

Synergistic Multi-Agent Framework with Trajectory Learning for Knowledge-Intensive Tasks

Shengbin Yue¹, Siyuan Wang², Wei Chen³, Xuanjing Huang¹,
Zhongyu Wei^{1*}

¹Fudan University, China

²University of Southern California, USA

³Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

sbyue23@m.fudan.edu.cn, sw_641@usc.edu, lemuria_chen@hust.edu.cn

{xjhuang, zywei}@fudan.edu.cn,

Abstract

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have led to significant breakthroughs in various natural language processing tasks. However, generating factually consistent responses in knowledge-intensive scenarios remains a challenge due to issues such as hallucination, difficulty in acquiring long-tailed knowledge, and limited memory expansion. This paper introduces SMART, a novel multi-agent framework that leverages external knowledge to enhance the interpretability and factual consistency of LLM-generated responses. SMART comprises four specialized agents, each performing a specific sub-trajectory action to navigate complex knowledge-intensive tasks. We propose a multi-agent co-training paradigm, Long- and Short-Trajectory Learning, which ensures synergistic collaboration among agents while maintaining fine-grained execution by each agent. Extensive experiments on 5 tasks demonstrate SMART’s superior performance compared to previous widely adopted methods. Our code is available at <https://github.com/yueshengbin/SMART>.

1 Introduction

Researchers continue to pursue empowering intelligent systems to generate factually consistent responses in knowledge-intensive tasks (Singhal et al., 2022; Yue et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023a). Although Large Language Models (LLMs) internalize substantial world knowledge within their parameter memory, they still suffer from fabricating facts, due to their inherent drawbacks, e.g., hallucination (Ji et al., 2023), trouble in acquiring long-tailed knowledge (Kandpal et al., 2023) and struggle to expand their memory (De Cao et al., 2021). These issues significantly underscore the necessity of incorporating external knowledge from non-parametric (i.e., retrieval-based) memories.

*Corresponding author




Figure 1: Example of our long trajectory for knowledge-intensive scenarios (Top) and optimization comparison of multi-agent frameworks (Bottom).

Current frameworks typically augment LLMs with retrieved knowledge as input to generate responses, which face three main challenges. (1) *Complex query intent*: the diverse nature of instructions (e.g., multiple choice, multi-turn dialogue, and complex questions) leads to confusion regarding the query intent of knowledge. (2) *Distractors in retrieved knowledge*: retrieving knowledge inevitably introduces noises, with superfluous spans distracting from accurate responses. (3) *Insufficient knowledge utilization*: LLMs tend to rely more on their implicit knowledge (parameter memory) rather than fully exploiting provided external facts (Wu et al., 2024). These challenges necessitate executing a long trajectory of actions for complex knowledge-intensive tasks. This trajectory involves reconstructing knowledge intent, accessing external knowledge, discriminating relevant information to identify factual spans, and ultimately crafting informed responses, as shown in Figure 1. This process enhances the knowledge interpretability and response factuality.

We therefore propose a multi-agent framework,

SMART, to integrate these four actions for complex knowledge-intensive tasks, with each agent performing a specific sub-trajectory action. Specifically, it comprises an Intent Reconstructor (IR) that clarifies knowledge intentions from various sources, a Knowledge Retriever (KR) that utilizes intent to access external knowledge, a Fact Locator (FL) that evaluates retrieved knowledge and identifies factual spans from distractors, a Response Generator (RG) that faithfully exploits facts and cites them when facts are available.

While most multi-agent frameworks (Yao et al., 2023; Mou et al., 2024) operate in a non-training manner, navigating multiple agents to collaborate on complex trajectories is a long-standing challenge: On one hand, modular operations, where separate learned modules are pipelined with each dedicated to a specific agent, can streamline the processing. However, this can lead to error accumulation as mistakes in earlier modules propagate through the pipeline. On the other hand, encouraging LLM variants to imitate the entire trajectory, while mitigating the fragmentation and error propagation seen in modular systems, this long-term and global supervision cannot guarantee the precise fine-grained execution by each agent. Overall, maintaining synergy while ensuring the contribution of various stakeholders is essential.

To address this, we propose a multi-agent co-training method, namely *Long-* and *Short-Trajectory Learning*, which consists of two stages. First, short trajectory learning activates each specific agent in the framework, affording insight into various explicit and implicit signals in the sub-trajectory. Next, long trajectory learning ensures synergy across multi-agents through trajectory head skeleton learning. The key difference between short and long trajectory training is that the former focuses on training individual agents on specific skills without relying on outputs from previous trajectories. This independence enables more efficient modular training with the utilization of existing NLP datasets for pre-training and targeted optimization. Our learning approach enables multi-agent systems to collaboratively navigate a long and complex trajectory while concurrently upholding a nuanced representation of each agent.

Empirical results on 5 tasks, including reasoning and long-form generation, demonstrate that our framework significantly outperforms pre-trained and instruction-tuned LLMs that have more parameters, and widely adopted methods. Our **contribu-**

tions are three-fold:

- We present SMART, an innovative multi-agent co-framework to internalize complex trajectories in knowledge-intensive tasks. Collaborative multi-agents mine intent from diverse instructions, evaluate and apprehend facts in recalled knowledge, and adapt knowledge preferences, which greatly enhances knowledge interpretability and factual consistency.
- We propose a co-training paradigm of the multi-agent framework, *Long-* and *Short-Trajectory Learning*, which ensures synergy while keeping fine-grained performance of each agent. This general paradigm can be expanded to other complex tasks, empowering arbitrary multi-agent frameworks to internalize tailored trajectories.
- Our proposed framework significantly enhances factual consistency across different tasks, demonstrating the potential and robustness of our framework and co-training paradigm.

2 Method

The overall illustration of our co-framework is presented in Figure 2. We first present our multi-agent framework, which consists of four key agents that execute different specific trajectories in knowledge-intensive tasks (Section 2.1). Then, we describe the data construction method for this co-framework (Section 2.2). Finally, we detail the Long-Short Trajectory Learning utilized to optimize the framework synergies (Section 2.3).

2.1 Multi-Agent Framework

To address various complex challenges in knowledge-intensive scenarios, we design a multi-agent framework to execute complex long trajectories. This framework incorporates four key agents: intent reconstructor (\mathcal{A}_i), knowledge retriever (\mathcal{A}_r), fact locator (\mathcal{A}_l), and response generator (\mathcal{A}_g). Each agent serves a specific sub-trajectory, and the final factually consistent response is obtained by synergizing these agents.

