
Mix-of-Granularity: Optimize the Chunking Granularity for Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Zijie Zhong¹, Hanwen Liu², Xiaoya Cui², Xiaofan Zhang^{1,*}, and Zengchang Qin^{2,*}

¹Shanghai Artificial Intelligence Laboratory

²School of Automation Science and Electrical Engineering, Beihang University

*Corresponding authors

{zhongzijie, zhangxiaofan}@pjlab.org.cn

{liuhwen, xiaoya, zcqin}@buaa.edu.cn

Abstract

Integrating information from different reference data sources is a major challenge for Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) systems because each knowledge source adopts a unique data structure and follows different conventions. Retrieving from multiple knowledge sources with one fixed strategy usually leads to under-exploitation of information. To mitigate this drawback, inspired by Mix-of-Expert, we introduce Mix-of-Granularity (MoG), a method that dynamically determines the optimal granularity of a knowledge database based on input queries using a router. The router is efficiently trained with a newly proposed loss function employing soft labels. We further extend MoG to Mix-of-Granularity-Graph (MoGG), where reference documents are pre-processed into graphs, enabling the retrieval of relevant information from distantly situated chunks. Extensive experiments demonstrate that both MoG and MoGG effectively predict optimal granularity levels, significantly enhancing the performance of the RAG system in downstream tasks. The code of both MoG and MoGG will be made public.

1 Introduction

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [30] has become a popular method for enhancing Large Language Models (LLMs). The core concept of RAG involves retrieving relevant information from external knowledge bases to provide additional context to the LLM, enabling it to generate more precise and grounded responses. RAG offers a promising and practical solution to mitigate LLMs' hallucinations because (1) it can be applied to any LLM, even those accessible only via APIs, and (2) the reference information is easy to modify or update. Many LLM-based products are supported by RAG systems, with examples spanning various industries such as customer service, advertising and marketing, education and e-learning, healthcare, and e-commerce and retailing [27, 51, 44, 26, 36].

The quality and pertinence of the retrieved reference documents are crucial for the quality of the final generated response. Consequently, much research has focused on the retrieval phase. Currently, most RAG systems follow the Dual-Encoder Architecture [11] (DEA) paradigm, in which the reference documents are divided into small snippets, encoded by specific encoders, and then stored in the vector database (e.g. FAISS [24] or Neo4j [8]) as embeddings. The DEA paradigm shows great potential for empowering LLMs with any existing knowledge database (knowledge graphs, textbooks, Wikipedia, etc.), providing a practical solution to alleviate LLMs' hallucinations.

However, a notable challenge in adopting the DEA paradigm is that the chunking size of reference documents is hard to optimize. For instance, effectively retrieving reference knowledge from medical textbooks or a Medical Knowledge Graph Database (e.g. Hetionet [16]) requires different chunking

sizes because the data structure and information density in both sources are quite different: medical textbooks contain long text passages organized around similar topics, while a Medical Knowledge Graph Database is formed with entities of different terms (usually quite short) and the relations between them. In practice, different chunking sizes should be set for these two knowledge databases. However, searching for the optimal chunking size for each knowledge source is tedious. Another challenge of the DEA paradigm is that even when an optimal chunking size is determined, this fixed chunking size does not work well in all cases, because different types of users' input correspond to different optimal chunking sizes. As illustrated in Figure 1, when the user asks for precise information about one disease or one medicine (fine-grained question), chunking the reference document in finer granularity is better; whereas, if the user asks for broad information, like the general information of a disease (coarse-grained question), a more coarse granularity of chunking is preferred. Thus, the community calls for a method to dynamically determine the chunking size, for which we propose the Mix-of-Granularity (MoG). We draw inspiration from Mix-of-Experts [6], which is a machine learning architecture that dynamically combines predictions from multiple specialized models, allowing for adaptive selection of the most relevant expertise for each input. Similarly, the fundamental concept of MoG involves training, in a supervised learning manner, a router to select and combine reference snippets of different granularity levels so that only the most pertinent snippets are passed to the backbone LLM. With the snippets of improved quality, the LLM can give better-grounded responses.




Figure 1: The Mix-of-Granularity (MoG) mechanism can automatically select the optimal granularity when extracting information from the reference knowledge database (scenarios 1 and 2), achieving both high information pertinence and coverage. The selected text is passed to LLM for generation. When relevant information is dispersed across distant sections (scenario 3), MoG-Graph (MoGG) is applied to effectively retrieve these separate pieces of information. In MoGG, the reference documents are pre-processed in the form of a graph, and MoGG retrieves information with the best hopping range. The text corresponding to the selected subgraph is then fed to LLM for RAG.

The MoG still has difficulty dealing with broader queries that require information from different documents of a single knowledge database or even information from different knowledge databases. In such cases, i.e., cross-document question in Figure 1, adjusting the granularity of the reference document is not helpful because the necessary information is so distantly located that it cannot be covered by a reasonably large chunking window. To better answer these broader queries, we extend MoG to Mix-of-Granularity-Graph (MoGG). In MoGG, the reference documents in the knowledge databases are pre-processed as a graph, allowing relevant snippets to be included as neighbors of each other, regardless of their distance in the original databases. This extension further improves the performance of retrieving information from multiple knowledge sources.

In most existing RAG systems, when retrieving information from a database, a top- k selection is implemented to control the number of candidate snippets. This common practice obstructs the backward propagation of the gradient, making the training infeasible. In this paper, we keep this top- k selection for maximum compatibility with other works. To solve the problem of backward propagation, we introduce a loss function using soft labels. Soft labels are approximate training signals generated using offline algorithms or models like TF-IDF [38] or RoBERTa [32]. With the soft labels, the top- k retrieval is excluded from the training process, thus the issue of backward propagation is circumvented and the training is accelerated.

In conclusion, the main contributions of this work are: (1) We propose MoG, which dynamically retrieves snippets from the optimal granularity level with the help of a router, achieving a balanced trade-off between coverage and pertinence during the retrieval phase of any RAG system. (2) We extend MoG to MoGG by reorganizing the reference document in the form of a graph, thereby further improving the quality of retrieval when relevant information is dispersed across distant sections in the knowledge database. (3) We introduce a loss function utilizing soft labels to overcome the challenges associated with training with top- k selection.

2 Related Work

2.1 Retrieval-Augmented Generation

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) [30] has emerged as a standard practice to enhance the performance of LLMs, aiming to mitigate their problems of “hallucinations” and knowledge cut-off. An RAG system typically includes a Retriever that extracts relevant information from an external knowledge database, and a backbone LLM to generate grounded responses by considering the given relevant information (in-context learning [10]).

Technological advancements in RAG have addressed fundamental questions such as “what should be retrieved”, “when should retrieval occur”, and “how should the retrieved information be utilized”. In terms of “what to retrieve”, research has evolved from simple token retrieval [28] and entity retrieval [34] to more complex structures like chunks [37] and knowledge graphs [25]. Granularity matters a lot in retrieval, coarse-granularity-retrieval yields more information but with lower precision, while fine-granularity-retrieval offers comprehensive information at the cost of efficiency. The question of “when to retrieve” has led to strategies ranging from single [49, 42] to adaptive [20, 17] and multiple retrieval [19] methods. Regarding “how to use” the retrieved data, integration techniques have been developed for various levels of the model architecture, including the input [29], intermediate [3], and output layers [31]. Although integration at the intermediate and output layers is more effective, challenges remain concerning training requirements and efficiency limitations.

