. Thus, we use an additional filtering step—we only keep questions that are grounded in real-world concepts that are not as commonly used in the context of coding problems. The intuition behind this is similar to the TheoremQA annotations process: the reasoning steps (i.e., the algorithms and data structures used to solve the problem) cannot be as easily deciphered as if the problem statement clearly describes the algorithm and data structure used. To this end, we first manually write instructions with six-shot in-context learning demonstrations, and use GPT-4 (gpt-4-0125-preview) to classify all LeetCode questions. Then, we validate the GPT-4 judgment with 80 annotations by the authors. Authors’ and GPT-4’s annotations have a Cohen’s kappa of 0.73, which suggests substantial agreement. The prompt used in this step and examples can be found in Table 18. GPT-4 judged a total of 291 samples of being grounded in real-world concepts, and we randomly sample 142 questions from this set to construct our test set.

**Remove examples with high topic overlap from the pool to avoid false negatives in LeetCode.** To avoid potential false negatives that are not annotated by the LeetCode website, we leverage the “Topics” field from the website, which contains information about the algorithms and data structure used in the problem, such as “stack” and “breadth first search”. For each question  $Q$ , we collect its topics  $T(Q) = \{t_q^1, \dots, t_q^m\}$  from the LeetCode website, where  $t_q$  denotes the  $m \geq 1$  different topics assigned to the question by the website. Since each question may have multiple tags, we exclude other questions that have a high overlap with test questions from the corpus for that specific question. Specifically, we exclude question  $Q'$  from the corpus for test query  $Q$  if  $\frac{|T(Q) \cap T(Q')|}{|T(Q)|} \geq 0.5$ , because more than half of the topics used in  $Q'$  are also used in  $Q$ . This means that the two questions can be highly related in reasoning steps. Overlap smaller than the 0.5 threshold means that  $Q'$  is unlikely to be related, and thus a false negative, to the test question  $Q$ . Finally, we construct the rest of the corpus from CodeSearchNet [23]<sup>18</sup>. We only consider the Python functions as the solutions to the LeetCode questions are all in Python.

## C Data Examples

In Table 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30, we show more examples in **BRIGHT**.

## D Case Study: Retrieving Relevant Examples Improves Model Performance

**BRIGHT** is designed to meet users’ needs to retrieve documents that are intrinsically relevant to the query beyond simple semantic matching. Besides serving users with retrieved documents, these documents can also be used as context for language models to provide an answer to the query directly, known as retrieval augmented generation (RAG). While our work focuses on evaluating retrieval performance, we also provide a case study in the RAG setting. This illustrates how annotated documents from **BRIGHT** can enhance the performance of language models to solve the query, whereas documents retrieved from state-of-the-art retrieval systems fail to do so.

We present an example from the TheoremQA dataset, where the query is a math problem that essentially requires using an integral rule to derive the original form of the function. Our gold positive example features a similar problem utilizing the same theorem. With this gold example as context, our model—gpt-4-0125-preview—successfully derives the correct solution, despite the surface differences between the gold positive example and the query. In contrast, the random example and the examples retrieved by BM25 and Qwen do not require the use of the integral rule; instead, they

<sup>18</sup>[https://huggingface.co/datasets/code\\_search\\_net](https://huggingface.co/datasets/code_search_net)

feature algebraic and combinatoric problems, respectively. With the retrieved example in the context, the model fails to derive the correct solution. This case study demonstrates that our gold annotation also has the potential to improve RAG performance by providing relevant examples. We will leave a systematic evaluation of RAG for future work.

Query (a math problem from TheoremQA)

You're tracking the growth of a plant from a seed. The rate at which the plant grows in height is equal to the square root of the number of days since you planted it. One day after the seed was first planted, the plant was 1 inch tall. How tall will the plant be after 4 days?

**Gold Positive Example:**  $\frac{dy}{dx} = \sqrt{t}, y(1) = 1$ . What is  $y(16)$ ?

To find  $y(4)$ , we need to solve the given differential equation and apply the initial condition  $y(1) = 1$ .

The given differential equation is:  $\frac{dy}{dx} = \sqrt{t}$

To solve this, we can integrate both sides with respect to  $t$ :

$$\int dy = \int \sqrt{t} dt$$

$$y(t) = (2/3)t^{(3/2)} + C$$

Now, we apply the initial condition  $y(1) = 1$ :

$$1 = (2/3)(1)^{(3/2)} + C$$

$$1 = 2/3 + C$$

$$C = 1/3$$

So, the solution to the differential equation is:  $y(t) = (2/3)t^{(3/2)} + 1/3$

Now, we can find  $y(16)$ :

$$y(4) = (2/3)(16)^{(3/2)} + 1/3$$

$$y(4) = (2/3)(64) + 1/3$$

$$y(4) = 128/3 + 1/3$$

$$y(4) = 43$$

Therefore, the answer is 43.

**Model Output ✓:** The growth rate of the plant is given by the differential equation  $\frac{dy}{dx} = \sqrt{t}$ , with the initial condition  $y(1) = 1$ , which is exactly the same as the differential equation problem described above. Therefore, the solution process and the final solution apply here as well. We found that  $y(t) = (2/3)t^{(3/2)} + 1/3$ . To find the height of the plant after 4 days, we substitute  $t = 4$  into this equation.

$$y(4) = (2/3)(4)^{(3/2)} + 1/3 = 17/3$$

Therefore, the plant will be 17/3 inches tall after 4 days.

**Random Example:** What is the smallest positive integer that can be multiplied by 605 to make it a perfect square? Answer Choices: (A) 2 (B) 3 (C) 5 (D) 7 (E) 11

Let's reason about the multi-choice question.

605 is multiplied by 5 gives 3025

Its a square root of 55

The answer is 5 -Option C

**Model Output ✗:** The growth rate of the plant is equal to the square root of the number of days since it was planted. After 4 days, the height of the plant will be equal to the square root of 4, which is 2. Therefore, the plant will be 2 inches tall after 4 days.

**BM25 Example:** A basketball team has 12 players, including 5 guards and 7 forwards. How many different starting lineups can be formed that include 3 guards and 2 forwards?

To form a starting lineup with 3 guards and 2 forwards, we need to choose 3 guards from the 5 available guards and 2 forwards from the 7 available forwards. We can use the combination formula to calculate this:

Number of ways to choose 3 guards from 5 =  $C(5, 3) = 5!/(3! * (5 - 3)!) = 10$   
 Number of ways to choose 2 forwards from 7 =  $C(7, 2) = 7!/(2! * (7 - 2)!) = 21$   
 Now, we multiply the number of ways to choose guards and forwards to get the total number of different starting lineups:  
 Total starting lineups = 10 (ways to choose guards) \* 21 (ways to choose forwards) = 210  
 Therefore, the answer is 210.

**Model Output X:** To find the height of the plant after 4 days, we use the given rate of growth: the square root of the number of days since the plant was planted. Since the height of the plant is equal to the square root of the number of days, we just substitute 4 days into the formula:  
 Height after 4 days =  $\sqrt{4} = 2$  inches.  
 Thus, the plant will be 2 inches tall after 4 days.

**Qwen Example:** A basketball team has 10 players, but only 5 can play at a time. In how many ways can the coach choose the 5 players who will play in the starting lineup?

To determine the number of ways the coach can choose the 5 players for the starting lineup, we can use the combination formula. The combination formula is:

$$C(n, k) = n!/(k!(n - k)!)$$

where  $n$  is the total number of players (10 in this case),  $k$  is the number of players to choose (5 in this case), and  $!$  denotes the factorial function (e.g.,  $5! = 54321$ ).

So, we have:

$$C(10, 5) = 10!/(5!(10 - 5)!)$$

$$C(10, 5) = 10!/(5!5!)$$

Now, let's calculate the factorials:  $10! = 10987654321 = 3,628,800$

$5! = 54321 = 120$

**Model Output X:** To determine the height of the plant after 4 days, we use the given growth rate formula: the height of the plant is equal to the square root of the number of days since it was planted.

On day 1, the plant is 1 inch tall, which is consistent with the formula since the square root of 1 is 1.

To find out the height after 4 days, we substitute the number of days (4) into the square root formula:

$$\text{Height} = \sqrt{\text{days}} = \sqrt{4}$$

The square root of 4 is 2.

Thus, the plant will be 2 inches tall after 4 days.

## E Dataset annotation

### E.1 Human annotators

We introduce human annotators in **BRIGHT** data collection. For the StackExchange datasets, Hongjin Su annotated/adapted Economics, Sustainable Living, Psychology, Robotics and Pony; Han-yu Wang annotated Biology; Haisu Liu annotated Stack Overflow; Qilin Liao annotated Earth Science. In addition to the author review, we also invite domain experts (PhD students) to review the data: Yun Han reviews Sustainable Living, Xiaoru Teng reviews Psychology, Cong Gao reviews Economics, Shengyu Wang, Xiaodong Wei and Yan Pan review Biology.

For the TheoremQA dataset, three of the authors—Quan Shi, Zachary S. Siegel, and Michael Tang—manually checked the rewritten questions for consistency and solvability. For the AoPS dataset, Howard Yen, Quan Shi, Zachary S. Siegel, and Michael Tang browsed through the AoPS Wiki and collected the topics (i.e., the theorems and problem-solving techniques) and their respective problem statements and solutions. For the LeetCode dataset, Howard Yen labeled questions on whether they are grounded in real-world concepts for checking human-model agreement. More details are described in §B.5. All involved authors are undergraduate or graduate students in computer science.

### E.2 LLM usage

There is no specific procedure for the annotators to use LLMs. The LLMs serve a tool to help annotators understand queries and documents, i.e., whenever they fail to understand something, they ask LLMs for clarification, explanation, etc. They are also used to summarize the content of StackExchange posts for searching negative documents in Google for StackExchange. To diversify the search results, the annotator prompts LLMs with role-playing scenarios (e.g., as a biology student)



to generate keywords of the posts. The responses from LLMs are not included in any of **BRIGHT** datasets. Since the responses from LLMs are not guaranteed to be correct, the annotators always search for trustworthy sources to verify the information. The LLMs used in the annotation include ChatGPT<sup>19</sup>, GPT-4, and Claude-3.