Intent Reconstructor. The \mathcal{A}_i agent aims to extract and clarify the knowledge query intent from user instructions. It possesses four primary capabilities: integrating contextual clues, identifying key query, unifying task formulation, and intent decomposition, to handle diverse instructions. For example, in multi-turn dialogues, \mathcal{A}_i models long-term history for intent. For noisy instructions, it




Figure 2: Overview of our multi-agent framework with long- and short-trajectory learning. This framework incorporates four agents: intent reconstructor, knowledge retriever, fact locator, and response generator.

filters out irrelevant information to identify key queries. For various task formats such as multiple-choice QA, \mathcal{A}_i formulate all inputs as a query format for subsequent processing. When handling multi-hop queries like “Who was born earlier, person A or person B?”, \mathcal{A}_i breaks them down into multiple sub-intents, *i.e.*, each person’s birth date. By flexibly applying these capabilities, this agent obtains clear knowledge intent to access relevant external knowledge.

Knowledge Retriever. The \mathcal{A}_r agent accesses external knowledge bases (e.g., Wikipedia) and obtains relevant knowledge based on reconstructed intents. Specifically, it is driven by an off-the-shelf retrieval model (Izacard et al., 2021) and acquires top- k knowledge documents from the knowledge base for each knowledge intent. Details of our knowledge retriever setup and the corpus is described in Section 3.2.

Fact Locator. The \mathcal{A}_l agent assesses the relevance of each knowledge document to the given instruction to determine relevant ones. It then identifies the factual spans from relevant documents as evidence. The fact locator serves two primary purposes: (1) It enables the agent to check its relevance judgments to minimize the distraction of extraneous spans of the document, and allows the response phase to focus more on fact spans. (2) By explicitly learning to locate facts, it enhances the interpretability of the knowledge application

process and bolsters user credibility.

Response Generator. The \mathcal{A}_g agent finally generates responses to user instructions. When facts are provided, it adjusts its knowledge preferences to adhere to these facts. In the absence of such information, the response generator relies on its knowledge memory to formulate responses.

Inference Overview. The systematic procedure is delineated in the following steps: \mathcal{A}_i first mines the explicit intent $\bar{q} = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m\}$ from the instruction x . Next, \mathcal{A}_r retrieves top- k knowledge documents $\bar{d} = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{k \times m}\}$ using each intent q_m . Then, \mathcal{A}_l determines each relevant knowledge passage and further locates the fact span $f \subset d_{k \times m}$. Finally, \mathcal{A}_g utilizes the previous execution trajectory to generate response y and citations when facts exist, otherwise \mathcal{A}_g utilizes only x . In the t th step, the Agent \mathcal{A} generates a response r_t and a head token h_{t+1} of the next trajectory based on the current state of the system:

$$r_t, h_{t+1} = \mathcal{A}(x, \tau_{t-1}), \quad (1)$$

where $\tau_{t-1} = \{h_t, r_1, e_1, \dots, h_{t-1}, r_{t-1}, e_{t-1}\}$ denotes the previous execution trajectory. e denotes the trajectory end token. In addition, \mathcal{A}_i , \mathcal{A}_l and \mathcal{A}_g are built upon same LLMs to fulfill their roles.

2.2 Trajectory Dataset Construction

To implement long-short trajectory learning to optimize our multi-agent framework, we construct

the Trajectory dataset. We collect samples from over 12 knowledge-intensive tasks to ensure coverage of various instruction semantics and formats, such as fact verification (Thorne et al., 2018), dialogue (Dinan et al., 2018; Anantha et al., 2021), open-domain Q&A (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019; Stelmakh et al., 2022; Geva et al., 2021), and commonsense reasoning (Mihaylov et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2019; Mihaylov et al., 2018). Detailed statistics are in Table 5 of Appendix A.1. Our dataset contains two components: the long-trajectory subset and the short-trajectory subset. The data construction follows two distinct principles:

Long-trajectory subset. The long-trajectory subset aims to precisely mimic our multi-agent framework inference-time process, which emphasizes the synergy and logical interaction between agents. Existing work (Zheng et al.; Asai et al., 2023) has demonstrated the effectiveness of the powerful LLM (e.g., GPT3.5 (Ouyang et al., 2022), GPT4 (Achiam et al., 2023)) as a critic model. Given an input-output pair (x, y) , we create supervised data under the guide of the retrieval (\mathcal{R}) and critic model (\mathcal{C}). We enable \mathcal{C} to unleash the knowledge intents \bar{q} in x according to the instruction type. Then, \mathcal{R} retrieves the top- k knowledge documents based on every \bar{q} . For each document, \mathcal{C} further evaluates whether the passage is relevant based on (x, y) . If a passage is relevant, \mathcal{C} further locates and extracts the fact spans. Finally, we combine the data and insert the trajectory header and end token (e.g., `<Reconstructor>`, `</eor>`) into each trajectory. Trajectory tokens are identifiers that serve as the skeleton of the multi-agent framework. In total, we construct 142,507 elaborated instances.

Short-trajectory subset. Unlike the long-trajectory subset, the short-trajectory subset facilitates the training of individual capabilities for each intelligent agent. This isolation allows us to acquire data directly from a huge amount of existing knowledge-intensive tasks through some simple processing. Thus, we sample from the established NLP and SFT datasets, appending the requisite trajectory header and end token. Note that the existing NLP datasets do not fulfill our requirements for intent reconstructing, we employ the methodology utilized in the long-trajectory subset collection. Table 1 exhibits the inputs and outputs of each short trajectory under the responsibility of each agent. In addition, the response generator contains two types of inputs to help adapt its knowledge preferences. We construct a total of 359,791 instances.

Type	Trajectory Head	Tokens End	Input	Output
\mathcal{A}_i	<code><Reconstructor></code>	<code></eor></code>	x	\bar{q}
\mathcal{A}_r	<code><retrieval></code>	<code></retrieval></code>	\bar{q}	\bar{d}
\mathcal{A}_l	<code><Locator></code>	<code></eol></code>	x, \bar{d}	γ, \bar{f}
\mathcal{A}_g	<code><Generator></code>	<code></eog></code>	$x, \bar{d} / x$	y

Table 1: Four types of trajectory tokens. $x, \bar{q}, \bar{d}, \gamma, \bar{f}$ and \bar{y} indicate instruction, intent, knowledge document, relevance tag, fact evidence and response, respectively.

To summarize. Two keys are in the construction: the Long-trajectory subset is crafted to emphasize synergy, and the Short-trajectory subset can be easily accessed in large quantities to emphasize uniqueness. Refer to Appendix Section A.1 and A.2 for the detail of data construction.