2.2 Chunking Optimization

Optimal chunk size is crucial for managing external documents. Breaking them down into small chunks is the first step to extracting and encoding the fine-grained features. Naive chunking strategies, such as “fixed-size” chunking and “recursive chunking,” attempt to create snippets of identical or similar size. However, fixed chunking size often yields suboptimal retrieval results in practice.

Current research in RAG explores chunking optimization techniques to improve retrieval efficiency and accuracy. One line of work focuses on increasing the recall of relevant snippets. For example, the “Sliding Window Chunking” [40] allows layered retrieval by merging globally related information across multiple processes. The “Parent Document Retrieval” [46] retrieves with small chunks and returns larger blocks of context for language model processing. Another line of work seeks to include more semantic information of the context to improve retrieval accuracy. “Metadata Filtering” [43] leverages document metadata to enhance the filtering process; “Context-Enriched Chunking” [45] breaks down information into meaningful segments and adds helpful summaries; while “Windowed Summarization Chunking” [45] enriches each text chunk with a windowed summary of the previous few chunks. Combining these methods has led to notable advancements, enhancing retrieval outcomes and improving performance in RAG.

2.3 Graph-Based Text Processing

Graph-based text processing techniques combine research in graphs and text retrieval. Previous works exploit semantic similarities between small snippets (a sentence or several words) and reorganize the text material into a graph using Entity Recognition and Relation Construction algorithms [33, 14, 52]. This approach breaks the constraint of the single dimension in the original text corpus, allowing chunks of the same topic to be grouped as neighbors in a graph. These graph-based text processing methods show great potential in tasks requiring reasoning over long texts or multi-hop reasoning.

Representative works in this field include “abstract embedding” [13], which prioritizes top- k retrieval based on document abstracts (or summaries), providing a comprehensive understanding of the context.

RAPTOR [41] organizes snippets as a tree (a special form of a graph) by recursively clustering them, where all non-leaf nodes correspond to summaries of their child nodes. This processing allows access to information at different granularity levels, resulting in significant improvements in summarization tasks. In GMoE [48], the authors use different expert networks to handle hop-1, hop-2, and mixed hop-1 & hop-2 neighbors of a node in a graph, which inspires our extension from MoG to MoGG.

3 Methodology

3.1 Preliminaries

Before describing the details of MoG and MoGG, let us begin with the basic annotations. MoG and MoGG are designed to enhance an existing RAG system, particularly its Retriever module. A typical RAG system comprises a Retriever \mathcal{R} , a Generator \mathcal{G} , and an external Knowledge database \mathcal{K} (knowledge source). A RAG system takes a user query q as input, retrieves reference document pieces (snippets or chunks) from \mathcal{K} , and uses these snippets to help the \mathcal{G} produce the final responses.

In practice, the most popular architecture for the Retriever is the Dual-Encoders Architecture [11], where the query q and all the snippets in \mathcal{K} are encoded into embeddings (e_q and e_s) using the same encoder \mathcal{E} . The extraction of relevant snippets is achieved by calculating the similarity between e_q and e_s . The calculation of cosine similarities is made efficient thanks to modern vector databases like FAISS [24] or the Neo4j Database [8]. The Generator module is typically a backbone LLM, such as GPT [4], Llama [1], GLM [12], or InternLM [5]. Once the snippets are retrieved, they are usually injected into the backbone LLM via prompt injection. This method is favored because many powerful LLMs are accessible only via API calls. With the knowledge-integrated prompt, the LLM generates the final response. In some RAG systems, post-processing modules are added after generation, but this aspect is not covered in our work as it is not our focus.

3.2 Naive MoG

3.2.1 Multi-granularity Router

We apply the idea of Mix-of-Expert [6] (MoE) to automatically determine the best granularity level in the retrieval phase of RAG. In a MoE system, different input tokens will be routed to the best expert network to be processed efficiently. Similarly, in MoG, a router is trained to predict the importance weight of different granularity levels based on the user’s input, so that the information retrieved from the optimal granularity level can be prioritized in the final top- k selection and thus has a higher chance to be passed to the LLM.

Figure 2 illustrates the workflow of retrieving relevant snippets with a router. At the beginning, the user’s input query q is encoded via RoBERTa before being mapped to a weight w by the router. In parallel, the input query is used to retrieve relevant snippets from the knowledge database \mathcal{K} . In each \mathcal{K} , the documents within it are first chunked into n_{gra} different granularity levels. Each snippet is then encoded into embeddings. The same retriever will retrieve the k_r most relevant snippets (in Figure 2 $k_r=3$) from each granularity level based on their similarity with q . After the retrieval, a pool of candidate snippets of size $n_{gra} \times k_r$ is formed. During the retrieval, each candidate snippet is assigned a relevance score. Since all snippets are retrieved with the same retriever, their relevance scores are comparable. These scores are then weighted and summed using weight w generated by the router. The k snippets with the highest weighted relevance scores ($k=1$ in Figure 2) are selected and fed to the backbone LLM, helping LLM generate grounded responses.

To trace the relevance scores of the same snippet across the different granularity levels, the documents are chunked in a non-overlapped way, and all chunks of coarser granularity are concatenations of several chunks of the finer granularity. In other words, each snippet of the finest granularity is included in one and only one snippet of coarser granularity. This approach allows us to trace the relevance scores of different granularity levels by the IDs of the finest chunks. For each chunk of the finest granularity level, if it is retrieved among the top- k_r snippets from one granularity level, its relevance score for that level is recorded as the actual relevance score, just like the chunk marked in red in Figure 2; otherwise, it is filled with 0, like some zeroes padded for the chunk marked in blue. In this way, we get the relevance scores t_{rs} of each finest snippet. Noting the set of all chunks of the




Figure 2: Mix-of-Granularity (MoG) mechanism prioritizes the chunks retrieved from optimal granularity level, which is determined by the router based on the user input query.

finest granularity level as \mathcal{C} , the retrieved chunk ($chunk_r$) is selected by top- k selection as follows:

$$chunk_r = \text{top}_k\text{-argmax}_{c \in \mathcal{C}}(t_{rs}(c) \cdot w). \quad (1)$$

The snippet injected to the prompt of LLM is the snippet containing $chunk_r$ of the granularity level with the highest weight (g_r). In Figure 2, the snippet of the third granularity level is injected in the prompt because this level has the highest weight. Formally, g_r is determined by:

$$g_r = \text{argmax}_{g \in [1, n_{gra}]} w_g, \quad (2)$$

where w_g represents the g -th element in w .