### E.3 Passage split

To split web pages or long documents into smaller pieces of passages, we employ simple heuristics with separators like two new line symbols, "#" in markdown files without additional assumptions on file structures. Although this split may not be optimal for every document, it simulates the realistic setting where long documents are automatically processed without human or expert intervention.

### E.4 False positive and false negative

we discuss the rationale for avoiding false positives and false negatives in the data collection process. In StackExchange, the positive relevance between queries and documents is manually verified by annotators, with detailed reasoning traces to illustrate their thinking process. To avoid false negatives, the annotators only select a StackExchange post that clearly distinguishes from previously annotated examples in the same domain, e.g., different entities and semantic meanings in both posts and answers, etc. This ensures that no pair of examples share the same positive documents.

### E.5 Sensitive information

All the data in **BRIGHT** are manually collected, carefully verified, and reviewed to remove any personally identifiable information or offensive content.

## F Annotator instructions

In this section, we describe the instructions for annotators to collect data in **BRIGHT**.

### F.1 StackExchange

1. Browse posts from the newest to the oldest.
2. Discard posts without an answer accepted by the user or obtains more than 5 votes
3. Discard answers of posts without URL links.
4. For each link in the answer, write down the answers to: (1). why are the document and the post relevant; (2). what is the reasoning required to understand the relevance between the post and the document. If there answers are not possible, discard the link.
5. Use LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, etc.) to generate post keywords, or use the post title to search for web pages with large keyword or semantic overlap in Google. Search for at most 5 negative web pages per query.
6. Split every web page into small passages either by two newline symbols, "#" in markdown files or fixed-length tokens

### F.2 TheoremQA

In TheoremQA, the main task for the annotator is to check if the GPT-4 rewritten questions are valid. The specific instructions are as follows:

1. Read the rewritten question and determine if it is solvable.
2. If it is solvable, read the original question and solution, and determine if the rewritten question is consistent with the original question. That is, the same reasoning steps and the final answer should hold.
3. If it is also consistent, mark the question as valid, and make any minor edits to the problem statement (e.g., to improve grammar or fluency) as you see fit.

<sup>19</sup><https://chatgpt.com/>

4. If it is not solvable or not consistent, read the original question and solution, and correct the rewritten question if possible. If not, then discard the problem.

### F.3 AoPS

In AoPS, annotators are tasked to find questions from the AoPS Wiki and record the problems:

1. Browse through the AoPS Wiki and find topic/category pages (example 1, example 2).
2. Look through each page and find pages specific theorems or techniques that can be used to solve problems. The page should link to at least two competition problems (example 1, example 2).
3. Record the links of both the theorem/technique as well as the problem pages.

The annotators are assigned a category to look for theorems in to avoid overlaps, and the categories are {algebra, geometry, calculus, probability, number theory, other}. After all links are collected, we use a web scraper to collect the problem statement and solutions, and we manually check the quality of the scraped data.

### F.4 LeetCode

In LeetCode, annotators determine whether a question is grounded in real-world concepts. We give a similar instruction to the annotator as to GPT-4:

1. Read the problem statement carefully.
2. Categorize the question into one of three categories:
  - 0: The question is not grounded in any real-world concepts. The description only uses coding-specific terms, such as "linked list", "binary search", "palindrome", "sorting", etc..
  - 1: The question is not grounded in any real-world concepts or real-world concepts that are commonly used in the context of coding, such as needle in a haystack, strings/words, or a spiral matrix.
  - 2: The question is grounded in real-world concepts that are not commonly used in the context of coding, such as building height, planting trees, or games. It may still use some code-specific terms to specify the data structure involved.

## G Limitations and Future Work

One limitation of this work is that the judgment about relevance between queries and documents is subjective. Even if the StackExchange answers are accepted by the users or obtain high votes, it is not guaranteed that everyone will agree the referenced documents are relevant. Therefore, we may not expect human retrieval results to be exactly the same as our annotation.

Aside from retrieval, other embedding tasks such as clustering may also require reasoning. We have not addressed multi-modal settings in this paper, but they represent intriguing avenues for future exploration.

## H Potential social impacts

This paper presents a new retrieval benchmark that features relevance beyond lexical and semantic similarity and requires intensive reasoning to solve. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, e.g., improving search algorithms, fostering better information access, developing more advanced retrieval models, etc. It could also promote collaboration among researchers and facilitate the development of more effective search engines, ultimately benefiting society by enhancing the way people find and access information.

Table 12: **Prompt used to rewrite TheoremQA questions.** Blue text denote instance-specific inputs. Violet text denotes the rewritten question and answer outputted by GPT-4. For each question, we provide the original question and answer, as well as the theorem name and theorem definition from the original TheoremQA dataset. The instruction prompts the model to rewrite the question with a different surface form without changing the reasoning steps or the final answer. We hand-write two examples to illustrate the rewriting process. We also allow the model to skip the question if it is too difficult to rewrite.

---

Rewrite the following question such that the logical steps and final answer are still the same, only change the surface form of the question. Avoid using the words related to the theorem used in the question. You can do this by using real-world examples and applications to illustrate the concepts, in a way that is easier to understand for a layman. Try to ground the question in a real-world context such as finance and engineering problems, but be creative and feel free to use any domain you like! However, the question should be standalone and solvable. Rewrite the question in a json format, with the fields "question" and "answer". The "theorem" field indicates the theorem used in the question, but you should not use the words related to the theorem in the rewritten question. If you do not think that the question cannot be rewritten in layman's terms in a standalone fashion, then you can write a json object with the field "skip" set to True.

```
{ "question": "In a group of 10 people, each of whom has one of 3 different eye colors, at least how many people must have the same eye color?", "answer": "4", "theorem": "pigeonhole principle", "theorem_definition": "The Pigeonhole Principle is a fundamental concept in combinatorics, a branch of mathematics that deals with counting and arranging objects. [additional text omitted...]" }
```

```
{ "question": "Mary is planning to bake exactly 10 cookies, and each cookie may be one of three different shapes - triangle, circle, and square. Mary wants the cookie shapes to be as diverse as possible. What is the smallest possible count for the most common shape across the ten cookies?", "answer": "4" }
```

```
{ "question": "dy/dt = \sqrt{t}, y(1) = 1. What is y(4)?", "answer": "5.667", "theorem": "integral rules", "theorem_definition": "Integral rules in calculus are a set of techniques and formulas used to evaluate and solve integrals. [additional text omitted...]" }
```

```
{ "question": "You're tracking the growth of a plant from a seed. The rate at which the plant grows in height is equal to the square root of the number of days since you planted it. One day after the seed was first planted, the plant was 1 inch tall. How tall will the plant be after 4 days?", "answer": "5.667" }
```

```
{ "question": "Given image \begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|} \hline 7 & 1 & 6 & 0 \\ \hline 3 & 3 & 7 & 6 \\ \hline 6 & 5 & 7 & \end{tabular} , and the bit-depth of the image is 4. Suppose you want to use the thresholding technique to segment the image. What is the appropriate threshold value based on the histogram of the image? Follow the following rule when you do thresholding or grouping: pixel  $(i, j)$  in Group A pixels if  $g(i, j) \leq$  current threshold  $\mathit{T}$ ; pixel  $(i, j)$  in Group B pixels otherwise, where  $g(i, j)$  is the intensity value of pixel  $(i, j)$ .", "answer": "4", "theorem": "image contrast", "theorem_definition": "Image contrast in signal processing refers to the difference in intensity or color between various elements or regions within an image. [additional text omitted...]" }
```

```
{ "question": "Imagine you have a collection of 12 unique stickers, each with a number from 0 to 7 representing its rarity level. You're planning to divide these stickers into two groups based on their rarity to make it easier for collectors to understand. You decide to use a method where stickers with a rarity level at or below a certain number go into the 'Common' group, and those above this number go into the 'Rare' group. Given the distribution of stickers' rarity levels as follows: two stickers each of levels 7, 6, and 5; three stickers of level 3; and one sticker each of levels 1 and 0. What is the rarity level that should be used as the cutoff to divide the stickers into the 'Common' and 'Rare' groups, ensuring a balanced understanding of rarity?", "answer": "4" }
```

---

Table 13: TheoremQA-Q Theorem names and the excluded topic names from CAMEL-Math.

TheoremQA-Q Theorem	CAMEL-Math Topics
acyclic graph	Graph theory, Combinatorics
binomial theorem	Combinatorics, Algebra
catalan-mingantu number	Combinatorics
cauchy's integral theorem	Complex analysis
cayley's formula	Graph theory, Combinatorics
convexity	Optimization
cramer rao lower bound	Statistics
definite matrix criteria	Algebra, Linear algebra
derivative chain rule	Calculus
double integral theorem	Calculus
eigenvalues and eigenvectors	Linear algebra
euler's method	Calculus, Numerical analysis, Differential equations
euler's theory	Graph theory, Combinatorics
expected utility	Game theory
fisher information	Statistics
fourier's theorem	Fourier analysis
gauss's lemma	Number theory, Algebra
integral rules	Calculus
intermediate value theorem	Calculus
isomorphisms	Group theory, Algebra
jensen's inequality	Statistics, Probability
l'hôpital's rule	Calculus
limit laws for sequences	Calculus
limiting theorem	Calculus
linear independence	Algebra, Linear algebra
linear subspaces	Algebra, Linear algebra
linear systems	Algebra, Linear algebra
liouville's theorem	Complex analysis
martingale	Statistics, Probability
matrix determinant formula	Algebra, Linear algebra
maximal planar graph	Graph theory, Combinatorics
maximum entropy	Statistics, Probability
message passing algorithm	Graph theory, Combinatorics
multinomial theorem	Combinatorics
newton-raphson method	Calculus, Numerical analysis
order	Group theory, Algebra
ordinary differential equation	Calculus, Differential equations
p-value	Statistics
pigeonhole principle	Combinatorics
poisson process	Statistics, Probability
projection theory	Algebra, Linear algebra
ramsey's theorem	Graph theory, Combinatorics
rolle's theorem	Calculus
series convergence	Calculus
shortest path	Graph theory, Optimization, Combinatorics
similarity	Geometry
squeeze theorem	Calculus
stirling number of the first kind	Combinatorics
stirling number of the second kind	Combinatorics
t-test	Statistics
taylor's approximation theorem	Calculus
trapezoidal rule	Calculus, Numerical analysis
vertex cover	Graph theory, Combinatorics
viterbi algorithm	Statistics
wave theorem	Differential equations

Table 14: **Subfield name in the original TheoremQA dataset and their corresponding categories in BRIGHT. Each category is used to specify the excluded problem-solution pairs from MATH and AoPS.**

Name	Category
Algebra	algebra
Atomic physics	others
Calculus	calculus
Celestial mechanics	others
Classic mechanics	others
Combinatorics	number theory
Complex analysis	calculus
Computer networking	others
Condensed matter physics	others
Derivatives	calculus
Economics	others
Electromagnetism	others
Equity investments	others
Fixed income	others
Fluid mechanics	others
Functional analysis	calculus
Geometry	geometry
Graph theory	others
Group theory	algebra
Information theory	others
Kinetics	others
Machine learning	others
Mathematical analysis	calculus
Number theory	number theory
Numerical analysis	calculus
Optics	others
Particle	others
Portfolio management	others
Probability theory	probability
Quantitive methods	others
Quantum	others
Real analysis	calculus
Relativity	others
Signal processing	others
Statistical physics	others
Statistics	others
Stochastic process	probability
Thermodynamics	others
Wave	others

Table 15: AoPS theorems and techniques and the excluded topic names from CAMEL-Math and TheoremQA.