2.3 Long Short-Trajectory Learning

Effectively fine-tuning a trajectory system consisting of multi-agents is a complex task: on the one hand, each agent has its specific trajectory signals of attention. On the other hand, the transformation between different trajectories requires the collaboration of the agents. In addition, the cost of trajectory data construction for a multi-agent framework greatly hinders the development of such systems. To this end, we propose Long Short-Trajectory Learning for our multi-agent framework, which consists of two stages, Short Trajectory and Long Trajectory Learning. As shown in Figure 3, Under the guidance of the trajectory head-end token pairs, the intuition is that Short Trajectory Learning first delineates the responsibilities of each agent to develop their unique capabilities, and then Long Trajectory Learning learns the interactions between them. This can be understood as initially activating each agent that masters short trajectories within a broader trajectory framework, and then exploring the interconnections between those agents to navigate the full long trajectory.

Short Trajectory Learning. Short Trajectory Learning is the training of individual capabilities for individual agents. In the context of a long trajectory, it is important to note that short trajectories spanning multiple steps do not necessarily exhibit a strong dependence on preceding short trajectories. To illustrate this point, consider the case of a fact locator, which primarily relies on the original user query and the retrieved results, rather than having a strict dependence on the queries generated in Intent Reconstructor. Similarly, the Response Generator




Figure 3: Overview of Long Short- Trajectory Learning. It consists of two stages, for short trajectory learning, under a given trajectory head, requires insight into the various explicit and implicit signals in each particular task. For long-trajectory learning, LLM executes the entire process by predicting different trajectory headers, ensuring the synergism of different short-trajectories.

necessitates only the question itself or a combination of the question and the located facts. As shown in Figure 3, the short trajectory learning first activates each short agent in the framework to focus on the fine-grained signals. Given the short-trajectory subset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{short}} = \{\mathcal{D}_{\text{intent}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{locator}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{generator}}\}$, we initialize a pre-trained LLM and train it on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{short}}$. For each example $\{(x_i; h_i), (y_i; e_i)\} \subset \mathcal{D}_{\text{short}}$, we use a standard conditional language modeling objective, maximizing likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{short}}) = \sum_i \log P_{LM}(y_i; e_i | x_i; h_i), \quad (2)$$

Given the inputs and trajectory header, the agent learns to predict the outputs, *i.e.*, delineate different belonging trajectories for the agent to make them understand the fine-grained representations of the corresponding tasks. This phase utilizes easily accessible and extensive data to build the basic capabilities of the trajectory, reducing the cost of such a framework while maintaining the creativity and versatility of the agent.

Long Trajectory Learning. After the above stage, the framework is equipped with four independent agents. Long Trajectory Learning further grooms the LLM to establish logical associations between agents in an end-to-end manner. We train based on the previous stage on the long-trajectory subset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{long}}$. Specifically, given instruction x , long trajectory learning forces the LLM to learn the long

trajectory process:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{Long}}) = \sum_i \log P_{LM}(\tau_i^R; \tau_i^I; \tau_i^G | x_i), \quad (3)$$

$$\tau_i^T = [h_i^T; y_i^T; e_i^T], T \subset \{R, I, G\}.$$

where R , I and G denote the Intent Reconstructor, Fact Locator and Response Generator, respectively. Unlike short trajectory learning (Eq. 2), the framework learns both to predict the target output for each short trajectory as well as from the previous trajectory end e^T to the next trajectory head h^{T+1} . In essence, the trajectory token serves as a skeleton in the learning process, guiding the agent not only to grasp a fine-grained representation of the intra-trajectory but also inter-trajectory interactions.

3 Experiment Setting

3.1 Setup

Task and Dataset. We evaluate our framework in a range of knowledge-intensive downstream tasks. Including (1) Fact verification: PubHealth (Akhtar et al., 2022) is a fact verification dataset about public health; (2) Multiple-choice reasoning: ARC-Challenge (Clark et al., 2018) is a multiple-choice questions dataset about science exam. (3) Open-domain question answering: contains two short-form QA datasets, PopQA (Mallen et al., 2022), and SQuAD 1.1 (Rajpurkar et al., 2016). (4) Ambiguous question answering: ASQA (Gao et al., 2023) is ambiguous factoid question of the long

Task Metric	Health Acc	ARC-C Acc	PopQA Acc	Squad1 Acc	Str_EM	ASQA R-L	Mauve
<i>General-purpose LLM</i>							
Aplca2 _{7B} *	44.78	36.43	25.58	11.50	14.42	28.72	51.24
Mistral-Instruct _{7B}	65.45	57.84	22.37	14.97	20.80	32.20	33.47
Llama-2-Chat _{7B}	47.95	47.95	25.44	14.13	16.79	32.35	24.21
Vicuna-v1.5 _{13B}	63.01	57.59	17.94	15.25	31.95	22.99	68.41
Llama-2-Chat _{13B}	62.20	48.72	21.22	15.97	19.97	30.37	40.23
ChatGPT	76.08	77.3	29.30	22.90	39.94	35.73	44.63
<i>Knowledge enhancement methods</i>							
Aplca2 _{7B} *	26.44	35.15	33.38	21.41	23.59	27.21	50.09
REPLUG _{7B} *	41.72	47.26	37.24	24.23	26.54	33.25	54.03
VANILLA _{7B} *	29.52	42.74	37.52	25.92	32.25	34.93	39.54
RAIT _{7B} *	52.98	62.10	38.02	23.86	25.68	15.99	12.35
INTERACT _{7B} *	65.45	48.12	<u>41.31</u>	31.52	<u>34.54</u>	35.51	43.45
SelfRag _{7B}	68.99	65.52	40.67	22.39	28.68	34.11	83.00
MMAgent _{3*7B} *	<u>70.82</u>	<u>63.99</u>	<u>36.88</u>	<u>23.79</u>	<u>33.04</u>	<u>36.49</u>	<u>88.98</u>
SMART (OURS)	<u>73.18</u>	<u>65.58</u>	42.60	<u>27.80</u>	41.16	40.66	91.47

Table 2: Comparison results against general-purpose LLM and knowledge enhancement methods. * denotes the method we reproduce based on the same base. * denotes re-implemented methods based on the same initial model. The **bold** numbers represent the best results and the underlined numbers represent the second.

form response. Details of evaluation data, including size, and evaluation metrics are available in the Appendix Section B.1.

Baselines. We compare our framework with a wide range of baseline methods in two categories. (1) General-purpose LLMs: ChatGPT (Ouyang et al., 2022), Mistral-Instruct-v0.2-7B (Jiang et al., 2023), Llama-2-Chat-7B/13B (Touvron et al., 2023), Vicuna-v1.5-13B (Zheng et al.) and Aplca2-7B¹ (Zheng et al.). (2) Knowledge enhancement methods: REPLUG-7 (Shi et al., 2023), VANILLA-7B (Gao et al., 2023), INTERACT-7B (Gao et al., 2023), RAIT-7B (Lin et al., 2023), SelfRAG-7B (Asai et al., 2023), MMAgent-3*7B. More details are in the Appendix Section B.3.