3.2.2 Soft-labels

In MoG, we use a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) as the router, which is trained in a supervised learning method. The input for the router is the embedding of the input query q generated with RoBERTa [32], which is then mapped to w by the router. The intrinsic training signal is the “labels” (l) in the Medical Question-Answering (MQA) datasets. In some MQA datasets, the ground truth snippets to be retrieved are provided, so we use them as “labels” directly; otherwise, the concatenation of the strings of the “Question” and “Answer” is used as the “label”. A natural training objective is to maximize the semantic similarity between $chunk_r$ and l by adjusting w . Unfortunately, this label can not be used to guide the training directly because there is a non-differentiable top- k selection in the way. The soft labels are proposed to bypass the top- k selection during the training.

For each query q , the most relevant snippet (S_{best}) is retrieved from the reference documents of each granularity level. The semantic similarity between each snippet in S_{best} and the label l is then calculated (with static models including TF-IDF [38], RoBERTa [32], or hitrate score) and stored in sim_{best} . We create a soft label of 0.8 (resp. 0.2) for the most (resp. the second) similar snippet in S_{best} , and pad 0 for the other snippets.

With the soft labels (sl) built, we can train the router to predict a high value (0.8) for the optimal granularity level, while conserving certain flexibility to choose the second-best granularity level. The router is trained by minimizing a Binary Cross Entropy loss function (l_{bce}):

$$l_{bce} = \sum_{i \in \text{len}(w)} -[sl_i \cdot \log(w_i) + (1 - sl_i) \cdot \log(1 - w_i)]. \quad (3)$$

3.3 MoGG: MoG with Graph-context

In MoG, by adjusting the granularity level, the adjacent snippets with relevant knowledge can be retrieved altogether. This method is particularly effective when information centered around the same

topic is stored in sentences close to each other. However, in most cases, answering a complex question requires reasoning over information stored in different paragraphs or even different documents. In practice, the solution is to perform more retrievals at a finer granularity level, retrieving only highly relevant small pieces to form a comprehensive reasoning chain. This approach is inconvenient because determining the optimal number of retrievals often involves manually adjusting k for the final selection, which is challenging because the whole tuning process is time-consuming and k can not go infinitely large. In this scenario, MoG shows no clear advantage compared to classic RAG implementations, because when changing the k is hard, adjusting the granularity level will only sacrifice either the precision or recall of the retrieval.

To overcome this challenge, an intuitive approach is to reorganize the reference document and group the relevant information so that each snippet in Figure 2 contains both the originally dispersed relevant text and the adjacent content. In this way, even for a limited k , the selected snippets can encompass information from different paragraphs or documents. Motivated by this, we propose a more applicable framework, MoGG, by enhancing MoG with a preprocessing step that organizes the reference database \mathcal{K} into a graph. As illustrated in Figure 3, each document is initially split into small pieces consisting of one or two sentences, and each piece is treated as a separate node in the graph. To determine the edges in the graph, an index is first created with all these nodes. Then, each node is used as a “query” to search for the k_{graph} (set as 3 in Figure 3) most relevant nodes using a retriever. An edge is then added between the query node and each of the relevant nodes while ensuring that the similarity between them meets a predefined threshold T_{graph} . For simplicity, here we use the same retriever as the RAG system. The graph obtained is a binary undirected graph, meaning that the connections between any nodes are bi-directional.




Figure 3: Pre-processing the reference document to form graphs. The concept of “granularity level” is changed into “hopping range” in graphs.

This transformation of the original reference document into a graph extends the concept of “context” in linear text to “neighbors” in a graph. In a graph setting, granularity levels are adapted to “hopping ranges”: in a non-graph setting, a larger granularity level corresponds to more adjacent sentences being grouped in a chunk; in a graph setting, a larger granularity level corresponds to sentences within a larger hopping range of a centered sentence being grouped as one chunk. To avoid context redundancy, duplicate nodes in the neighbors are considered only once. Similar to MoG, the documents in the external knowledge database \mathcal{K} are chunked with n_{gra} different hopping ranges and then encoded into embeddings. The rest of the MoG, i.e., parts I and III in Figure 2, remains unchanged. By transforming the documents into a graph structure and defining granularity based on hopping ranges, MoGG effectively captures dispersed relevant information, allowing for more comprehensive and efficient retrieval.

4 Experiments

4.1 Corpus and Medical QA datasets

A reference knowledge database used in a RAG system is often termed a “corpus”. To form the corpora, data from various sources were collected, including the widely-used PubMed¹ corpus for all biomedical abstracts, the StatPearls² corpus for clinical decision support, the Textbooks[21] corpus

¹<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>

²<https://www.statpearls.com/>

covering medical textbook knowledge, and the Wikipedia³ corpus for general knowledge. The four corpora are combined to form a larger corpus, named “MedCorp”. The statistics of the used corpora are shown in Table 1 (left).

Following the setup in the MIRAGE benchmark [51], we evaluate the performance of the RAG system using five Medical Question-Answering datasets: MMLU-Med [15], MedQA-US [53], MedMCQA [35], PubMedQA* [22], and BioASQ-Y/N [47]. Specifically, we extracted only the multiple-choice questions relevant to the biomedical field and removed the ground truth supporting contexts during testing. The details of each QA dataset are included in Appendix A. The statistics of the five datasets used in our experiments are listed in Table 1 (right).

Table 1: Important statistics of corpora and QA datasets

Corpus	#Doc	#Snip.	\bar{L} .	Domain	Datasets	Size	#Opt.	\bar{L}	Source
PubMed	23.9M	23.9M	196	Bio.-Med.	MMLU-Med	1,089	4	63	Exam.
StatPearls	9.3k	301.2k	119	Clinics	MedQA-US	1,273	4	177	Exam.
Textbooks	18	125.8k	182	Medicine	MedMCQA	4,183	4	26	Exam.
Wikipedia	6.5M	29.9M	162	General	PubMedQA*	500	3	24	Literature
MedCorp	30.4M	54.2M	221	Mixed	BioASQ-Y/N	618	2	17	Literature

4.2 Experiment Setup

All backbone LLMs, whether accessed via API or local deployment, are run under off-the-shelf settings. The exact versions of the backbone LLMs are listed in Appendix B. Experiments are conducted on Nvidia GeForce 3090 and 4090 GPUs. The code is written using the PyTorch framework, utilizing an Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 0.001. Each training job is run until the convergence of the loss value. During the experiment, there are two top-k selections. Unless specified, when retrieving snippets from each corpus, we select the top-3 snippets; when all the snippets are retrieved from each corpus, we select the top-2 snippets with the highest relevance scores to pass to the backbone LLM. When snippets are too long, they are truncated automatically to fit the LLM’s context window size. The router requires approximately 12GB of GPU memory for training and 6GB for inference. Utilizing a caching mechanism, we efficiently completed 35 training sessions and over a hundred inferences, each training session taking around 4 hours for 1000 epochs.

4.3 Performance of MoG on Medical QA Task

As mentioned above, we test the effectiveness of MoG on Medical Question-Answering datasets. Each question within the dataset is formulated as a multiple-choice question. The LLM is tasked with choosing the best answer option(s) from the given options. Under this setting, we evaluated the performance of the entire RAG system by calculating the Exact Matching accuracy of the answers. To prevent knowledge leakage, following previous work [51], only the question is used (options not given) to retrieve reference documents from the external knowledge database.