AoPS Theorem	CAMEL-Math Topics	TheoremQA Theorems
Binomial Theorem	Combinatorics, Algebra	binomial theorem, multinomial theorem
Vieta's Formulas	Algebra	vieta's formula, birg-vieta's theorem
Ptolemy's theorem	Geometry	properties of kites, similarity, rhombus, rectangle, quadrilateral, triangle, isosceles triangle, parallelogram
Recursive Series	Calculus, Algebra	
Power of a Point	Geometry	similarity
Ball and urn	Combinatorics	
Newtons Sums	Algebra	vieta's formula
Probability	Probability, Statistics	probability
Fibonacci sequence	Combinatorics, Number theory	
Chicken McNugget Theorem	Combinatorics, Number theory	
Central Tendency	Statistics	
Principle of Inclusion Exclusion	Combinatorics, Set theory	inclusion-exclusion principle
Factorial	Combinatorics	
Picks Theorem	Geometry	similarity, triangle, isosceles triangle, parallelogram, rhombus, quadrilateral, rectangle, triangle midsegment theorem
Shoelace Theorem	Geometry	rhombus, rectangle, quadrilateral, triangle, isosceles triangle, parallelogram
Geometric probability	Geometry, Probability	
Euclidean algorithm	Number theory, Cryptography, Algebra	euclidean algorithm
Mass Points	Geometry	similarity, triangle, isosceles triangle, parallelogram, rhombus, quadrilateral, rectangle, triangle midsegment theorem
Geometric Series	Algebra	
Triangle Inequality	Geometry	inequalities, triangle, isosceles triangle
Simons Favorite Factoring Trick	Number theory, Algebra	
Properties of Logarithms	Algebra	
Fermat's Little Theorem	Number theory, Cryptography	fermat's little theorem, euler's totient theorem

Table 16: **Prompt used to check TheoremQA-Theorem documents.** Blue text denote instance-specific inputs. For each question, we provide the problem statement, the solution, the theorem name, the theorem definition, and the document text from a ProofWiki document.

---

Instruction: Determine if the given text can be helpful in understanding and solving the given problem. Use the theorem, its definition, and the problem solution to help you make a decision. The text can be helpful if it uses very similar reasoning steps as the solution and applies the theorem in a related way as the solution applies the theorem to solve the problem. The text should be able to assist a student who is not familiar with the theorem in ultimately solving the problem.

The input is given to you in a json format with the following keys:  
 Problem statement: The problem statement that the student is trying to solve.  
 Solution: The solution to the problem.  
 Theorem: The theorem that is used in the solution.  
 Theorem definition: The definition of the theorem.  
 Text: The text that you need to evaluate.  
 Think step by step and reason about the theorem and the text first before finally making a decision. Output True if the text is helpful, and False if it is not.

```
{ "Problem statement": "", "Solution": "", "Theorem": "", "Theorem definition": "", "Text": "", }
```

Now, write your answer in the following format:  
 Reasoning: [your reasoning here]  
 Answer: [True/False]

---

Table 17: **Theorems and techniques used in the AoPS dataset, and their corresponding subfield categories.**

Name	Category
Ball and urn	number theory
Binomial Theorem	algebra
Central Tendency	others
Chicken McNugget Theorem	algebra
Euclidean algorithm	number theory
Factorial	number theory
Fermat's Little Theorem	number theory
Fibonacci sequence	number theory
Geometric Series	algebra
Geometric probability	probability
Mass Points	geometry
Newtons Sums	algebra
Picks Theorem	geometry
Power of a Point	geometry
Principle of Inclusion Exclusion	number theory
Probability	probability
Properties of Logarithms	algebra
Ptolemy's theorem	geometry
Recursive Series	algebra
Shoelace Theorem	geometry
Simon's Favorite Factoring Trick	number theory
Triangle Inequality	algebra
Vieta's Formulas	algebra

Table 18: **Prompt used to check LeetCode questions.** Blue text denote instance-specific inputs. Violet text denotes the output from GPT-4. For each question, we provide the title and the problem statement. We use six in-context demonstrations, and the instruction prompts the model to categorize the question based on the criteria provided. Although there are three possible labels, we only keep questions that were labeled as 2, which are grounded in real-world concepts. For sake of brevity, we only show one example, but other examples can be found on the code repo.

---

Read the coding question and categorize it using the following criteria:

0: The question is not grounded in any real-world concepts. The description only uses coding-specific terms, such as "linked list", "binary search", "palindrome", "sorting", etc..

1: The question is not grounded in any real-world concepts or real-world concepts that are commonly used in the context of coding, such as needle in a haystack, strings/words, or a spiral matrix.

2: The question is grounded in real-world concepts that are not commonly used in the context of coding, such as building height, planting trees, or games. It may still uses some code-specific terms to specify the data structure involved.

You should only consider the initial problem statement and problem title, not the examples or constraints.

Use the following examples to help you categorize the question:

Example 1:

```
{
  "title": "Merge Two Sorted Lists",
  "question": "You are given the heads of two sorted linked lists 'list1' and 'list2'. Merge the two lists in a one sorted list. The list should be made by splicing together the nodes of the first two lists. Return the head of the merged linked list."
}
```

*\*\*Example 1:\*\*  
rest of the example omitted...  
}}*

```
{
  "label": 0
}
```

*Examples 2-6 are omitted for brevity...*

Now, consider the question below and categorize it using the criteria above. Output your answer in a json format:

```
{
  "title": "Container With Most Water",
  "question": "You are given an integer array 'height' of length 'n'. There are 'n' vertical lines drawn such that the two endpoints of the 'ith' line are '(i, 0)' and '(i, height[i])'. Find two lines that together with the x-axis form a container, such that the container contains the most water. Return the maximum amount of water a container can store."
}
```

*rest of the question omitted...*

```
{ "label": 2 }
```

---



Table 19: **Biology example.**

<b><i>Query</i></b>
After I cut trees into logs and remove the branches in winter, they start growing. They sprout out and grow completely normal looking stems and leaves and maintain them all summer. The sprouts mostly appear around the cut branches. Sometimes they last all winter and grow for another year. How does a tree trunk sprout and grow after being cut?
<b><i>Reasoning steps</i></b>
The essential question is to figure out the growing mechanism of trees after being cut. It is usually related to cell division, which later develops into tissues and organs. We need to find relevant information of these cells in plants and their growing capabilities after being cut.
<b><i>Example positive document</i></b>
<p>Meristem</p> <p>Tunica-carpus model of the apical meristem (growing tip). The epidermal (L1) and subepidermal (L2) layers form the outer layers called the tunica. The inner L3 layer is called the corpus. Cells in the L1 and L2 layers divide in a sideways fashion, which keeps these layers distinct, whereas the L3 layer divides in a more random fashion.</p> <p>In cell biology, the meristem is a type of tissue found in plants. It consists of undifferentiated cells (meristematic cells) capable of cell division. Cells in the meristem can develop into all the other tissues and organs that occur in plants. These cells continue to divide until they become differentiated and lose the ability to divide.</p> <p>There are three types of meristematic tissues: apical (at the tips), intercalary or basal (in the middle), and lateral (at the sides also known as cambium). At the meristem summit, there is a small group of slowly dividing cells, which is commonly called the central zone. Cells of this zone have a stem cell function and are essential for meristem maintenance. The proliferation and growth rates at the meristem summit usually differ considerably from those at the periphery.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Under appropriate conditions, each shoot meristem can develop into a complete, new plant or clone. Such new plants can be grown from shoot cuttings that contain an apical meristem.</p> <p>...</p>
<b><i>Example negative document</i></b>
<p>Cutting firewood from felled trees safely and easily (bucking)</p> <p>There are loads of articles on the web showing how (and sometimes how not to!) cut down trees, but not so much about actually cutting firewood after the tree has been felled and stripped of its branches (called snedding or limbing in arborist speak). This 'how to' shows the easiest way to produce firewood by cutting many logs at the same time. I actually use my firewood cutting operation as part of my fitness regime, much more useful than going to the gym and the same muscle burn the day after!</p> <p>I start by cutting the trees into 10' (3m) logs so that I can easily drag them to my cleared working area close to the pick up point.</p> <p>You can make a homemade 'cradle' that holds a whole bunch of logs from sturdy construction lumber (2 by 4). This enables you to safely cut many at once, as long as you put some of the heavy logs both at the bottom and on the top. Don't forget to make the cradle narrow enough for the size of chainsaw bar you have. Usually not more than 12" or 300mm inside measurement. Make sure that it is constructed in such a way that you cannot hit any nails etc with the chainsaw.</p> <p>Place the logs onto the cradle keeping the ends off the logs flush one side ( or at least staggered in 12" steps). If you are fussy like me you can mark one of the top logs at 12" (300mm) intervals with chalk to ensure even log lengths. Then cut alternate sides (so that it doesn't topple over to one side), finishing off with a couple of cuts over the cradle itself, don't forget to stop before you saw the thing in half lol! (See upgraded version below...)</p> <p>...</p>

Table 20: Earth Science example

**Query**

Why does winter get colder after the solstice?