3.2 Implementation Details

Due to page limitations, details of our training and evaluation are in the Appendix Section B.2

4 Experiment Result

4.1 Main Result

Comparison against general-purpose LLM. As shown in Table 2, our framework shows a significant performance advantage over equivalently

sized fine-tuned LLMs across all tasks. In comparison to larger LLMs (Vicuna-v1.5-13B and Llama-2-Chat-13B), which possess greater internalized knowledge, our SMART framework also exhibits superior performance in all metrics. Furthermore, our framework surpasses ChatGPT in all evaluated metrics for PopQA (long-tail knowledge evaluation), Squad1, and ASQA. Experimental results indicate that our method more effectively addresses long-tail knowledge, delivering more accurate and fluent responses compared to knowledge internalization methods, which necessitate extensive fine-tuning and training on large volumes of private data.

Comparison against knowledge enhancement methods.

Considering fairness and persuasiveness, we compared knowledge enhancement methods based on the same size as ours. As shown in Table 2, our SMART performs better on most tasks compared to other knowledge enhancement methods. Compared to the SOTA retrieval method, SelfRag (Asai et al., 2023), our model shows great superiority in both accuracy and fluency. Our method exceeds MMAgent (four independent agents coupled together) in all metrics. This demonstrates that our learning paradigm improves multi-agent collaboration, resulting in more accurate responses. Note that INTERACT (Gao et al., 2023) is better

¹https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca

	Health (Acc)	ARC-C (Acc)	Pop (Acc)	AS (Em)
Training (60K)				
SMART (L)	72.15	60.22	37.27	36.10
w/o \mathcal{A}_f	70.13	58.95	34.31	34.77
w/o \mathcal{A}_i	69.82	54.94	35.17	34.41
w/o All	57.95	56.99	21.15	20.05
Inference (Full)				
SMART (L+S)	73.18	65.58	42.60	41.16
w/o \mathcal{A}_f	71.63	62.45	37.45	36.10
w/o \mathcal{A}_i	71.22	60.11	39.88	35.30
w/o All	69.32	58.81	16.79	31.32

Table 3: Ablation studies for the contribution of different agents in training and inference. L and S denote long-trajectory and short-trajectory learning, respectively.

than us on Squad1, the reason is that INTERACT allows the response model to do more reasoning steps, which is beneficial for hitting answers in short-format generation tasks. RAIT (Lin et al., 2023) is trained with SMART same data and initialized model without fact location and intent reconstruction, lagging behind us. Overall, our SMART delivers excellent performance in a diverse range of knowledge-intensive tasks. This result indicates SMART gains are not solely from the multi-agent framework and demonstrate the effectiveness of the long-short trajectory learning.

4.2 Ablation Studies

Contribution of different agents. We explore two settings to reveal the contributions of different agents in the co-framework. w/o \mathcal{A}_f , w/o \mathcal{A}_i , and w/o All denote no fact Locator, no intent reconstructor, and only response generator. (1) Training phase: We implement long trajectory learning using 60,000 samples from the long-trajectory subset to evaluate the performance of the co-framework under different agent absence scenarios. As the top part of Table 3, the absence of the fact Locator and the intent reconstructor significantly degrades the framework’s performance. The intent reconstructor provides substantial benefits for multiple-choice reasoning (ARC-C) and ambiguous questions (ASQA), while the fact Locator is crucial for long-tail knowledge Q&A (PopQA). (2) Inference phase: We use the full SMART with short-long trajectory learning to ignore the trajectories of different agents during the inference phase. As the

Methods	Health	PopQA	ASQA	
	(Acc)	(Acc)	(Em)	(R-L)
Vanilla LLM	9.80	22.69	14.11	6.45
+ Short	62.00	32.23	23.95	19.91
+ Long	72.9	37.66	39.86	39.51
+ Short & Long	73.18	42.60	41.16	40.66

Table 4: Ablation studies of long-trajectory (Long) and short-trajectory (Short) learning.

bottom part of Table 3, each agent plays an important role in the collaboration framework. The effect degradation of the fact-checking task (Health) was not severe, which may be related to the large amount of knowledge injected during the short trajectory learning. The experiment proved the effectiveness of different agents in our SMART, especially the fact Locator and the intent reconstructor.

Effects of Long Short-Trajectory Learning.

Long Short-Trajectory Learning Optimising a Multi-agent framework through two-stage learning. we demonstrate its effectiveness progressively by training it on vanilla models, Llama-2-7B-hf (Touvron et al., 2023). As shown in Table 4, short-trajectory learning and long-trajectory learning enable huge performance improvements in the framework for all tasks. Short-trajectory learning enhances the system by optimizing each agent’s base capability, though its impact is not as substantial as that of long-trajectory learning. Long-trajectory learning, by optimizing agent synergy, underscores the importance of collaborative optimization in a multi-agent framework, despite the challenges posed by complex data construction. Overall, the combined approach of long-short trajectory learning yields the best performance, highlighting the significance of simultaneous collaboration and individual uniqueness.

Effects of training data size. To examine the impact of long-trajectory training data on long-short trajectory learning, we randomly selected subsets of 8k, 20k, 60k, and 121k instances from the initial 140k training instances and fine-tuned four SMART variants on these subsets. Subsequently, we compared the model performance on ARC-C, PopQA, and ASQA with our SelfRAG and MMagent models. As illustrated in Figure 4, an increase in data size generally leads to improved performance across all datasets. Notably, by utilizing 60k data instances, SMART outper-




Figure 4: Effects of long-trajectory training data size (K) on three tasks, ARC-C, PopQA and ASQA.

formed SelfRAG, which employs 120k samples. This demonstrates the significant advantage of our long-short trajectory learning in markedly enhancing the performance of multi-agent frameworks.

5 Related Work

Trajectory Learning. Trajectory learning aims to allow agents or agent systems to complete a complex task or scenario through a series of interconnected phases, which requires a profound understanding of both global and local dimensions. Some methods (Chen et al., 2023b; Zhou et al., 2022; Song et al., 2023; Kong et al., 2023; Asai et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2022) enable agent learning trajectory via providing crafted prompt or tuning, which may not consistently yield high performance in every phase. Moreover, independently modules (Liu et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023) can be combined with agent to implement trajectory inference, while this integration confers robust isolated capabilities, the gap between modules might lead to cumulative errors throughout the trajectory process. In this paper, we introduce long-short trajectory learning, which equips multi-agent systems with the ability to not only grasp the logic connecting steps but also to refine each step. Our approach is scalable to increasingly complex scenarios.