The router of MoG guides the retrieval system to choose the optimal granularity. As shown in Figure 4, when tested on different datasets, the router trained with Textbook corpus shows a preference for different granularity levels. For instance, on the PubMedQA dataset, the finest granularity snippets are selected most frequently. This is because the questions in PubMedQA are typically precise and can be answered with short reference snippets.

MoG is integrated into one same RAG system, with which we conduct the Medical Question-Answering task. Backbone LLMs are altered to cover some of the popular ones, such as ChatGPT [4], InternLM2 [5], Llama3 [1], GLM3 [12], and Qwen1.5 [2]. The router is trained with the soft labels built using RoBERTa [32], this choice is justified by the experiment in Appendix C. Three candidate snippets are retrieved from each granularity level of the external knowledge database. To investigate the effect of varying the number of candidate snippets on RAG system performance, we conducted experiments with different snippet counts. Detailed methodology and results are provided in Appendix D. The retriever is fixed as BM25 [39], with a further discussion on the performance of different retrievers included in Appendix E. Here we present the experimental results obtained with

³<https://www.wikipedia.org>




Figure 4: Averaged weights of different granularity levels on different QA datasets

the router trained with MedCorp corpus in Table 2, the results obtained with routers trained on four single corpora are presented in Appendix F. The results demonstrate that MoG consistently enhanced the performance of the RAG system across different backbone models. Apart from the standard baseline using Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [50], we add a RAG system with a single granularity corpus as the baseline. The granularity level selected for this baseline is set to be the same as the one in MedRAG [51], therefore, it is also noted as “MedRAG” in Table 2.

From the table, we find that MoG constantly performs better than MedRAG, while not necessarily better than CoT. The reason why CoT might be better is that the RAG system we used has no noise filters, thus the noise is injected together with the external knowledge via prompts. A detailed analysis of the number of samples improved or degraded by the application of MoG is included in the Appendix G, in which we manually verified that the majority of degradation is caused by noise.

We also find that MoG improves the accuracy score more when applied on smaller, weaker LLMs (like ChatGLM and Qwen), this is probably because smaller LLMs have less knowledge stored in their internal parameters and, thus could benefit more from the retrieved snippets.

Table 2: Accuracy of Medical Question-Answering task with MoG (trained with MedCorp), best results marked in **bold**.

LLM	Method	MIRAGE Benchmark Dataset (Acc.)					Avg.
		MMLU	MedQA	MedMCQA	PubMedQA	BioASQ	
GLM3	CoT	0.4356±0.04	0.3451±0.03	0.3250±0.02	0.3400±0.05	0.5081±0.04	0.3908
	MedRAG	0.4950±0.04	0.3804 ±0.03	0.3632±0.02	0.5100±0.05	0.6532±0.04	0.4804
	MoG	0.5198 ±0.04	0.3529±0.03	0.3716 ±0.02	0.5400 ±0.05	0.6774 ±0.04	0.4923
GPT-3.5	CoT	0.7525 ±0.03	0.6118±0.03	0.5890 ±0.02	0.5200±0.05	0.7339±0.04	0.6571
	MedRAG	0.6931±0.03	0.6510 ±0.03	0.4671±0.02	0.6000±0.05	0.8306 ±0.03	0.6484
	MoG	0.7129±0.03	0.6471±0.03	0.5532±0.02	0.6200 ±0.05	0.7823±0.04	0.6631
InternLM	CoT	0.7426 ±0.03	0.6118 ±0.03	0.5269±0.02	0.3500±0.05	0.7258±0.04	0.5914
	MedRAG	0.6040±0.04	0.5294±0.03	0.3847±0.03	0.4300±0.05	0.7661 ±0.04	0.5428
	MoG	0.7129±0.03	0.5961±0.03	0.5436 ±0.02	0.4100 ±0.05	0.7661 ±0.04	0.6057
Llama3	CoT	0.7079±0.03	0.6431 ±0.03	0.5663 ±0.02	0.5500±0.05	0.7258±0.04	0.6386
	MedRAG	0.6040±0.03	0.5725±0.03	0.4313±0.02	0.5600±0.05	0.7823±0.04	0.5900
	MoG	0.7228 ±0.03	0.6000±0.03	0.5627±0.02	0.6400 ±0.05	0.7984 ±0.04	0.6648
Qwen1.5	CoT	0.4604±0.04	0.3255±0.03	0.3883±0.02	0.2000±0.03	0.5484±0.04	0.3845
	MedRAG	0.5594±0.03	0.4353 ±0.03	0.4038±0.02	0.3400±0.05	0.5403±0.04	0.4558
	MoG	0.5941 ±0.04	0.4235±0.03	0.4301 ±0.02	0.4700 ±0.05	0.6694 ±0.04	0.5174

4.4 Performance of MoGG on Medical QA Task

Similarly to the experiment of MoG, we test the performance of MoGG on Medical QA datasets. Due to the large volume of Wikipedia and PubMed corpus, building the index for them in the setting of MoGG is too time-consuming. Therefore, we tested only the performance of MoGG with routers trained on Textbooks and StatPearls corpora. In Table 3 we present the results obtained when trained with Textbook corpus. The results obtained with StatPearls show similar patterns (listed in Appendix H). From the table, we can tell that MoGG can further improve the averaged accuracy scores. By

comparing Table 2 and Table 3, we can find that, even when trained with significantly fewer samples (Textbooks corpus is a tiny subset of MedCorp corpus, accounting for only about 0.2% of all the snippets in MedCorp), MoGG brings more significant improvement in terms of the averaged accuracy score with respect to MedRAG than MoG. This finding highlights that MoGG is more efficient than MoG thanks to its flexible way of organizing the reference snippets (in the form of a graph).

Table 3: Accuracy of Medical Question-Answering task with MoGG (trained with Textbooks), best results marked in **bold**.