Intuitively, it makes perfect sense to think that the coldest day of the year would be the day that gets the least sunshine, the winter solstice. In the northern hemisphere, this occurs a few days before Christmas. But as anyone who lives in places that gets snow can tell you, the most bitter parts of winter are in January and February, not December.

Why does it get so much colder when sunlight (and the warmth it should be bringing with it) is increasing?

**Reasoning steps**

This is the phenomenon where the minimum temperature is delayed after the date with the least sunshine. This may be related to the alignment between seasonal cycles and temperature cycles. We need to find out more about the misalignment between these two cycles in the earth.

**Example positive document**

Seasonal lag is the phenomenon whereby the date of maximum average air temperature at a geographical location on a planet is delayed until some time after the date of maximum insolation (i.e. the summer solstice). This also applies to the minimum temperature being delayed until some time after the date of minimum insolation. Cultural seasons are often aligned with annual temperature cycles, especially in the agrarian context.

...

Earth's seasonal lag is largely caused by the presence of large amounts of water, which has a high latent heat of freezing and of condensation.[1]

The length of seasonal lag varies between different climates. Extremes range from as little as 15–20 days for polar regions in summer, as well as continental interiors, for example Fairbanks, Alaska, where annual average warmest temperatures occur in early July, and August is notably cooler than June, to 2–3 months in oceanic locales, whether in low latitudes, as in Miami, Florida or higher latitudes as in the Kuril Islands (where at Simushir annual average temperatures peak in late August), and at Cape Sable Island in Nova Scotia, Canada, where (by a slight margin) September is actually the year's warmest month on average. In mid-latitude continental climates, it is approximately 20–25 days in winter and 25–35 days in summer. August as the narrowly warmest month can even happen in ultra-maritime areas north of the Arctic Circle, such as Røst or offshore islands like Jan Mayen and Bear Island in Norway. The latter is at 74°N and such high-latitude summer lag is enabled by Gulf Stream moderation tempering seasonal swings to extend the season ...

**Example negative document**

The winter solstice marks the shortest day and longest night of the year. In the Northern Hemisphere, it occurs when the sun is directly over the Tropic of Capricorn, which is located at 23.5° south of the equator and runs through Australia, Chile, southern Brazil, and northern South Africa. This year, the Northern Hemisphere winter solstice will occur at 8:58 am MST on December 21, 2020. For a complete listing of the dates of the winter and summer solstice's and spring and fall equinox's, check out this site: <https://www.weather.gov/media/ind/seasons.pdf> A pinhole camera (no lens and a single small aperture) can be effectively used to document the change in elevation of the sun during the year. The image below is a solargraph made with a pinhole camera, in which the path of the sun as it crosses the sky is captured for an extended period. It was made in Tijeras, and depicts the period from the summer solstice (highest streaks) to the winter solstice (lowest streaks) in 2009.

We all know that the Earth makes a complete revolution around the sun once every 365 days, following an orbit that is elliptical in shape. This means that the distance between the Earth and Sun, which is 93 million miles on average, varies throughout the year. During the first week in January, the Earth is about 1.6 million miles closer to the sun ...

Table 21: Economics example

<i>Query</i>
<p>Would a GDP measure be improved by excluding foreign interest paid?            The income method of calculating GDP is as follows: <math>GDP = \text{wages} + \text{profits} + \text{rents} + \text{interest} + \text{depreciation} + \text{taxes} + \text{NFFI}</math>. If an economy has high external debt, for instance, because it used external financing to buy machinery and equipment, then foreign interest payments will be high. In that case, wouldn't GDP (per capita) be a poor measure of economic well-being since a significant portion of the generated income is leaving the home economy?            Wouldn't excluding foreign interest payments in calculating GDP/ income give us a better measure since this represents what income is available to the home economy?</p>
<i>Reasoning steps</i>
<p>The statement implies that GDP serves as an indicator of economic well-being, yet GDP, Gross domestic product, primarily reflects economic production and outputs rather than directly gauging well-being. It's crucial to understand the association between GDP and economic well-being.</p>
<i>Example positive document</i>
<p>Measuring well-being is about going beyond the cold numbers of GDP. But cold as it may be, GDP remains a very important indicator for measuring the economic performance of countries, which is a fundamental driver of well-being. This is not only because income means higher material standards but also because income is needed to sustain private and public spending in non-material components of well-being, such as education and health. However, there is an increasing recognition that focusing on GDP alone is not enough to achieve better lives for all. The relationship between a country's GDP per capita and well-being is usually positive – in other words, countries with higher GDP per capita are also those where well-being is higher on average. However this relationship becomes weaker as a country's income grows, suggesting that once income reaches a certain level, increased income is less likely to generate well-being. The other interesting phenomenon is that some countries do better at delivering wellbeing than they do if gauged only on the basis of economic production per capita. This is the case for Nordic European countries but also for New Zealand. On the other hand, there are countries that do better in GDP per capita than on average well-being, for instance the United States and Switzerland.</p> <p>...</p>
<i>Example negative document</i>
<p>The impact of foreign interest rates on the economy: The role of the exchange rate regime            It is often argued that many economies are affected by conditions in foreign countries. This paper explores the connection between interest rates in major industrial countries and annual real output growth in other countries. The results show that high foreign interest rates have a contractionary effect on annual real GDP growth in the domestic economy, but that this effect is centered on countries with fixed exchange rates. The paper then examines the potential channels through which major-country interest rates affect other economies. The effect of foreign interest rates on domestic interest rates is the most likely channel when compared with other possibilities, such as a trade effect.</p> <p>...</p> <p>This paper answers two questions. First, what is the effect of interest rates in base countries on other countries' annual real GDP growth?3 Second, how does this effect vary by the exchange rate regime and other country characteristics? Answering the second question helps to disentangle the channels through which foreign country interest rates affect other economies. We find that annual real output growth in countries is negatively associated with interest rates in their base countries, but that this effect holds only for countries with fixed exchange rates.</p> <p>...</p>

Table 22: Psychology example

<i>Query</i>
<p>Why do we forget what we try to remember?</p> <p>Almost everybody has had an experience where someone asks them what their favorite book is, and they immediately forget every single book they have ever read. This infuriating consequence of attempting to dig into memory is mysterious enough by itself. Why does this happen? Why do our memories suddenly disappear when provoked?</p> <p>I have searched a lot, but the results don't provide a direct and suitable enough answer.</p>
<i>Reasoning steps</i>
<p>This is the phenomenon when people can't quite remember a word or term, but feel like they are on the brink of recalling it, with only a partial memory of it at the moment. It is related to the memory, which is not strong enough to recall the item, but strong enough to trigger the recall. We can search if there is a specific term for this and more analysis, explanations, and research on the causes.</p>
<i>Example positive document</i>
<p>Tip of the tongue</p> <p>Tip of the tongue (also known as TOT, or lethologica) is the phenomenon of failing to retrieve a word or term from memory, combined with partial recall and the feeling that retrieval is imminent.[1] The phenomenon's name comes from the saying, "It's on the tip of my tongue." The tip of the tongue phenomenon reveals that lexical access occurs in stages</p> <p>...</p> <p>Causes</p> <p>The causes of TOTs are largely unknown but numerous explanations have been offered. These explanations mainly fall within the realms of two overarching viewpoints: the direct-access view and the inferential view.</p> <p>Direct-access view</p> <p>The direct-access view posits that the state occurs when memory strength is not enough to recall an item, but is strong enough to trigger the state. That is, the rememberer has direct access to the target word's presence in memory, even though it cannot be immediately recalled. Theories of the causes of tip of the tongue phenomenon that adopt direct-access views include the blocking hypothesis, the incomplete-activation hypothesis, and the transmission-deficit model.</p> <p>...</p>
<i>Example negative document</i>
<p>what to say if an interviewer asks about your favorite books or movies</p> <p>A reader writes:</p> <p>I have a question about an interview that I'm pretty sure I bombed recently. Things were going fairly well until my interviewer asked me for my favorite book and favorite movie. I completely blanked and took way too long to answer, and I'm not even sure what I said for them (I think I said Little Women for the book). I spent so much time preparing to talk about my background and experiences and the job that I wasn't prepared for more off-the-wall questions (my fault, I know).</p> <p>My question is, what are interviewers looking for with these questions? I mean, obviously I guess they want someone who is intelligent, can think on their feet (which I did not do), and has varied interests, but how do you convey that with these types of answers? I can come up with an answer to the book question now (I'm planning to say I've been into Neil deGrasse Tyson's books recently, because I have), but I'm stumped as far as movies in case I get asked this again. My movie tastes aren't exactly sophisticated (Mean Girls? Boondock Saints? Fight Club? When Harry Met Sally?). Is this a question you find helpful or not?</p> <p>...</p>

Table 23: Robotics example

**Query**

Can't see debug messages using RCLCPP\_DEBUG

I can't see messages using RCLCPP\_DEBUG by terminal and rqt, but I can using other levels of verbosity( INFO, ERROR, FATAL. . .).Selecting debug in rqt to see those messages doesn't work either.

I'm using rolling, working in C++ in a plugin of a controller and launching tb3\_simulation\_launch.py from nav2\_bringup.

I also saw a post here where they recommended to set the environment variable:

RCLCPP\_LOG\_MIN\_SEVERITY=RCLCPP\_LOG\_MIN\_SEVERITY\_DEBUG

but that didn't work either. It must be something silly that I'm missing. Has this ever happened to you?

Thank you

**Reasoning steps**

The problem looks like to be related to the setting of log level. If selecting debug in rqt does not work, we can check the code about potential arguments that could affect the logging messages and verbosity,

**Example positive document**

```
...
declare_log_level_cmd = DeclareLaunchArgument(
  'log_level', default_value='info', description='log level'
)
load_nodes = GroupAction(
  condition=IfCondition(PythonExpression(['not', use_composition])),
  actions=[
    SetProperty('use_sim_time', use_sim_time),
    Node(
      package='nav2_controller',
      executable='controller_server',
      output='screen',
      respawn=use_respawn,
      respawn_delay=2.0,
      parameters=[configured_params],
      arguments=['-ros-args', '-log-level', log_level],
      remappings=remappings + [('cmd_vel', 'cmd_vel_nav')],
    ),
  ],
)
...