Knowledge Enhancement Methods. LLMs parameterize knowledge by training on gargantuan textual corpora (Dhingra et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2020). However, LLMs knowledge suffers from hallucination (Ji et al., 2023), trouble in acquiring long-tailed fact (Kandpal et al., 2023) and struggle to expand their parametric knowledge. For knowledge-intensive scenarios, existing methods (Izacard et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2020; Borgeaud et al., 2022) usually assist LLMs by integrating non-parametric knowledge. Recent advances incor-

porated retrievers (Asai et al., 2023; Mallen et al., 2022; Shi et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023) to augment LLMs. The efficacy of non-parametric knowledge collaboration in improving task performance significantly relies on the relevance of the acquired knowledge and the level of knowledge utilization by the LLM itself. However, existing work has not comprehensively confronted these challenges. Some works (Xu et al., 2023; Ma et al., 2023) simply select relevant knowledge and demonstrate better intentions by combining separate modules. SelfRAG (Asai et al., 2023) integrates specialized feedback tokens into the language model to assess the necessity for retrieval and to verify the relevance, support, or completeness of the output. Unlike existing approaches, we introduce a novel multi-agent framework that addresses the challenges with trajectory learning.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduce SMART, a novel multi-agent framework that addresses the challenges of generating factually consistent responses in knowledge-intensive tasks. By leveraging external knowledge and employing specialized agents, SMART enhances the interpretability and factual consistency of LLMs generated responses. Our proposed Long- and Short-Trajectory Learning paradigm ensures synergistic collaboration among agents while maintaining fine-grained execution, enabling the framework to navigate complex knowledge-intensive tasks effectively. Empirical results on five diverse tasks demonstrate SMART’s superior performance compared to SOTA pre-trained and instruction-tuned LLMs, as well as widely adopted methods. SMART highlights the importance of integrating external knowledge and employing multi-agent systems to tackle the limitations of LLMs in knowledge-intensive scenarios.

Limitation

SMART demonstrates significant improvements in generating factually consistent responses for knowledge-intensive tasks, while there are still several limitations and future directions worth exploring. One limitation is that our multi-agent framework currently executes sequentially without iterative optimization, which may lead to insufficient knowledge retrieval for multi-hop problems. However, this can be addressed by adding loop arrows between the Fact Locator and Intent Reconstructor agents, allowing the system to return to the IR step to generate missing fact queries when the facts in the FL step are insufficient. Another limitation is that our retriever is not trained in the whole process, although it can be incorporated into the training process using techniques such as contrastive learning. Furthermore, in our framework, the retriever can also serve as a tool for any knowledge query, expanding its utility beyond the current implementation.

References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Mubashara Akhtar, Oana Cocarascu, and Elena Simperl. 2022. Pubhealthtab: A public health table-based dataset for evidence-based fact checking. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 1–16.
- Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 520–534.
- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511*.
- Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Jordan Hoffmann, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Katie Millican, George Bm Van Den Driessche, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Bogdan Damoc, Aidan Clark, et al. 2022. Improving language models by retrieving from trillions of tokens. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2206–2240. PMLR.
- Wei Chen, Qiushi Wang, Zefei Long, Xianyin Zhang, Zhongtian Lu, Bingxuan Li, Siyuan Wang, Jiarong Xu, Xiang Bai, Xuanjing Huang, et al. 2023a. Discfinllm: A chinese financial large language model based on multiple experts fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15205*.
- Wenhu Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W Cohen. 2023b. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Peter Clark, Isaac Cowhey, Oren Etzioni, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Carissa Schoenick, and Oyvind Tafjord. 2018. Think you have solved question answering? try arc, the ai2 reasoning challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.05457*.
- Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2021. Editing factual knowledge in language models. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6491–6506.
- Bhuwan Dhingra, Jeremy R Cole, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Daniel Gillick, Jacob Eisenstein, and William W Cohen. 2022. Time-aware language models as temporal knowledge bases. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:257–273.
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2018. Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tianyu Gao, Howard Yen, Jiatong Yu, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Enabling large language models to generate text with citations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6465–6488.
- Mor Geva, Daniel Khashabi, Elad Segal, Tushar Khot, Dan Roth, and Jonathan Berant. 2021. Did aristotle use a laptop? a question answering benchmark with implicit reasoning strategies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:346–361.
- Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2020. Constructing a multi-hop qa dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.01060*.
- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lifu Huang, Ronan Le Bras, Chandra Bhagavatula, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Cosmos qa: Machine reading comprehension with contextual commonsense reasoning. 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)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2021. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09118*.
- Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, Fabio Petroni, Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Armand Joulin, Sebastian Riedel, and Edouard Grave. 2023. Atlas: Few-shot learning with retrieval augmented language models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(251):1–43.
- Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. 2023. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38.
- Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. 2023. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*.
- Nikhil Kandpal, Haikang Deng, Adam Roberts, Eric Wallace, and Colin Raffel. 2023. Large language models struggle to learn long-tail knowledge. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15696–15707. PMLR.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781.
- Yilun Kong, Jingqing Ruan, Yihong Chen, Bin Zhang, Tianpeng Bao, Shiwei Shi, Guoqing Du, Xiaoru Hu, Hangyu Mao, Ziyue Li, et al. 2023. Tptu-v2: Boosting task planning and tool usage of large language model-based agents in real-world systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11315*.
- Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi-Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Nguyen Minh Duc, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, et al. Openassistant conversations-democratizing large language model alignment. corr, abs/2304.07327, 2023. doi: 10.48550. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07327*.
- 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.
- Xi Victoria Lin, Xilun Chen, Mingda Chen, Weijia Shi, Maria Lomeli, Rich James, Pedro Rodriguez, Jacob Kahn, Gergely Szilvasy, Mike Lewis, et al. 2023. Ra-dit: Retrieval-augmented dual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01352*.
- Bo Liu, Yuqian Jiang, Xiaohan Zhang, Qiang Liu, Shiqi Zhang, Joydeep Biswas, and Peter Stone. 2023. Llm+ p: Empowering large language models with optimal planning proficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11477*.
- Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, et al. 2023. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 22631–22648. PMLR.
- Xinbei Ma, Yeyun Gong, Pengcheng He, Hai Zhao, and Nan Duan. 2023. Query rewriting in retrieval-augmented large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5303–5315.
- Alex Mullen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10511*.
- Todor Mihaylov, Peter Clark, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2018. Can a suit of armor conduct electricity? a new dataset for open book question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02789*.
- Xinyi Mou, Zhongyu Wei, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. Unveiling the truth and facilitating change: Towards agent-based large-scale social movement simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16333*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744.
- Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. Instruction tuning with gpt-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03277*.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. Squad: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05250*.
- Jeff Rasley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Deepspeed: System optimizations enable training deep learning models with over 100 billion parameters. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pages 3505–3506.