LLM	Method	MIRAGE Benchmark Dataset (Acc.)					
		MMLU	MedQA	MedMCQA	PubMedQA	BioASQ	Avg.
GLM3	CoT	0.4356±0.04	0.3451±0.03	0.3250±0.02	0.3400±0.05	0.5081±0.04	0.3908
	MedRAG	0.4802±0.04	0.3569±0.03	0.3811±0.02	0.3600±0.05	0.5565±0.04	0.4269
	MoG	0.5545±0.04	0.2941±0.03	0.3548±0.02	0.4700±0.05	0.5726±0.04	0.4492
	MoGG	0.5347±0.04	0.3176±0.03	0.3608±0.02	0.4500±0.05	0.5645±0.04	0.4455
GPT-3.5	CoT	0.7525±0.03	0.6118±0.03	0.5890±0.02	0.5200±0.05	0.7339±0.04	0.6571
	MedRAG	0.7277±0.03	0.6745±0.03	0.4468±0.02	0.2600±0.04	0.5161±0.04	0.5250
	MoG	0.7525±0.03	0.6667±0.03	0.5603±0.02	0.5200±0.05	0.7016±0.04	0.6122
	MoGG	0.7673±0.03	0.6784±0.03	0.5233±0.02	0.4700±0.05	0.6452±0.04	0.6168
InternLM	CoT	0.7426±0.03	0.6118±0.03	0.5269±0.02	0.3500±0.05	0.7258±0.04	0.5914
	MedRAG	0.6188±0.03	0.5569±0.03	0.3118±0.02	0.1400±0.03	0.4839±0.04	0.4223
	MoG	0.7277±0.03	0.5725±0.03	0.5281±0.02	0.3400±0.05	0.7339±0.04	0.5804
	MoGG	0.7228±0.03	0.5882±0.03	0.5173±0.02	0.3400±0.05	0.7339±0.04	0.5804
Llama3	CoT	0.7079±0.03	0.6431±0.03	0.5663±0.02	0.5500±0.05	0.7258±0.04	0.6386
	MedRAG	0.6485±0.03	0.5961±0.03	0.4146±0.02	0.3800±0.05	0.5242±0.04	0.5127
	MoG	0.7228±0.03	0.6196±0.03	0.5484±0.02	0.5100±0.05	0.7097±0.04	0.6221
	MoGG	0.7030±0.03	0.5961±0.03	0.5460±0.02	0.5200±0.05	0.7661±0.04	0.6262
Qwen1.5	CoT	0.4604±0.04	0.3255±0.03	0.3883±0.02	0.2000±0.03	0.5484±0.04	0.3845
	MedRAG	0.5941±0.03	0.4000±0.03	0.3835±0.02	0.3300±0.05	0.4919±0.04	0.4399
	MoG	0.5792±0.03	0.3843±0.03	0.4110±0.02	0.3300±0.05	0.6129±0.04	0.4635
	MoGG	0.5594±0.03	0.4314±0.03	0.4480±0.02	0.3000±0.05	0.6371±0.04	0.4752

5 Limitations and Broader Impacts

Our work serves as an early trial in dynamic chunking strategy, with the following major directions for improvement. First, MoG(G)’s candidate granularity levels are manually assigned. It could be more efficient if an algorithm automatically set these granularity levels to avoid excessive grid-searching for parameter optimization. Secondly, the current router uses only the semantic information of the input query to predict the best granularity level. In practice, other factors might influence this choice, such as the user’s knowledge of relevant fields, the type of query, and the expected response length. Incorporating more information into the router could potentially improve prediction results. Lastly, MoG(G) could be combined with other techniques to further enhance retrieval quality, such as Recursive Character Splitting ⁴, Parent Document Retrieval [46], or Sliding Window Chunking [40].

MoG(G) provides a valuable tool for integrating multiple sources of external knowledge databases into a RAG system, thereby enhancing RAG systems with existing knowledge sources. However, the router also introduces a new security risk: a compromised router could redirect knowledge retrieval to malicious sources, injecting incorrect or even harmful information into the backbone LLM. Therefore, it is crucial to protect and monitor the router to mitigate this risk.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we present Mix-of-Granularity (MoG), a mechanism to dynamically choose the best granularity when retrieving information from an external knowledge database. When applied to a Retrieval-Augmented Generation system, MoG helps retrieve more relevant information while

⁴https://python.langchain.com/v0.1/docs/modules/data_connection/document_transformers/recursive_text_splitter

reducing noise. MoG is further extended as Mix-of-Granularity-Graph (MoGG), where reference documents are reorganized in graph form. This extension allows distantly situated information to be retrieved simultaneously, overcoming the limitations of a fixed top- k selection strategy. Finally, we introduce a soft label guided loss function to address the difficulty of backward propagation with top- k selection, which could benefit future research.

References

- [1] Meta AI. Introducing meta llama 3: The most capable openly available llm to date. *Meta document*, 2024.
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, Binyuan Hui, Luo Ji, Mei Li, Junyang Lin, Runji Lin, Dayiheng Liu, Gao Liu, Chengqiang Lu, Keming Lu, Jianxin Ma, Rui Men, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Chuanqi Tan, Sinan Tan, Jianhong Tu, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Wei Wang, Shengguang Wu, Benfeng Xu, Jin Xu, An Yang, Hao Yang, Jian Yang, Shusheng Yang, Yang Yao, Bowen Yu, Hongyi Yuan, Zheng Yuan, Jianwei Zhang, Xingxuan Zhang, Yichang Zhang, Zhenru Zhang, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xiaohuan Zhou, and Tianhang Zhu. Qwen technical report, 2023.
- [3] Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George 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 W. Rae, Erich Elsen, and Laurent Sifre. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens, 2022.
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- [5] Zheng Cai, Maosong Cao, Haojiong Chen, Kai Chen, Keyu Chen, Xin Chen, Xun Chen, Zehui Chen, Zhi Chen, Pei Chu, Xiaoyi Dong, Haodong Duan, Qi Fan, Zhaoye Fei, Yang Gao, Jiaye Ge, Chenya Gu, Yuzhe Gu, Tao Gui, Aijia Guo, Qipeng Guo, Conghui He, Yingfan Hu, Ting Huang, Tao Jiang, Penglong Jiao, Zhenjiang Jin, Zhikai Lei, Jiaxing Li, Jingwen Li, Linyang Li, Shuaibin Li, Wei Li, Yining Li, Hongwei Liu, Jiangning Liu, Jiawei Hong, Kaiwen Liu, Kuikun Liu, Xiaoran Liu, Chengqi Lv, Haijun Lv, Kai Lv, Li Ma, Runyuan Ma, Zerun Ma, Wenchang Ning, Linke Ouyang, Jiantao Qiu, Yuan Qu, Fukai Shang, Yunfan Shao, Demin Song, Zifan Song, Zhihao Sui, Peng Sun, Yu Sun, Huanze Tang, Bin Wang, Guoteng Wang, Jiaqi Wang, Jiayu Wang, Rui Wang, Yudong Wang, Ziyi Wang, Xingjian Wei, Qizhen Weng, Fan Wu, Yingtong Xiong, Chao Xu, Ruiliang Xu, Hang Yan, Yirong Yan, Xiaogui Yang, Haochen Ye, Huaiyuan Ying, Jia Yu, Jing Yu, Yuhang Zang, Chuyu Zhang, Li Zhang, Pan Zhang, Peng Zhang, Ruijie Zhang, Shuo Zhang, Songyang Zhang, Wenjian Zhang, Wenwei Zhang, Xingcheng Zhang, Xinyue Zhang, Hui Zhao, Qian Zhao, Xiaomeng Zhao, Fengzhe Zhou, Zaida Zhou, Jingming Zhuo, Yicheng Zou, Xipeng Qiu, Yu Qiao, and Dahua Lin. Internlm2 technical report, 2024.
- [6] Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Yue Wu, Quanquan Gu, and Yuanzhi Li. Towards understanding mixture of experts in deep learning, 2022.
- [7] Arman Cohan, Sergey Feldman, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Daniel S. Weld. Specter: Document-level representation learning using citation-informed transformers, 2020.
- [8] Neo4j Company. Neo4j - the world’s leading graph database, 2012.
- [9] Gordon V Cormack, Charles LA Clarke, and Stefan Buettcher. Reciprocal rank fusion outperforms condorcet and individual rank learning methods. In *Proceedings of the 32nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 758–759, 2009.
- [10] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Jingjing Xu, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning, 2023.