```

**Example negative document**

Unit 5 - Exercise 5.22.1: Cannot build after setup all the exercises

I have gone through and set up all the Exercises as guidance:

Here is my dynamixel\_hardware\_interface.cpp after all the exercises:

```
#include <algorithm>
#include <array>
#include <string>
#include <limits>
#include <vector>
#include "dynamixel_hardware_interface/dynamixel_hardware_interface.hpp"
#include "hardware_interface/types/hardware_interface_return_values.hpp"
#include "hardware_interface/types/hardware_interface_type_values.hpp"
#include "rclcpp/rclcpp.hpp"
...

```

Table 24: **Stack Overflow example****Query**

Is there a Snowflake command that can do the following:

```
a,b,c
1,10,0.1
2,11,0.12
3,12,0.13
to a table like this:
```

```
key,value
a,1
a,2
a,3
b,10
b,11
b,13
c,0.1
c,0.12
c,0.13
?
```

This operation is often called melt in other tabular systems, but the basic idea is to convert the table into a list of key value pairs.

There is an UNPIVOT in SnowSQL, but as I understand it UNPIVOT requires to manually specify every single column. This doesn't seem practical for a large number of columns.

**Reasoning steps**

This operation is a kind of table transformation like reshaping, serialization, or flattening. We are looking for an operation in Snowflake that can take 2-dimensional values, and transform them into an view that presents one-one correlation mapping between key and value.

**Example positive document****FLATTEN**

Flattens (explodes) compound values into multiple rows.

FLATTEN is a table function that takes a VARIANT, OBJECT, or ARRAY column and produces a lateral view (i.e. an inline view that contains correlation referring to other tables that precede it in the FROM clause).

FLATTEN can be used to convert semi-structured data to a relational representation.

**Syntax**

```
FLATTEN( INPUT => <expr> [ , PATH => <constant_expr> ]
        [ , OUTER => TRUE | FALSE ]
        [ , RECURSIVE => TRUE | FALSE ]
        [ , MODE => 'OBJECT' | 'ARRAY' | 'BOTH' ] )
```

...

**Example negative document****MAP\_PICK**

Returns a new MAP containing the specified key-value pairs from an existing MAP.

To identify the key-value pairs to include in the new map, pass in the keys as arguments, or pass in an array containing the keys.

If a specified key is not present in the input map, the key is ignored.

**Syntax**

```
MAP_PICK( <map>, <key1> [ , <key2>, ... ] )
MAP_PICK( <map>, <array> )
```

...

Table 25: Sustainable Living example

**Query**

How good is it to reuse water from plant pots?

I'm living in an apartment, and after I water my plants the water goes to plates below the pots. The pots are in a metallic structure above the plates, so I can take the plates to reuse the water (throwing it at the plants again).

This reuse seems beneficial, because I think I can get rid of mosquitoes that would reproduce in the stagnated water. And also some nutrients of the soil (as well as earthworms) can return to the vase.

Is there some negative points in doing that?

**Reasoning steps**

The water that accumulates in the plates as a result of watering is likely to contain minerals, soluble salts, and other materials that exist in soil or plants. To figure out whether there is any negative point in reusing that water, we thus need to understand whether the components in that water will result in any adverse effects.

**Example positive document****Soluble Salts**

Soluble salts may accumulate on the top of the soil, forming a yellow or white crust. A ring of salt deposits may form around the pot at the soil line or around the drainage hole. Salts may also build up on the outside of clay pots. In house plants, signs of excess soluble salts include reduced growth, brown leaf tips, dropping of lower leaves, small new growth, dead root tips, and wilting.

Soluble salts are minerals dissolved in water. Fertilizer dissolved in water becomes a soluble salt. When water evaporates from the soil, the minerals or salts stay behind. As the salts in the soil become more and more concentrated, it becomes more difficult for plants to take up water. If salts build up to an extremely high level, water can be taken out of the root tips, causing them to die. High levels of soluble salts damage the roots directly, weakening the plant and making it more susceptible to attack from insects and diseases. One of the most common problems associated with high salt levels is root rot.

The best way to prevent soluble salt injury is to stop the salts from building up. When watering, allow some water to drain through the container and then empty the saucer. Do not allow the pot to sit in water. If the drained water is absorbed by the soil, the salts that were washed out are reabsorbed through the drainage hole or directly through a clay pot.

...

**Example negative document****Water reuse in California**

Water reuse in California is the use of reclaimed water for beneficial use. As a heavily populated state in the drought-prone arid west, water reuse is developing as an integral part of water in California enabling both the economy and population to grow.

Wastewater Reclaimed water is treated wastewater that comes from homes and businesses, such as sink water, shower water, and toilet water including everything dumped into wastewater drains from laundry soap to bleach to oil to human waste. Wastewater can be divided into greywater and blackwater, with the first being defined as water that had been used for laundry, bathing, sink washing, and dishwashers. Blackwater is defined as sewage that includes feces from toilets.[1] Due to the low amounts of physical pollutants in greywater, most of its contaminants are dissolved organic matter, which can be physically filtered and cleaned through various membranes, as well as through biological treatment methods.

...

Table 26: **LeetCode example.** Both the query and the positive document uses two pointers in the solution. The negative example is retrieved by BM25.

---

### *Query*

Given 'n' non-negative integers representing an elevation map where the width of each bar is '1', compute how much water it can trap after raining.

**Example 1:**

**Input:** height = [0, 1, 0, 2, 1, 0, 1, 3, 2, 1, 2, 1]

**Output:** 6

**Explanation:** The above elevation map (black section) is represented by array [0, 1, 0, 2, 1, 0, 1, 3, 2, 1, 2, 1]. In this case, 6 units of rain water (blue section) are being trapped.

**Example 2:**

**Input:** height = [4, 2, 0, 3, 2, 5]

**Output:** 9

**Constraints:**

\* 'n == height.length'

\* '1 <= n <= 2 \* 10<sup>4</sup>'

\* '0 <= height[i] <= 10<sup>5</sup>'

---

### *Reasoning steps*

This problem can be solved using a two-pointer approach, and uses ideas from dynamic programming to keep track of the maximum height to the left and right of each bar. The tags associated with this problem are 'Array', 'Two Pointers', 'Dynamic Programming', 'Stack', and 'Monotonic Stack'.

---

### *Example positive document*

```
def max_area(height):
```

```
    """You are given an integer array 'height' of length 'n'. There are 'n' vertical lines drawn such that the two endpoints of the 'ith' line are '(i, 0)' and '(i, height[i])'.
```

```
    Find two lines that together with the x-axis form a container, such that the container contains the most water.
```

```
    Return the maximum amount of water a container can store.
```

```
    Notice that you may not slant the container.
```

```
    Example 1:
```

```
    Input: height = [1, 8, 6, 2, 5, 4, 8, 3, 7]
```

```
    Output: 49
```

```
    Constraints:
```

```
    * 'n == height.length'
```

```
    * '2 <= n <= 105'
```

```
    * '0 <= height[i] <= 104'"""
```

```
    max_area, left, right = 0, 0, len(height) - 1
```

```
    while left < right:
```

```
        max_area = max(max_area, min(height[left], height[right]) * (right - left))
```

```
        if height[left] < height[right]:
```

```
            left += 1
```

```
        else:
```

```
            right -= 1
```

```
    return max_area
```

---

### *Example negative document*

```
def get_power(x):
```

```
    """Your country has an infinite number of lakes. Initially, all the lakes are empty, but when it rains over the 'nth' lake, the 'nth' lake becomes full of water. If it rains over a lake that is full of water, there will be a flood. Your goal is to avoid floods in any lake.
```

```
    Given an integer array 'rains' where: ...rest of the document omitted
```

---



Table 27: Pony example

---

**Query**

---

Given the lengths of a triangle's sides, write a pony program to classify it as equilateral, isosceles or scalene.

---

**Reasoning steps**

---

To determine the category of the triangle, we need to compare the side lengths. A common syntax for conditions and comparison used in many other programming languages is the 'if' or 'switch' related to control structure.

---

**Example positive document**

---

# Control Structures

To do real work in a program you have to be able to make decisions, iterate through collections of items and perform actions repeatedly. For this, you need control structures. Pony has control structures that will be familiar to programmers who have used most languages, such as 'if', 'while' and 'for', but in Pony, they work slightly differently.

## Conditionals

The simplest control structure is the good old 'if'. It allows you to perform some action only when a condition is true.

In Pony it looks like this:

```
if condition then
  control_body
end
```

Here is a simple example:

```
if a > b then
  env.out.print("a is bigger")
end
```

Often the condition may be composed of many sub conditions connected by 'and' and 'or'.

...

---

**Example negative document**

---

# Classes

Just like other object-oriented languages, Pony has `__classes__`.

A class is declared with the keyword 'class', and it has to have a name that starts with a capital letter, like this:

```
class Wombat
```

Do all types start with a capital letter?

Yes! And nothing else starts with a capital letter.

So when you see a name in Pony code, you will instantly know whether it's a type or not.

## What goes in a class?

A class is composed of:

1. Fields.
2. Constructors.
3. Functions.

...

---

Table 28: **AoPS example.** The negative example is retrieved by BM25, and it uses stars and bars to solve the problem, whereas the query and gold document use the Chicken McNugget Theorem.

---

*Query (from 2015 AMC 10B Problem 15)*

---

The town of Hamlet has 3 people for each horse, 4 sheep for each cow, and 3 ducks for each person. Which of the following could not possibly be the total number of people, horses, sheep, cows, and ducks in Hamlet?

- (A) 41    (B) 47    (C) 59    (D) 61    (E) 66
- 

*Reasoning steps*

---

We can use the [Chicken McNugget Theorem](#) to solve this problem.

---

*Example positive document*

---

Find the sum of all positive integers  $n$  such that, given an unlimited supply of stamps of denominations 5,  $n$ , and  $n + 1$  cents, 91 cents is the greatest postage that cannot be formed.