- Weizhou Shen, Chenliang Li, Hongzhan Chen, Ming Yan, Xiaojun Quan, Hehong Chen, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. 2024. Small llms are weak tool learners: A multi-llm agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07324*.
- Weijia Shi, Sewon Min, Michihiro Yasunaga, Minjoon Seo, Rich James, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Wen-tau Yih. 2023. Replug: Retrieval-augmented black-box language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12652*.
- Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, Ajay Tanwani, Heather Cole-Lewis, Stephen Pfohl, et al. 2022. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.13138*.
- Chan Hee Song, Jiaman Wu, Clayton Washington, Brian M Sadler, Wei-Lun Chao, and Yu Su. 2023. Llm-planner: Few-shot grounded planning for embodied agents with large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2998–3009.
- Ivan Stelmakh, Yi Luan, Bhuwan Dhingra, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. Asqa: Factoid questions meet long-form answers. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8273–8288.
- Tianxiang Sun, Yunfan Shao, Hong Qian, Xuanjing Huang, and Xipeng Qiu. 2022. Black-box tuning for language-model-as-a-service. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 20841–20855. PMLR.
- Tianxiang Sun, Yunfan Shao, Xipeng Qiu, Qipeng Guo, Yaru Hu, Xuan-Jing Huang, and Zheng Zhang. 2020. Colake: Contextualized language and knowledge embedding. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3660–3670.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. Fever: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and verification. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 809–819.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajwal Bhargava, Shrubhi Bhosale, et al. 2023. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*.
- Zhiruo Wang, Jun Araki, Zhengbao Jiang, Md Rizwan Parvez, and Graham Neubig. 2023. Learning to filter context for retrieval-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08377*.
- 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.
- Kevin Wu, Eric Wu, and James Zou. 2024. How faithful are rag models? quantifying the tug-of-war between rag and llms’ internal prior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10198*.
- Fangyuan Xu, Weijia Shi, and Eunsol Choi. 2023. Re-comp: Improving retrieval-augmented llms with compression and selective augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.04408*.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. 2018. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Shengbin Yue, Wei Chen, Siyuan Wang, Bingxuan Li, Chenchen Shen, Shujun Liu, Yuxuan Zhou, Yao Xiao, Song Yun, Wei Lin, et al. 2023. Disc-lawllm: Fine-tuning large language models for intelligent legal services. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11325*.
- Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. 2022. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*.

A Data Collection

A.1 Full list of datasets.

For coverage of a wide range of data sources, we sampled instances from four categories of knowledge-intensive tasks: (1) Fact Checking includes FEVER (Thorne et al., 2018). (2) Dialogue includes Wizard of Wikipedia (Dinan et al., 2018) and QReCC (Anantha et al., 2021). (3) open-domain Q&A includes Natural Questions (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), 2WikiMHQA (Ho et al., 2020), StrategyQA (Geva et al., 2021) and ASQA (Stelmakh et al., 2022). (4) Commonsense Reasoning includes ComsmosQA (Huang et al., 2019), ARCEasy (Clark et al., 2018), OpenBookQA (Mihaylov

Category	Dataset name	Long-Trajectory	Short-Trajectory			
			Loctor	Intent	Response	
					w/o F	w/ F
Fact Verification	FEVER	22,485	25,211	10,761	1,757	3,513
Dialogue	QReCC	18,363	-	21,000	3,383	-
	WoW	10,701	-	-	3,824	-
open-domain Q&A	Natural Questions	17,770	25,065	15,069	1,347	2,695
	HotpotQA	10,792	25,325	10,200	1,356	2,714
	2WikiMHQA	9,847	25,118	17,140	1,675	3,348
	StrategyQA	2,281	-	-	-	-
	ASQA	4,236	-	-	667	1,335
Commonsense Reasoning	CosmosQA	6,923	6,315	-	-	2,526
	OpenbookQA	4,923	-	-	495	992
	Arc-Easy	2,242	-	-	-	-
	ThoughtSource	5,918	-	20,000	18,711	-
General	Alpaca-GPT4	13,944	-	-	26,001	-
	Alpaca-Stanford	12,082	-	-	25,989	-
	FLAN-V2	-	-	-	30,316	-
	Dolly	-	-	-	6,802	-
	OpenAssistant	-	-	-	19,141	-
Total		142,507	107,034	94,170	141,464	17,123

Table 5: Distribution of our dataset. w/o F indicates that there is no facts guidance in the response generator, w/ F on the contrary

et al., 2018) and ThoughtSource (Wei et al., 2022). In addition, We also sampled from some generic instruction datasets to ensure flexibility and creativity in the framework, including GPT-4 Alpaca (Peng et al., 2023), Alpaca², OpenAssistant (Köpf et al.), FLAN-V2 (Longpre et al., 2023), and Dolly³. Table 5 shows the full list of training instances. The total dataset amount is 508,298 instances, where the long-trajectory subset includes 142,507 well-designed instances, and the short-trajectory subset contains 359,791 easily accessible instances.

A.2 Datasets Construction Details

We propose two distinct types of datasets: Long-trajectory Datasets and Short-trajectory Datasets. These datasets differ in their structure, objectives, and the way they are used to train models, as shown in Table 5. Long-trajectory Datasets aim to capture the end-to-end reasoning process, while Short-trajectory Datasets focus on individual agent skills. By leveraging both types of datasets, we can develop more robust and versatile models that combine the benefits of task-specific training with the power of end-to-end reasoning.

Long-trajectory Datasets. To construct the Long-trajectory Datasets, we leverage existing QA datasets and transform them into a unified format. Let $\mathcal{D} = (x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^N$ denote a QA dataset, where x_i

represents the question and y_i represents the corresponding answer. For multi-turn dialogue datasets, we concatenate the historical context and the current question to form x_i , and use the answer from the last turn as y_i . This allows us to standardize both single-turn QA datasets and multi-turn dialogue datasets into a consistent format of (x_i, y_i) pairs.

To generate the Long-trajectory Datasets, we employ GPT-4 and an off-the-shelf retriever. For each input x , we use few-shot prompting to generate multiple query texts (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m) , where the number of queries m is determined by GPT-4. The prompting strategies are tailored to different types of datasets, including Fact Verification, Multi-turn Dialogue, Open-domain Q&A, Commonsense Reasoning, and etc.

For each query text q_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m$), we retrieve k candidate passages from a fixed knowledge base (e.g., Wikipedia), resulting in a total of $m \times k$ candidate passages. We then utilize few-shot prompting with GPT-4 to determine the relevance of each candidate passage in answering the user’s question. Specifically, for each passage, GPT-4 is prompted to identify the specific facts (multiple sentences in the the passage) that can help answer the question, or output "irrelevant" if the passage does not contain relevant information. We require that the facts outputted by GPT-4 must be contained within the passage.