- [11] Zhe Dong, Jianmo Ni, Daniel M. Bikel, Enrique Alfonseca, Yuan Wang, Chen Qu, and Imed Zitouni. Exploring dual encoder architectures for question answering, 2022.
- [12] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. Gln: General language model pretraining with autoregressive blank infilling, 2022.
- [13] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey, 2024.
- [14] Qipeng Guo, Zhijing Jin, Xipeng Qiu, Weinan Zhang, David Wipf, and Zheng Zhang. Cyclegt: Unsupervised graph-to-text and text-to-graph generation via cycle training, 2020.
- [15] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding, 2021.
- [16] Daniel Scott Himmelstein, Antoine Lizee, Christine Hessler, Leo Brueggeman, Sabrina L Chen, Dexter Hadley, Ari Green, Pouya Khankhanian, and Sergio E Baranzini. Systematic integration of biomedical knowledge prioritizes drugs for repurposing. *eLife*, 6:e26726, sep 2017.
- [17] Jie Huang, Wei Ping, Peng Xu, Mohammad Shoeybi, Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang, and Bryan Catanzaro. Raven: In-context learning with retrieval-augmented encoder-decoder language models, 2024.
- [18] Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning, 2022.
- [19] Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models, 2022.
- [20] Zhengbao Jiang, Frank F. Xu, Luyu Gao, Zhiqing Sun, Qian Liu, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. Active retrieval augmented generation, 2023.
- [21] Di Jin, Eileen Pan, Nassim Oufattole, Wei-Hung Weng, Hanyi Fang, and Peter Szolovits. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams, 2020.
- [22] Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William W. Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering, 2019.
- [23] Qiao Jin, Won Kim, Qingyu Chen, Donald C Comeau, Lana Yeganova, W John Wilbur, and Zhiyong Lu. Medcpt: Contrastive pre-trained transformers with large-scale pubmed search logs for zero-shot biomedical information retrieval. *Bioinformatics*, 39(11), November 2023.
- [24] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus, 2017.
- [25] Minki Kang, Jin Myung Kwak, Jinheon Baek, and Sung Ju Hwang. Knowledge graph-augmented language models for knowledge-grounded dialogue generation, 2023.
- [26] YuHe Ke, Liyuan Jin, Kabilan Elangovan, Hairil Rizal Abdullah, Nan Liu, Alex Tiong Heng Sia, Chai Rick Soh, Joshua Yi Min Tung, Jasmine Chiat Ling Ong, and Daniel Shu Wei Ting. Development and testing of retrieval augmented generation in large language models – a case study report, 2024.
- [27] Assia Khan. Retrieval augmented generation: 5 uses and their examples. *Lettria*, 2023.
- [28] Urvashi Khandelwal, Omer Levy, Dan Jurafsky, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Generalization through memorization: Nearest neighbor language models, 2020.
- [29] Omar Khattab, Keshav Santhanam, Xiang Lisa Li, David Hall, Percy Liang, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. Demonstrate-search-predict: Composing retrieval and language models for knowledge-intensive nlp, 2023.
- [30] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9459–9474. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.

- [31] Han Liang, Wenqian Zhang, Wenxuan Li, Jingyi Yu, and Lan Xu. Intergen: Diffusion-based multi-human motion generation under complex interactions. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, March 2024.
- [32] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach, 2019.
- [33] Igor Melnyk, Pierre Dognin, and Payel Das. Knowledge graph generation from text, 2022.
- [34] Sosuke Nishikawa, Ryokan Ri, Ikuya Yamada, Yoshimasa Tsuruoka, and Isao Echizen. Ease: Entity-aware contrastive learning of sentence embedding, 2022.
- [35] Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikannan Sankarasubbu. Medmcqa : A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering, 2022.
- [36] Irina Radeva, Ivan Popchev, Lyubka Doukova, and Miroslava Dimitrova. Web application for retrieval-augmented generation: Implementation and testing. *Electronics*, 13:1361, 04 2024.
- [37] Ori Ram, Yoav Levine, Itay Dalmedigos, Dor Muhlgay, Amnon Shashua, Kevin Leyton-Brown, and Yoav Shoham. In-context retrieval-augmented language models, 2023.
- [38] Juan Enrique Ramos. Using TF-IDF to determine word relevance in document queries, 2003.
- [39] Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.*, 3(4):333–389, apr 2009.
- [40] Krystian Safjan. From fixed-size to nlp chunking - a deep dive into text chunking techniques. *Krystian’s Safjan Blog*, 2023.
- [41] Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D. Manning. Raptor: Recursive abstractive processing for tree-organized retrieval, 2024.
- [42] Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen tau Yih. Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models, 2023.
- [43] Ryan Siegler. Optimizing vector search with metadata filtering. *KX systems*, 2024.
- [44] Sumit Soman and Sujoy Roychowdhury. Observations on building rag systems for technical documents, 2024.
- [45] Antematter team. Optimizing retrieval-augmented generation with advanced chunking techniques: A comparative study. *Antematter*, 2024.
- [46] LangChain team. Parent document retriever. *LangChain document*, 2023.
- [47] George Tsatsaronis, Georgios Balikas, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Ioannis Partalas, Matthias Zschunke, Michael Alvers, Dirk Weißenborn, Anastasia Krithara, Sergios Petridis, Dimitris Polychronopoulos, Yannis Almirantis, John Pavlopoulos, Nicolas Baskiotis, Patrick Gallinari, Thierry Artieres, Axel-Cyrille Ngonga Ngomo, Norman Heino, Eric Gaussier, Liliana Barrio-Alvers, and Georgios Paliouras. An overview of the bioasq large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 16:138, 04 2015.
- [48] Haotao Wang, Ziyu Jiang, Yuning You, Yan Han, Gaowen Liu, Jayanth Srinivasa, Ramana Rao Kompella, and Zhangyang Wang. Graph mixture of experts: Learning on large-scale graphs with explicit diversity modeling, 2023.
- [49] Yile Wang, Peng Li, Maosong Sun, and Yang Liu. Self-knowledge guided retrieval augmentation for large language models, 2023.
- [50] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 24824–24837. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- [51] Guangzhi Xiong, Qiao Jin, Zhiyong Lu, and Aidong Zhang. Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for medicine, 2024.
- [52] Jiaxuan You, Rex Ying, Xiang Ren, William L. Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. Graphrnn: Generating realistic graphs with deep auto-regressive models, 2018.
- [53] Xiao Zhang, Ji Wu, Zhiyang He, Xien Liu, and Ying Su. Medical exam question answering with large-scale reading comprehension, 2018.

A Details of QA Datasets

A.1 MMLU-Med

The Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) benchmark [15] evaluates the multitask learning capability of language models. While the full MMLU dataset encompasses 57 different tasks, we specifically extracted the medical questions for our tests, totaling 1089 questions.

A.2 MedQA-US

MedQA [53] is a multiple-choice QA dataset derived from professional medical board exams. It is available in Simplified Chinese, Traditional Chinese, and English. For our experiments, we used 1273 questions from the English version.