By the Chicken McNugget theorem, the least possible value of  $n$  such that 91 cents cannot be formed satisfies  $5n - (5 + n) = 91 \implies n = 24$ , so  $n$  must be at least 24.

For a value of  $n$  to work, we must not only be unable to form the value 91, but we must also be able to form the values 92 through 96, as with these five values, we can form any value greater than 96 by using additional 5 cent stamps.

Notice that we must form the value 96 without forming the value 91. If we use any 5 cent stamps when forming 96, we could simply remove one to get 91. This means that we must obtain the value 96 using only stamps of denominations  $n$  and  $n + 1$ .

Recalling that  $n \geq 24$ , we can easily figure out the working  $(n, n + 1)$  pairs that can be used to obtain 96, as we can use at most  $\frac{96}{24} = 4$  stamps without going over. The potential sets are  $(24, 25)$ ,  $(31, 32)$ ,  $(32, 33)$ ,  $(47, 48)$ ,  $(48, 49)$ ,  $(95, 96)$ , and  $(96, 97)$ .

The last two obviously do not work, since they are too large to form the values 92 through 94, and by a little testing, only  $(24, 25)$  and  $(47, 48)$  can form the necessary values, so  $n \in \{24, 47\}$ .  $24 + 47 = \boxed{71}$ .

---

*Example negative document*

---

Alice has 24 apples. In how many ways can she share them with Becky and Chris so that each of the three people has at least two apples?

- (A) 105    (B) 114    (C) 190    (D) 210    (E) 380

Note: This solution uses the non-negative version for stars and bars. A solution using the positive version of stars is similar (first removing an apple from each person instead of 2).

This method uses the counting method of stars and bars (non-negative version). Since each person must have at least 2 apples, we can remove  $2 * 3$  apples from the total that need to be sorted. With the remaining 18 apples, we can use stars and bars to determine the number of possibilities. Assume there are 18 stars in a row, and 2 bars, which will be placed to separate the stars into groups of 3. In total, there are 18 spaces for stars + 2 spaces for bars, for a total of 20 spaces. We can now do  $\binom{20}{2}$ . This is because if we choose distinct 2 spots for the bars to be placed, each combo of 3 groups will be different, and all apples will add up to 18. We can also do this because the apples are indistinguishable.  $\binom{20}{2}$  is 190, therefore the answer is

- (C) 190.
-

Table 29: **TheoremQA Questions example.** Both the query and the positive document uses the Pigeonhole Principle to solve the problem. The negative document is retrieved by BM25, and it only requires simple arithmetics to solve.

---

**Query**

Mary is planning to bake exactly 10 cookies, and each cookie may be one of three different shapes – triangle, circle, and square. Mary wants the cookie shapes to be as diverse as possible. What is the smallest possible count for the most common shape across the ten cookies?

---

**Reasoning steps**

This problem can be solved with the Pigeonhole Principle.

---

**Example positive document**

Arbitrarily place 19 points in a unit square and cover as many of these points as possible with a circle of diameter  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}$ . Question: At least how many points can be guaranteed to be covered? We can divide the unit square into 9 smaller squares, each with side length  $\frac{1}{3}$ . Since there are 19 points and 9 smaller squares, by the Pigeonhole Principle, at least one of these smaller squares must contain at least 3 points.

Now, consider a circle with diameter  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}$ . The diagonal of each smaller square has length  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}$ , so the circle can be placed inside the smaller square in such a way that it covers the entire square. Therefore, the circle can cover at least 3 points in that square.

Therefore, the answer is 3.

---

**Example negative document**

Yanna baked twenty butter cookies and forty biscuits in the morning. In the afternoon, she baked ten butter cookies and twenty biscuits. How many more biscuits did she bake than butter cookies? She baked  $20 + 10 = 30$  butter cookies. And, she baked  $40 + 20 = 60$  biscuits. Therefore, she baked  $60 - 30 = 30$  more biscuits than butter cookies. The answer is 30

---

Table 30: **TheoremQA Theorems example.** The query uses the Pigeonhole Principle, which is the gold document from ProofWiki. The negative document is retrieved by BM25, which is not relevant to the question

<p><b>Query</b></p> <p>Mary is planning to bake exactly 10 cookies, and each cookie may be one of three different shapes – triangle, circle, and square. Mary wants the cookie shapes to be as diverse as possible. What is the smallest possible count for the most common shape across the ten cookies?</p>
<p><b>Reasoning steps</b></p> <p>This problem can be solved with the Pigeonhole Principle.</p>
<p><b>Example positive document</b></p> <p>Pigeonhole Principle Tags: Pigeonhole Principle, Named Theorems, Combinatorics  begin{theorem} Let <math>S</math> be a finite set whose cardinality is <math>n</math>. Let <math>S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k</math> be a partition of <math>S</math> into <math>k</math> subsets. Then: at least one subset <math>S_i</math> of <math>S</math> contains at least <math>\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil</math> elements where <math>\lceil \cdot \rceil</math> denotes the ceiling function.  end{theorem}</p> <p>begin{proof} AimForCont no subset <math>S_i</math> of <math>S</math> has as many as <math>\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil</math> elements. Then the maximum number of elements of any <math>S_i</math> would be <math>\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor - 1</math>. So the total number of elements of <math>S</math> would be no more than <math>k \left( \lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor - 1 \right) = k \lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor - k</math>. There are two cases: <math>n</math> is divisible by <math>k</math> <math>n</math> is not divisible by <math>k</math>. Suppose <math>k \nmid n</math>. Then <math>\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor = \frac{n}{k}</math> is an integer and: <math>k \lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor - k = n - k</math> Thus: <math> S  = \sum_{i=1}^k  S_i  \leq n - k &lt; n</math> This contradicts the fact that <math> S  = n</math>. Hence our assumption that no subset <math>S_i</math> of <math>S</math> has as many as <math>\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor</math> elements was false. Next, suppose that <math>k \mid n</math>. Then: <math> S  = k \lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor - k &lt; \frac{k(n+k)}{k} - k = n</math> and again this contradicts the fact that <math> S  = n</math>. In the same way, our assumption that no subset <math>S_i</math> of <math>S</math> has as many as <math>\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil</math> elements was false. Hence, by Proof by Contradiction, there has to be at least <math>\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil</math> elements in at least one <math>S_i \subseteq S</math>. qed  end{proof}</p>
<p><b>Example negative document</b></p> <p>begin{definition}[Definition:Conditional/Semantics of Conditional]Let <math>p \implies q</math> where <math>\implies</math> denotes the conditional operator.<math>p \implies q</math> can be stated thus: * "If" <math>p</math> is true "then" <math>q</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "if" <math>p</math> is true.* * "(The truth of) <math>p</math> "implies" (the truth of) <math>q</math>.* * "(The truth of) <math>q</math> "is implied by" (the truth of) <math>p</math>.* * "<math>q</math> "follows from" <math>p</math>.* * "<math>p</math> is true "only if" <math>q</math> is true."*The latter one may need some explanation. <math>p</math> can be either true or false, as can <math>q</math>. But if <math>q</math> is false, and <math>p \implies q</math>, then <math>p</math> can not be true. Therefore, <math>p</math> can be true "only if" <math>q</math> is also true, which leads us to our assertion. * "<math>p</math> is true "therefore" <math>q</math> is true.* * "<math>p</math> is true "entails" that <math>q</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "because" <math>p</math> is true.* * "<math>p</math> "may" be true "unless" <math>q</math> is false.* * "Given that" <math>p</math> is true, <math>q</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "whenever" <math>p</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "provided that" <math>p</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "in case" <math>p</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "assuming that" <math>p</math> is true.* * "<math>q</math> is true "on the condition that" <math>p</math> is true."*Further colloquial interpretations can often be found in natural language whose meaning can be reduced down " "<math>p</math> only if <math>q</math>", for example: * "<math>p</math> is true "as long as" <math>q</math> is true":Example::::"Mummy, can I go to the pictures?"::::"As long as" you've done your homework. Have you done your homework? No? Then you cannot go to the pictures."::In other words::::"You can go to the pictures "only if" you have done your homework."::Using the full language of logic::::"If it is true that you are going to the pictures, it is true that you must have done your homework."* * "<math>p</math> is true "as soon as" <math>q</math> is true"::"Are we going to this party, then?"::::"As soon as" I've finished putting on my makeup."::The analysis is the same as for the above example of "as long as".  end{definition}</p>

Table 31: Example of Gemini reasoning on Sustainable Living

**Query**

How good is it to reuse water from plant pots?  
 I'm living in an apartment, and after I water my plants the water goes to plates below the pots. The pots are in a metallic structure above the plates, so I can take the plates to reuse the water (throwing it at the plants again).  
 This reuse seems beneficial, because I think I can get rid of mosquitoes that would reproduce in the stagnated water. And also some nutrients of the soil (as well as earthworms) can return to the vase.  
 Is there some negative points in doing that?

**LLM Reasoning steps****## Plant Pot Water Reuse****\*\* (1) Essential Problem: \*\***

The user wants to know if it is beneficial or detrimental to reuse the water collected from plant pot drainage plates.  
 They are concerned about potential mosquito breeding and the impact on plant growth.

**\*\* (2) Reasoning: \*\*****\*\* Reused Water Composition: \*\***

- Potentially contains dissolved nutrients, minerals and salts from the soil.
- May contain microorganisms.
- Could harbor mosquito larvae if stagnant.

**\*\* Negative Impact on Plant Growth: \*\***

- Stagnant water can attract mosquitoes.
- High salt concentrations from fertilizers can harm plants.
- Waterborne pathogens could potentially harm plants.

**\*\* (3) Draft Answer: \*\*****## Reusing Water from Plant Pots: A Balancing Act**

It's commendable that you're looking for ways to conserve water and potentially benefit your plants.  
 Reusing water from plant pot drainage plates can be a good idea, but there are some drawbacks to consider:

- \* **\*\* Mosquito Breeding: \*\*** Stagnant water in the plates can become a breeding ground for mosquitoes, posing a health risk. Regularly empty and clean the plates to prevent this.
- \* **\*\* Salt Accumulation: \*\*** Repeatedly using the same water can lead to a buildup of salts from fertilizers, which can harm plants.
- \* **\*\* Pathogen Risk: \*\*** While less common, waterborne pathogens could potentially harm your plants.  
 Using filtered or boiled water can minimize this risk.