The final answer consists of the original answer and the passage number of the facts supporting

²https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca

³<https://huggingface.co/datasets/databricks/databricks-dolly-15k>

the answer. The Long-trajectory Datasets are constructed by combining the reconstructed queries, retrieved passages, located facts, and generated answer into a single sequence. For each (x, y) pair, we transform y into a long-trajectory reasoning process as follows:

```

Input: x
-----
Output:
<Reconstructor> q1, q2, ... </eor>
<retrieval>
[1] xxxxxxxx
[2] xxxxxxxx
[3] xxxxxxxx
...
</retrieval>
<Locator>
[Relevant]:[1] xxxx
[Irrelevant]:[2] Lacking Supporting Facts.
[Irrelevant]:[3] Lacking Supporting Facts.
...
</eol>
<Generator> y [Cite]: [1]</eog>

```

By reconstructing the original answer y_i into a long-trajectory reasoning process, we explicitly model the steps of query rewriting, retrieval, fact locating, and question answering. This approach allows us to create datasets that showcase the complex reasoning capabilities required for knowledge-intensive tasks, providing valuable insights and resources for advancing research in this area. The loss function is computed only for the components generated by the large language model, i.e., the <Reconstructor>, <Locator>, and <Generator> sections, while the <Retrieval> section is excluded from the loss computation.

Short-trajectory Datasets. In contrast to the Long-trajectory Datasets, the Short-trajectory Datasets focus on the individual capabilities of each agent. These datasets are constructed to target specific skills, such as intent reconstruction, fact location, and response generation, and can be used for pre-training models or training specialized agents.

For intent reconstruction, the construction of Short-trajectory Datasets follows the same approach as Long-trajectory Datasets. These datasets can be formalized as:

```

Input: x
<Reconstructor>
-----

```

```

Output: q1, q2, ... </eor>

```

where q_i represents the reconstructed knowledge query intent from the user input x .

For fact location, we can leverage existing datasets such as HotpotQA, Natural Questions, and 2WikiMHQA. Fact location does not require the output from the reconstructor, instead, it only needs the user input and the retrieved passages. These datasets can be formalized as:

```

Input: x
<retrieval>
[1] xxxxxxxx
[2] xxxxxxxx
[3] xxxxxxxx
</retrieval>
<Locator>
-----
Output:
[Relevant]:[1] xxxx
[Irrelevant]:[2] Lacking Supporting Facts.
[Irrelevant]:[3] Lacking Supporting Facts.
<eol>

```

For response generation, we construct two types of training samples, one type that directly generates an answer based on the user question:

```

Input: x
<Generator>
-----
Output: y </eog>

```

and another that answers the question based on both the question and the located facts:

```

Input: x
<Locator>
[Relevant]:[1] xxxx
[Irrelevant]:[2] Lacking Supporting Facts.
[Irrelevant]:[3] Lacking Supporting Facts.
</eol>
<Generator>
-----
Output: y [Cite]: [1] </eog>

```

The Short-trajectory Datasets offer several advantages. First, they do not necessarily require a complete long-trajectory training dataset, allowing us to utilize a large number of existing NLP datasets. Second, they enable focused training on individual skills, and subsequent short trajectories do not need to depend on the outputs of all previous short trajectories. By pre-training LLMs on cost-effective Short-trajectory Datasets, we can reduce the amount of cost-ineffective Long-trajectory

training data required to achieve better performance comparable to LLMs without pre-training.

Furthermore, the Short-trajectory Datasets can be used to train specialized agents, each responsible for a specific task (e.g., intent reconstruction, fact location, or response generation). These agents can then be combined to form a complete question-answering system, offering a modular and adaptable approach to solving complex tasks.

In summary, the Short-trajectory Datasets provide a complementary approach to the Long-trajectory Datasets, focusing on individual agent capabilities and enabling efficient pre-training and specialization. By leveraging both types of datasets, we can develop more robust and versatile models for knowledge-intensive tasks, while reducing the reliance on large amounts of long-trajectory training data. This hybrid approach combines the benefits of task-specific training with the power of end-to-end reasoning, offering a promising direction for advancing research in this area.

B Experimental Setups

B.1 Dataset and Evaluation Metrics

- **Fact verification:** PubHealth (Akhtar et al., 2022) is a fact verification dataset about public health. We use accuracy as an evaluation metric and report on the test set, which contains 987 test examples with veracity labels (true, false).
- **Multiple-choice reasoning:** ARC-Challenge (Clark et al., 2018) is a multiple-choice questions dataset about science exams, containing 1172 test examples. We also use accuracy as an evaluation metric.
- **Open-domain Q&A:** 1) PopQA (Mallen et al., 2022) is a long-tailed set of 1,399 rare entity queries collected from Wikipedia. 2) SQuAD 1.1 (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) contains 8,886 queries that is created through a process where annotators write questions based on the documents they read. Following previous practice (Asai et al., 2023; Gao et al., 2023), we assessed this track accuracy by matching, *i.e.*, ground truth appears in the model responses.
- **Ambiguous question answering:** ASQA (Gao et al., 2023) contains 4132 ambiguous factoid questions of the long-form response. Following the official setting (Gao

Dataset	Instruction
ARC-C	Given four answer candidates, choose the best answer choice.
PubHealth	Is the following statement correct or not? Say true if it's correct; otherwise, say false.
ASQA	Answer the following question. The question may be ambiguous and have multiple correct answers, and in that case, you have to provide a long-form answer including all correct answers.

Table 6: Instructions for zero-shot evaluations.

et al., 2023), we use Mauve to assess fluency, and Str_EM and Rouge-L (R-L) to assess accuracy.

B.2 Setting Details

Training Detail. We use pre-trained LLM, Llama2-7B (Touvron et al., 2023), as our initial model. We use 8*V100 GPUs with 32GB memory to conduct our Short-Long Trajectory learning by LoRA method (Hu et al., 2021). Both short and long-trajectory learning are conducted over 2 epochs with a batch size of 96, a peak learning rate of 2e-4, and 3% warmup steps, followed by linear decay. The maximum token length is set to 3,076 for short-trajectory learning and 2,816 for long-trajectory learning. Multi-GPU distributed training is performed using DeepSpeed Stage 3 (Rasley et al., 2020).

Evaluation Details. Knowledge Retriever is driven by Retriever-MSMARCO (Izacard et al., 2021) and access top-3 knowledge documents from the official Wikipedia corpus (Karpukhin et al., 2020). In the evaluation, we conduct zero-shot assessment, *i.e.*, and we provide instructions describing tasks without few-shot demonstrations (Asai et al., 2023). Greedy decoding was used across the evaluations.

Evaluation Task Instructions. Following the existing work (Asai et al., 2023), in addition to open-domain Q&A, we implemented zero-shot evaluations by providing prompts for task descriptions as shown in Table 6.