A.3 MedMCQA

MedMCQA [35] comprises a large number of questions from the Indian medical entrance exam, covering 2400 healthcare topics and 21 medical subjects. For the MIRAGE benchmark, we utilized the “dev” set of the original MedMCQA dataset.

A.4 PubMedQA*

PubMedQA is a research QA dataset in the biomedical field, consisting of 1000 manually annotated questions constructed from PubMed abstracts. In the MIRAGE benchmark, the reference contexts were removed. We selected a subset of 500 questions, which we refer to as PubMedQA*.

A.5 BioASQ-Y/N

BioASQ [47] is an annual biomedical QA competition. For the MIRAGE benchmark, we selected only the Machine Reading Comprehensive Track (Task B), focusing on 618 questions from recent years (2019-2023).

B Exact versions of LLMs

The exact versions of the backbone LLMs tested are listed in Table 4.

Table 4: Versions of the backbone LLMs

LLM name	LLM version	LLM site
ChatGPT	gpt-3.5-turbo-16k	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3.5-turbo
Llama3	Meta-Llama-3-8B	https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B-Instruct
InternLM2	internlm2-123b	https://www.sensetime.com/en/news-detail/51167237
ChatGLM3	chatglm3-6b	https://huggingface.co/THUDM/chatglm3-6b
Qwen1.5	Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B	https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen1.5-MoE-A2.7B-Chat

C Experiment on soft labels

In this section, we evaluate the performance of building soft labels using different methods (TF-IDF [38], RoBERTa [32], and hitrate score). For this experiment, we fix one retriever (BM25) and the backbone LLM (Qwen1.5), then build the soft labels using these three different methods. Different routers are trained with these different soft labels and tested on various datasets of the Medical Question-Answering task. The results are grouped in Table 5.

The results indicate that there is no universal best method for building soft labels. For instance, “hitrate score” is the most effective when training on MedMCQA, while RoBERTa shows advantages on PubMedQA. Overall, the soft labels built with RoBERTa demonstrate good performance across the board. Therefore, for the remainder of the experiments, RoBERTa is adopted as the default method for building soft labels.

Table 5: The performance of the routers trained with the soft labels created with different methods, best method marked in **bold**.

Training datasets	Methods	MIRAGE Benchmark Dataset (Acc.)					
		MMLU	MedQA	MedMCQA	PubMedQA	BioASQ	Avg.
MedQA	RoBERTa	0.4265±0.04	0.3711±0.04	0.3831±0.02	0.5000 ±0.06	0.6234±0.06	0.4608
	hitrate	0.4779 ±0.04	0.4088 ±0.04	0.4330 ±0.02	0.4194±0.06	0.6753 ±0.05	0.4829
	TF-IDF	0.4559±0.04	0.3019±0.04	0.4023±0.02	0.4355±0.06	0.5714±0.06	0.4334
MedMCQA	RoBERTa	0.4485 ±0.05	0.3459±0.04	0.4023±0.02	0.4839±0.06	0.5195±0.06	0.4400
	hitrate	0.4118±0.04	0.3774±0.04	0.3678±0.02	0.3387±0.06	0.5065±0.06	0.4004
	TF-IDF	0.4412±0.04	0.3899 ±0.04	0.4119 ±0.02	0.5161 ±0.06	0.5844 ±0.06	0.4687
PubMedQA	RoBERTa	0.4485 ±0.04	0.4528 ±0.04	0.3966 ±0.02	0.4677 ±0.06	0.6623 ±0.05	0.4856
	hitrate	0.4118±0.04	0.4088±0.04	0.3851±0.02	0.4355±0.06	0.6104±0.06	0.4503
	TF-IDF	0.4044±0.04	0.3208±0.04	0.3908±0.02	0.4677 ±0.06	0.5584±0.06	0.4284

D Impact of the Number of Candidate Snippets

In the previous experiment, three candidate snippets were retrieved from each granularity level of the external knowledge database. In this section, we investigate the effect of varying the number of candidate snippets on the overall performance of the RAG system. The rationale behind this exploration lies in the potential limitation of a small pool of candidate snippets, such as keeping only three. In such case, valuable snippets may be overlooked. For instance, a snippet ranked fourth or fifth in each retrieval may appear repeatedly across different granularity levels and thus might be selected after its relevance scores adjusted with weights assigned by the router. However, despite potentially high relevance, such snippets are excluded early in the retrieval process.

In this experiment, we test the RAG system equipped with MoG using different numbers of candidate snippets k_r ($k_r \in \{3, 8, 16, 32\}$). For simplicity, the backbone LLM was fixed as Qwen1.5. The experiment results are shown in Figure 5.

Generally, RAG performance improves as k_r increases, indicating the presence of helpful knowledge in the retrieved snippets. However, too many irrelevant snippets mislead the inference of LLM based on its knowledge. MoG stands out with its high initial performance even at low k_r values ($k_r \leq 8$ in this case), thanks to its multi-granularity filtering, which efficiently selects relevant snippets. This enhances the LLM’s accuracy without requiring a large snippet pool. MoG even strikes a balance at high k_r values ($k_r \geq 16$ in this case) due to its threshold limiting of the different corpora, avoiding the pitfalls of excessive information retrieval. MoG’s consistently high performance demonstrates its superiority in optimizing the number of candidate snippets for effective medical question-answering.




Figure 5: Accuracy of Medical Question-Answering task with different number of candidate snippets

E Choice of Retriever

In the previous experiment, BM25 [39] was used as the retriever because it is a lightweight and popular choice in practice. In this section, we replace BM25 with other popular retrievers to evaluate their performance. Referring to the setup in MedRAG [51], we select a general-domain semantic retriever called Contriever [18], a scientific-domain retriever called SPECTER [7], and a biomedical-domain retriever called MedCPT [23]. Additionally, the Reciprocal Rank Fusion (RRF) method [9] is utilized to combine results from different retrievers, including RRF-2 (fusion of BM25 and MedCPT) and RRF-4 (fusion of all four retrievers). From Table 6, we can observe the following: Each retriever

has a well-performing QA set, which results in minimal overall differences among these retrievers. Considering these conclusions, we decide to continue using BM25 for all other experiments.

Table 6: Performance of different retrievers

Corpus	Retriever	MIRAGE Benchmark Dataset (Acc.)					Avg.
		MMLU	MedQA	MedMCQA	PubMedQA	BioASQ	
Textbooks	BM25	0.6139±0.04	0.3961±0.04	0.3907±0.02	0.3100±0.06	0.5000±0.05	0.4421
	Contriever	0.5644±0.03	0.4235±0.03	0.4074±0.01	0.2500±0.04	0.5161±0.04	0.4323
	SPECTER	0.5941±0.03	0.4118±0.03	0.3919±0.01	0.1900±0.04	0.4839±0.04	0.4143
	MedCPT	0.5347±0.04	0.4549±0.03	0.4026±0.02	0.3100±0.05	0.5565±0.04	0.4517
	RRF-2	0.5396±0.03	0.4196±0.03	0.4241±0.02	0.2800±0.04	0.5403±0.04	0.4407
	RRF-4	0.5495±0.04	0.4392±0.03	0.4397±0.02	0.2600±0.04	0.6129±0.04	0.4603

F Performance of MoG on Medical QA Task (Other results)

In this section, we present the experiment result of MoG on the Medical QA task with four different corpora as the training datasets for the router. The results are grouped in Table 7.