Table 32: Example of Gemini reasoning on Sustainable Living, continue

<i>Example positive document</i>												
Soluble Salts												
Soluble salts may accumulate on the top of the soil, forming a yellow or white crust. A ring of salt deposits may form around the pot at the soil line or around the drainage hole. Salts may also build up on the outside of clay pots. In house plants, signs of excess soluble salts include reduced growth, brown leaf tips, dropping of lower leaves, small new growth, dead root tips, and wilting.												
Soluble salts are minerals dissolved in water. Fertilizer dissolved in water becomes a soluble salt. When water evaporates from the soil, the minerals or salts stay behind. As the salts in the soil become more and more concentrated, it becomes more difficult for plants to take up water. If salts build up to an extremely high level, water can be taken out of the root tips, causing them to die. High levels of soluble salts damage the roots directly, weakening the plant and making it more susceptible to attack from insects and diseases. One of the most common problems associated with high salt levels is root rot.												
The best way to prevent soluble salt injury is to stop the salts from building up. When watering, allow some water to drain through the container and then empty the saucer. Do not allow the pot to sit in water. If the drained water is absorbed by the soil, the salts that were washed out are reabsorbed through the drainage hole or directly through a clay pot.												
...												

Table 33: The performance of retrieval models when using reasoning steps generated by GritLM as queries

	StackExchange							Coding		Theorem-based			Avg.
	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
<i>Sparse model</i>													
BM25 [44]	33.1	38.5	19.2	28.1	16.7	16.2	20.7	19.7	13.3	3.3	12.1	8.7	19.1
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>													
BGE [63]	17.7	29.8	18.7	22.9	12.6	11.6	17.6	23.5	3.2	4.2	15.4	11.3	15.7
Inst-L [49]	22.3	27.6	19.3	26.2	13.1	11.9	17.7	16.5	0.7	4.7	19.3	9.0	15.7
SBERT [43]	17.0	22.0	15.2	23.9	9.7	9.3	13.1	24.2	1.7	3.8	15.4	9.4	13.7
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>													
E5 [57]	24.3	36.5	18.5	21.2	10.6	14.9	15.0	27.0	0.3	4.0	20.0	17.4	17.5
SFR [34]	22.1	31.3	20.0	23.0	12.2	15.0	16.8	26.2	0.6	5.3	19.2	15.2	17.2
Inst-XL [49]	34.5	44.7	26.5	36.5	19.3	21.7	24.8	24.7	1.6	6.0	16.0	8.4	22.1
GritLM [37]	24.6	31.6	18.8	21.0	14.2	10.9	21.5	28.9	5.0	5.5	18.6	17.0	18.1
Qwen [31]	25.7	35.8	19.5	29.7	12.1	18.1	22.0	22.9	7.8	2.6	17.9	21.8	19.7
<i>Proprietary models</i>													
Cohere [14]	21.8	26.4	22.2	21.5	15.1	15.8	17.1	21.3	1.9	4.7	14.4	9.9	16.0
OpenAI [40]	26.4	29.8	21.5	29.4	11.4	11.6	21.1	22.6	2.6	7.5	18.3	11.9	17.8
Voyage [55]	28.4	29.0	19.9	28.3	9.6	17.7	17.2	29.2	1.7	7.2	23.1	10.6	18.5
Google [28]	25.6	34.4	22.1	30.0	14.8	19.3	16.5	28.9	1.6	8.5	16.9	12.5	19.3

Table 34: The performance of retrieval models when using reasoning steps generated by Gemini-pro as queries

	StackExchange							Coding		Theorem-based			Avg.
	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
<i>Sparse model</i>													
BM25 [44]	54.3	49.1	20.7	33.2	19.8	18.3	23.5	20.9	12.7	2.7	17.2	9.5	23.5
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>													
BGE [63]	28.4	34.7	21.8	25.1	13.5	13.4	19.1	24.7	5.3	4.0	17.7	13.8	18.4
Inst-L [49]	35.9	41.3	22.8	34.0	17.8	16.7	16.4	17.4	0.9	6.1	23.2	12.1	20.4
SBERT [43]	20.3	24.2	15.5	24.7	11.5	9.8	16.6	25.1	2.3	4.1	18.2	10.9	15.3
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>													
E5 [57]	29.7	42.0	18.1	19.2	13.8	17.1	14.1	27.6	0.2	5.9	20.5	23.9	19.3
SFR [34]	29.3	38.2	20.4	23.8	16.3	16.0	16.8	26.8	0.3	6.9	21.6	22.0	19.9
Inst-XL [49]	44.5	48.7	26.8	34.7	22.3	22.0	26.5	24.8	1.5	7.0	17.4	11.6	24.0
GritLM [37]	29.0	33.9	20.8	24.6	17.0	12.9	19.2	32.1	4.3	6.7	22.8	22.9	20.5
Qwen [31]	35.0	41.6	20.0	29.0	15.9	17.4	21.3	23.6	4.4	6.0	25.6	27.6	22.3
<i>Proprietary models</i>													
Cohere [14]	30.2	33.2	22.9	27.1	16.6	19.3	21.6	20.7	3.4	5.2	18.2	15.6	19.5
OpenAI [40]	35.1	38.3	24.7	33.2	15.1	14.4	17.6	24.3	4.7	6.7	21.4	19.3	21.2
Voyage [55]	37.5	40.0	22.8	29.7	13.6	17.9	19.6	32.3	2.3	5.3	26.7	17.6	22.1
Google [28]	35.6	38.4	23.6	33.1	16.6	22.5	16.2	32.3	2.6	8.0	23.8	17.4	22.5

Table 35: The performance of retrieval models when using reasoning steps generated by Llama3-70B as queries

	StackExchange							Coding		Theorem-based			Avg.
	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
<i>Sparse model</i>													
BM25 [44]	54.0	51.2	24.1	35.2	19.6	21.6	25.3	21.1	14.0	4.9	16.2	17.1	25.3
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>													
BGE [63]	28.8	38.6	22.7	23.5	15.0	16.5	22.2	25.4	7.5	5.7	21.7	16.7	20.3
Inst-L [49]	39.8	45.4	24.2	34.4	19.5	20.3	19.4	19.2	1.4	4.4	24.1	15.4	22.3
SBERT [43]	20.2	25.5	16.9	24.1	10.3	11.7	16.6	24.7	6.6	3.8	19.7	13.8	16.1
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>													
E5 [57]	30.2	43.7	18.2	23.4	13.4	15.8	15.2	26.9	0.3	5.9	19.0	23.3	19.6
SFR [34]	26.1	38.4	21.4	25.3	14.7	15.8	17.7	27.1	0.5	6.9	20.3	21.5	19.7
Inst-XL [49]	45.2	51.2	32.1	39.8	21.1	26.2	28.0	25.3	1.7	6.8	19.5	13.1	25.8
GritLM [37]	28.2	35.0	22.4	24.6	17.0	14.4	20.9	32.0	4.3	4.8	22.1	20.8	20.5
Qwen [31]	33.1	43.0	21.7	30.4	13.7	20.0	22.3	25.8	8.0	5.2	25.3	28.9	23.1
<i>Proprietary models</i>													
Cohere [14]	34.8	35.1	26.4	27.6	17.9	22.4	24.0	24.5	4.2	6.6	19.7	19.7	21.9
OpenAI [40]	34.1	41.0	26.1	35.5	12.3	14.5	22.4	24.3	5.9	7.7	20.8	18.9	22.0
Voyage [55]	37.1	41.1	23.8	26.9	13.6	18.8	24.2	31.9	1.4	6.9	26.0	21.4	22.8
Google [28]	39.5	44.0	26.4	37.0	18.7	25.0	17.5	31.1	3.1	8.8	21.2	21.4	24.5

Table 36: The performance of retrieval models when using reasoning steps generated by Claude-opus as queries

	StackExchange							Coding		Theorem-based			Avg.
	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
<i>Sparse model</i>													
BM25 [44]	54.2	51.7	23.2	38.3	22.4	20.3	25.8	20.0	19.8	4.0	18.5	17.6	26.3
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>													
BGE [63]	30.2	38.0	23.4	29.3	14.7	15.0	22.0	22.4	6.0	4.5	24.2	19.4	20.7
Inst-L [49]	37.8	40.0	24.9	34.2	19.6	17.6	18.9	17.8	1.5	4.0	24.5	18.2	21.6
SBERT [43]	19.1	24.4	18.5	24.9	11.5	11.0	14.5	23.0	5.7	3.1	19.3	18.5	16.1
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>													
E5 [57]	31.6	43.3	20.9	25.8	13.6	17.4	14.6	29.1	0.3	6.8	23.1	26.4	21.1
SFR [34]	29.9	38.8	24.3	28.4	15.6	16.8	18.8	28.5	0.6	7.3	24.3	24.9	21.5
Inst-XL [49]	45.7	50.0	29.0	43.0	22.5	23.0	27.0	23.8	2.0	6.6	21.2	15.4	25.8
GritLM [37]	32.4	36.4	22.5	28.8	19.5	15.8	24.1	31.1	6.3	5.7	25.0	26.5	22.8
Qwen [31]	35.8	45.1	22.0	34.4	15.8	19.5	26.4	24.6	5.7	6.2	27.0	30.9	24.5
<i>Proprietary models</i>													
Cohere [14]	33.3	36.4	24.8	28.7	18.1	20.4	21.2	21.6	4.4	6.9	21.6	20.2	21.5
OpenAI [40]	36.5	39.6	25.6	36.7	13.2	14.8	22.6	25.5	5.4	7.7	22.5	21.2	22.6
Voyage [55]	37.2	40.2	24.8	31.1	12.6	18.4	20.5	30.9	1.9	6.9	27.9	21.3	22.8
Google [28]	37.3	43.7	27.1	38.8	21.8	23.7	17.6	31.4	2.9	9.1	24.6	22.0	25.0

Table 37: The performance of retrieval models when using reasoning steps generated by GPT-4 as queries

	StackExchange							Coding		Theorem-based			Avg.
	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
<i>Sparse model</i>													
BM25 [44]	53.6	53.6	24.3	38.6	18.8	22.7	25.9	19.3	17.7	3.9	18.9	20.2	26.5
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>													
BGE [63]	29.3	41.8	23.4	27.8	11.7	14.4	21.6	24.2	8.2	7.5	24.3	25.1	21.6
Inst-L [49]	40.0	44.9	24.2	34.4	18.2	21.1	19.0	17.8	1.3	6.8	27.1	19.9	22.9
SBERT [43]	18.9	26.0	17.5	27.1	9.1	9.9	17.3	24.3	10.2	5.0	21.4	22.9	17.5
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>													
E5 [57]	29.6	43.6	20.1	26.7	11.8	17.7	15.6	29.1	0.9	5.3	25.6	35.7	21.8
SFR [34]	26.2	39.1	21.5	28.3	13.4	16.8	19.5	28.4	1.5	7.1	25.9	33.2	21.7
Inst-XL [49]	47.3	51.4	29.7	40.5	20.5	25.3	27.0	24.4	2.1	8.4	21.8	16.4	26.2
GritLM [37]	33.1	38.9	22.3	28.8	17.4	17.7	24.1	31.8	11.7	6.7	26.3	29.5	24.0
Qwen [31]	35.8	43.0	24.3	34.3	15.6	19.7	24.4	25.4	5.2	4.6	28.0	33.7	24.5
<i>Proprietary models</i>													
Cohere [14]	31.8	36.6	25.6	29.3	16.1	22.0	23.2	20.8	7.0	7.0	23.0	25.16	22.3
OpenAI [40]	35.5	40.0	24.8	38.0	13.7	17.0	24.2	24.4	6.5	7.7	22.1	23.5	23.1
Voyage [55]	36.9	42.7	24.5	34.3	13.9	21.2	22.1	31.4	2.1	6.6	29.0	27.4	24.4
Google [28]	36.5	45.3	25.6	38.1	19.1	25.0	18.0	31.1	3.6	10.1	27.4	29.6	25.8



Table 38: **Long-context retrieval performance on unsplit web pages of StackExchange data.** The scores are reported in recall@1

	Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Pony	Avg.
Sparse models									
BM25	10.7	15.4	10.7	8.4	7.4	22.2	10.7	5.4	11.4
Open-sourced models (<1B)									
BGE	16.4	27.7	20.9	11.6	10.9	13.2	16.9	0.4	14.8
Inst-L	24.1	29.5	14.1	21.3	12.9	14.5	25.4	3.9	18.2
SBERT	25.6	34.1	18.9	15.8	10.9	15.0	18.0	1.2	17.4
Open-sourced models (>1B)									
E5	29.9	36.3	26.2	46.7	17.3	14.5	32.2	1.1	25.5
SFR	30.3	37.0	24.3	47.7	17.3	14.5	35.0	2.0	26.0
Inst-XL	22.0	32.0	14.1	20.5	12.9	15.0	20.1	5.9	17.8
GritLM	37.5	39.4	25.7	35.3	17.8	20.1	32.4	0.0	26.0
Qwen	39.2	36.1	25.7	42.3	21.3	23.5	33.1	1.3	27.8
Proprietary models									
Cohere	31.5	35.5	18.0	20.5	9.9	15.8	15.2	0.8	18.4
OpenAI	33.1	32.3	24.8	35.1	11.9	11.5	26.3	0.0	21.9
Voyage	34.4	35.3	26.7	41.6	12.9	13.7	31.1	1.3	24.6
Google	30.9	38.0	21.8	30.7	12.9	19.2	25.6	0.3	22.4

Table 39: **Statistics of StackExchange and Pony data before web pages and documentation are split.** For each dataset, we show the number of queries and documents, the average length of queries and documents, and the average number of gold documents.

	# Query	# Doc	Avg Query Len	Avg Doc Len	# Avg Gold Doc
Biology	103	524	115.2	9422.4	1.3
Earth Science	116	601	109.5	27312.3	1.6
Economics	103	516	181.5	11896.4	1.1
Psychology	101	512	149.6	12411.66	1.1
Robotics	101	508	818.9	14998.2	1.1
Stack Overflow	117	1858	478.3	40759.7	1.1
Sustainable Living	108	554	148.5	12077.7	1.2
Pony	112	577	102.6	1361.0	6.9

Table 40: **MiniLM (cross-encoder), Gemini and GPT-4 reranking scores based on BM25 top-10 or top-100 retrieval results.**

Reranker	top-k	StackExchange							Code		Math			Avg.
		Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
None	-	19.2	27.1	14.9	12.5	13.5	16.5	15.2	24.4	7.9	6.2	9.8	4.8	14.3
MiniLM	10	15.4	26.6	13.0	11.8	14.3	15.4	13.6	21.8	8.7	6.1	6.5	4.2	13.1
	100	8.5	18.9	6.0	5.4	7.6	7.9	8.9	15.0	11.3	6.1	3.6	0.5	8.3
Gemini	10	21.9	29.7	16.9	14.2	16.1	16.7	16.7	24.5	8.0	6.2	9.5	8.2	15.7
GPT-4	10	23.8	33.7	18.4	16.4	18.4	20.3	17.2	22.6	10.2	6.5	11.3	9.6	17.4
	100	33.8	34.2	16.7	27.0	22.3	27.7	11.1	3.4	15.6	1.2	2.0	8.6	17.0

Table 41: MiniLM (cross-encoder), Gemini and GPT-4 reranking scores based on Google retrieval top-10 or top-100 results.

Reranker	top-k	StackExchange							Code		Math			Avg.
		Bio.	Earth.	Econ.	Psy.	Rob.	Stack.	Sus.	Leet.	Pony	AoPS	TheoQ.	TheoT.	
None	-	23.0	34.4	19.5	27.9	16.0	17.9	17.3	29.6	3.6	9.3	21.5	14.3	19.5
MiniLM	10	17.0	30.6	15.8	20.3	12.3	15.0	14.6	24.0	6.0	9.8	14.2	11.9	16.0
	100	7.5	21.7	6.4	6.2	7.0	7.1	8.3	16.0	17.2	8.1	4.2	2.9	9.4
Gemini	10	23.8	35.8	19.6	29.0	16.4	17.2	18.6	29.1	5.0	9.4	20.8	16.3	20.1
GPT-4	10	26.1	36.5	20.9	32.6	16.8	22.6	20.8	24.5	5.5	8.9	22.9	19.8	21.5
	100	42.5	40.9	25.9	42.1	23.2	35.1	17.2	5.6	10.8	2.4	6.6	19.3	22.6

Table 42: Gemini prompt to rerank documents.

Gemini

The following passages are related to the query: {query}

[1]. {doc 1}

[2]. {doc 2}

...

First identify the essential problem in the query.

Think step by step to reason about why each document is relevant or irrelevant.

Rank these passages based on their relevance to the query.

Please output the ranking result of the most relevant {k} passages as a list,

where the first element is the id of the most relevant passage,

the second element is the id of the second most element, etc.

Please strictly follow the format to output a list of {k} ids:

'''

[...]

'''

Table 43: Results of retrieval models copied from MTEB [38] for easier reference. Argu. refers to ArguAna, Climate. refers to ClimateFEVER, CQA. refers to CQADupstackRetrieval, FIQA. refers to FIQA2018, Hot. refers to HotpotQA, MS. refers to MSMARCO, NF. refers to NFCorpus, Quora refers to QuoraRetrieval, SCI. refers to SCIDOCS, Sci. refers to SciFact, Touche. refers to Touche2020, TREC. refers to TRECCOVID. Except BM25, whose results are from Thakur et al. [52], all other results are from Muennighoff et al. [38].

	Argu.	Climate.	CQA.	DBPedia	FEVER	FIQA.	Hot.	MS.	NF.	NQ	Quora.	SCI.	Sci.	Touche.	TREC.	Avg.
<i>Sparse model</i>																
BM25 [44]	31.5	21.3	29.9	31.3	75.3	23.6	60.3	22.8	32.5	32.9	78.9	15.8	66.5	36.7	65.6	41.6
<i>Open-sourced models (&lt;1B)</i>																
BGE [63]	63.5	36.6	42.2	44.1	87.2	45.0	74.1	42.6	38.1	55.0	89.1	22.6	74.6	24.8	74.8	54.3
Inst-L [49]	57.1	27.7	43.8	36.7	72.7	45.5	55.2	39.7	34.1	50.1	88.4	18.6	64.3	21.6	58.1	47.6
SBERT [43]	46.5	22.0	45.0	32.1	50.9	50.0	39.3	39.8	33.3	50.5	87.5	23.8	65.6	19.9	51.3	43.8
<i>Open-sourced models (&gt;1B)</i>																
E5 [57]	61.9	38.4	43.0	48.9	87.8	56.6	75.7	43.1	38.6	63.5	89.6	16.3	76.4	26.4	87.3	56.9
SFR [34]	67.2	36.4	46.5	49.1	89.4	60.4	77.0	43.4	41.9	69.9	89.8	19.9	77.7	29.0	87.6	59.0
Inst-XL [49]	55.7	26.5	43.1	40.2	70.0	47.0	55.9	41.6	36.0	57.2	88.9	17.4	64.6	23.4	71.4	49.3
GritLM [37]	63.2	30.9	49.4	46.6	82.7	60.0	79.4	42.0	40.9	70.3	89.5	24.4	79.2	27.9	74.8	57.4
Qwen [31]	62.7	44.0	40.6	48.0	93.4	55.3	72.3	41.7	38.3	61.8	89.6	27.7	75.3	20.3	72.7	56.2
<i>Proprietary models</i>																
Cohere [14]	61.5	38.4	41.5	43.4	89.0	42.2	70.7	42.9	38.6	61.6	88.7	20.3	71.8	32.4	81.9	55.0
Voyage [55]	64.1	32.7	46.6	46.0	91.5	59.8	70.9	40.6	40.3	65.9	87.4	24.3	80.0	39.2	85.1	58.3
OpenAI [40]	58.1	30.3	47.5	44.8	87.9	55.0	71.6	40.2	42.1	61.3	89.1	23.1	77.8	23.4	79.6	55.4
Google [28]	62.2	33.2	48.9	47.1	87.0	59.2	71.3	32.6	40.3	61.3	88.2	20.3	75.4	25.9	82.6	55.7