Table 7: Accuracy of Medical Question-Answering task with MoG (trained with different corpora)

LLM	Method	Training Corpora (Avg Acc.)			
		Textbooks	StatPearls	PubMed	Wikipedia
GLM3	CoT	0.3908	0.3908	0.3908	0.3908
	MedRAG	0.4269	0.4343	0.4716	0.4582
	MoG	0.4492	0.4465	0.4911	0.4241
GPT-3.5	CoT	0.6571	0.6571	0.6571	0.6571
	MedRAG	0.5250	0.5229	0.6322	0.5332
	MoG	0.6122	0.5921	0.6795	0.6154
InternLM	CoT	0.5914	0.5914	0.5914	0.5914
	MedRAG	0.4223	0.4380	0.5559	0.4506
	MoG	0.5800	0.5886	0.6394	0.5810
Llama3	CoT	0.6386	0.6386	0.6386	0.6386
	MedRAG	0.5127	0.5133	0.6170	0.5206
	MoG	0.6221	0.6415	0.6394	0.6328
Qwen1.5	CoT	0.3845	0.3845	0.3845	0.3845
	MedRAG	0.4399	0.4623	0.4499	0.4391
	MoG	0.6129	0.4622	0.5145	0.4547

G Analysis on Samples Improved or Degraded

We counted the number of samples of four categories before and after applying MoG. The four categories are 1. improved (CoT gives wrong answer, MoG gives correct answer); 2. degraded (CoT gives correct answer, MoG gives wrong answer); 3. remain_correct (both CoT and MoG give correct answers); 4. remain_wrong (both CoT and MoG give wrong answers). The results are visualized as Figure 6. In this presented figure, the MoG is trained on the Wikipedia corpus. The pattern observed from this figure is similar to the ones shown in other test results. The zeroes in bars named “cot_err” and “mog_err” indicate that all the responses are correctly parsed when counting.

Around 10% of the degraded samples are randomly chosen and manually verified. We confirmed that in most (95%) degraded cases being verified, all the following statements are true:

- several candidate snippets are retrieved correctly;
- top-2 candidate snippets are correctly selected with the weights calculated by the router;
- the prompt is correctly augmented and passed to backbone LLM;

- the LLM generates the response without error;
- the final choice (A/B/C/D or Yes/No) was correctly parsed.

In other words, the LLM changed its answer based on the snippet retrieved, it is infected by the introduced noises. The degradation is caused by the fact that the tested RAG system lacks a noise filtering mechanism, rather than by the default of MoG or MoGG.




Figure 6: Number of samples improved or degraded after application of MoG

H Performance of MoGG on Medical QA Task (Other results)

In this section, we present the experiment result of MoGG on the Medical QA task with StatPearls as the training corpus for the router. The results are grouped in Table 8.

Table 8: Accuracy of Medical Question-Answering task with MoGG (trained with StatPearls), best results marked in **bold**.

LLM	Method	MIRAGE Benchmark Dataset (Acc.)					
		MMLU	MedQA	MedMCQA	PubMedQA	BioASQ	Avg.
GLM3	CoT	0.4901 \pm 0.04	0.3294 \pm 0.03	0.3799 \pm 0.02	0.3900 \pm 0.05	0.5645 \pm 0.04	0.4181
	MedRAG	0.4901 \pm 0.04	0.3294 \pm 0.03	0.3799 \pm 0.02	0.4400 \pm 0.05	0.5323 \pm 0.04	0.4343
	MoG	0.4851 \pm 0.04	0.2902 \pm 0.03	0.3799 \pm 0.02	0.4400 \pm 0.05	0.6371 \pm 0.04	0.4465
	MoGG	0.4802 \pm 0.04	0.3059 \pm 0.03	0.3668 \pm 0.02	0.4600 \pm 0.05	0.5806 \pm 0.04	0.4387
GPT-3.5	CoT	0.7624 \pm 0.03	0.6706 \pm 0.03	0.5866 \pm 0.02	0.4200 \pm 0.05	0.7339 \pm 0.04	0.6347
	MedRAG	0.6881 \pm 0.03	0.6549 \pm 0.03	0.4552 \pm 0.02	0.2600 \pm 0.04	0.5565 \pm 0.04	0.5229
	MoG	0.7277 \pm 0.03	0.6471 \pm 0.03	0.5400 \pm 0.02	0.3200 \pm 0.05	0.7258 \pm 0.04	0.5921
	MoGG	0.7624 \pm 0.03	0.6314 \pm 0.03	0.5460 \pm 0.02	0.3700 \pm 0.05	0.7177 \pm 0.04	0.6055
InternLM	CoT	0.7228 \pm 0.03	0.6000 \pm 0.03	0.5352 \pm 0.02	0.3700 \pm 0.05	0.7339 \pm 0.04	0.5924
	MedRAG	0.6584 \pm 0.03	0.5137 \pm 0.03	0.3596 \pm 0.02	0.1500 \pm 0.04	0.5081 \pm 0.04	0.4380
	MoG	0.6881 \pm 0.03	0.5961 \pm 0.03	0.5448 \pm 0.02	0.3800 \pm 0.05	0.7339 \pm 0.04	0.5886
	MoGG	0.6782 \pm 0.03	0.5725 \pm 0.03	0.3500 \pm 0.02	0.7500 \pm 0.05	0.7500 \pm 0.04	0.6201
Llama3	CoT	0.7277 \pm 0.03	0.6392 \pm 0.03	0.5663 \pm 0.02	0.5900 \pm 0.05	0.7177 \pm 0.04	0.6482
	MedRAG	0.6089 \pm 0.03	0.5882 \pm 0.03	0.4170 \pm 0.02	0.3800 \pm 0.05	0.5242 \pm 0.04	0.5133
	MoG	0.7376 \pm 0.03	0.5961 \pm 0.03	0.5317 \pm 0.02	0.6000 \pm 0.05	0.7419 \pm 0.04	0.6415
	MoGG	0.7030 \pm 0.03	0.6275 \pm 0.03	0.5436 \pm 0.02	0.5900 \pm 0.05	0.7258 \pm 0.04	0.6380
Qwen1.5	CoT	0.4604 \pm 0.04	0.3255 \pm 0.03	0.3883 \pm 0.02	0.2000 \pm 0.04	0.5484 \pm 0.04	0.3845
	MedRAG	0.5495 \pm 0.04	0.4471 \pm 0.03	0.4146 \pm 0.02	0.3600 \pm 0.05	0.5403 \pm 0.04	0.4623
	MoG	0.5446 \pm 0.04	0.3882 \pm 0.03	0.4337 \pm 0.02	0.3400 \pm 0.05	0.6048 \pm 0.04	0.4623
	MoGG	0.5446 \pm 0.04	0.4157 \pm 0.03	0.4253 \pm 0.02	0.3500 \pm 0.05	0.6290 \pm 0.04	0.4729