B.3 Baselines

General-purpose LLMs: (1) Instruct fine-tuned and preference alignment models: ChatGPT ⁴ (Ouyang et al., 2022), Llama-2-Chat-7B (Touvron

⁴We use gpt-3.5-turbo-0125.

et al., 2023), Llama-2-Chat-13B (Touvron et al., 2023). (2) Instruct fine-tuned models: Instruct-v0.2-7B (Jiang et al., 2023), Vicuna-v1.5-13B (Zheng et al.), and Alpaca2-7B (Following Alpaca⁵, we trained based on Llama-2). We use the official system prompt or instruction format used during training.

Knowledge enhancement methods:

- **REPLUG** (Shi et al., 2023) treats the frozen black-box LLM and augments it with a tuneable retrieval model. We use Llama-2-Chat-7B (Touvron et al., 2023) as black-box LLM.
- **VANILLA-7B** (Gao et al., 2023) is a framework that retrieves passages, then instructs the model to distinguish relevant documents and cite accordingly. We use Llama-2-Chat-7B as the backbone.
- **INTERACT-7B** (Gao et al., 2023) is an interactive prompting scheme that allows the agent to check passages by executing the "Check" "Output" and "End" actions. We use Llama-2-Chat-7B as the backbone.
- **RAIT-7B** (Lin et al., 2023) retrofit LLMs with retrieval capabilities by tuning. To be fair, we train pre-trained Llama-2 using the same dataset as ours.
- **SelfRAG-7B** (Asai et al., 2023) is a framework to enhance the response quality through retrieval on demand and self-reflection.
- **MMAgent-3*7B** is modular multi-agent framework. We train separate agents based on the same dataset and complete the workflow by decoupling them. We use pre-trained Llama-2 as their backbone.

⁵https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca

<Instruction> when was alice through the looking glass filmed ? (from nq)

<Reconstructor> Search(Key figures in the War of 1812)</eor>

<retrieval>[1] War of 1812 -War of 1812 The War of 1812 was a conflict fought between the United States, the United Kingdom, and their respective allies from June 1812 to February 1815. Historians in Britain often see it as a minor theater of the Napoleonic Wars; in the United States and Canada, it is seen as a war in its own right, though it was separate. From the outbreak of war with Napoleonic France, Britain had enforced a naval blockade to choke off neutral trade to France, which the US contested as illegal under international law. To man the blockade, Britain impressed American merchant

[2] War of 1812 -to the United States. Some British officers and Canadians objected to handing back Prairie du Chien and especially Mackinac under the terms of the Treaty of Ghent. However, the Americans retained the captured post at Fort Malden, near Amherstburg, until the British complied with the treaty. Fighting between Americans, the Sauk, and other indigenous tribes continued through 1817, well after the war ended in the east. In 1812, Britain's Royal Navy was the world's largest, with over 600 cruisers in commission and some smaller vessels. Although most of these were involved in blockading the French navy and protecting British trade

[3] War of 1812 -War of 1812", sees the British as having fought to a much stronger position than the United States. Even tied down by ongoing wars with Napoleonic France, the British had enough capable officers, well-trained men, and equipment to easily defeat a series of American invasions of Canada. In fact, in the opening salvos of the war, the American forces invading Upper Canada were pushed so far back that they ended up surrendering Michigan Territory. The difference between the two navies was even greater. While the Americans famously (shockingly for contemporaries on both sides of the Atlantic) bested British ships in

</retrieval>

<Locator> [Relevant]: [1] War of 1812 -The War of 1812 was a conflict fought between the United States, the United Kingdom, and their respective allies from June 1812 to February 1815.

[Relevant]: [2] War of 1812 -Fighting between Americans, the Sauk, and other indigenous tribes continued through 1817, well after the war ended in the east.

[Relevant]: [3] War of 1812 -War of 1812", sees the British as having fought to a much stronger position than the United States.</eol>

<Generator> the United States , the United Kingdom , and their respective allies

[Cite]: [1] [2] [3]</eog>

<Instruction> Lichens are symbiotic organisms made of green algae and fungi. What do the green algae supply to the fungi in this symbiotic relationship? -A: carbon dioxide -B: food -C: protection -D: water</eoi> (from openbook)

<Reconstructor> Search(Symbiotic relationship between lichens -What do green algae supply to fungi in a lichen symbiotic relationship)</eor>

</retrieval> [1] Symbiosis in lichens -a very different form (morphology), physiology, and biochemistry than any of the constituent species growing separately. The algae or cyanobacteria benefit their fungal partner by producing organic carbon compounds through photosynthesis. In return, the fungal partner benefits the algae or cyanobacteria by protecting them from the environment by its filaments, which also gather moisture and nutrients from the environment, and (usually) provide an anchor to it. The majority of the lichens contain eukaryotic autotrophs belonging to the Chlorophyta (green algae) or to the Xanthophyta (yellow-green algae). About 90% of all known lichens have a green alga as a symbiont. Among

[2]

[3] Cyanobacteria -"Chara", where they may fix nitrogen. Cyanobacteria such as "Anabaena" (a symbiont of the aquatic fern "Azolla"), can provide rice plantations with biofertilizer. Many cyanobacteria form motile filaments of cells, called hormogonia, that travel away from the main biomass to bud and form new colonies elsewhere. The cells in a hormogonium are often thinner than in the vegetative state, and the cells on either end of the motile chain may be tapered. To break away from the parent colony, a hormogonium often must tear apart a weaker cell in a filament, called a necridium. Each individual cell (each single cyanobacterium)</retrieval>

<Locator>

[Relevant]:[1] Symbiosis in lichens -The algae or cyanobacteria benefit their fungal partner by producing organic carbon compounds through photosynthesis.

[Relevant]: [2] Algae -In these symbioses, the algae supply photosynthates (organic substances) to the host organism providing protection to the algal cells. The host organism derives some or all of its energy requirements from the algae.

[Irrelevant]: [3] Lacking Supporting Facts.</eol>

<Generator> B: food

[Cite]: [1] [2]</eog>

Table 7: examples of the long-trajectory subset.

<Instruction> What did Rahul Bose do in 1993? -Rahul Bose starred in the 1993 Are There Tigers in the Congo. What was Rahul Bose's early career? -Bose started his acting career on the Mumbai stage in Rahul D'Cunha's Topsy Turvey and Are There Tigers In The Congo? What other films has Rahul Bose starred in besides Topsy Turvey and Are There Tigers In The Congo? -D'Cunha's aunt was the casting director for director Dev Benegal's film English, August and suggested that Rahul Bose should play the lead role. What else has Rahul Bose done in his career besides Topsy Turvey, Are There Tigers in The Congo and English, August? -After English, August, Rahul Bose found work in television What was the name of the show Rahul Bose found work in after English, August? -Rahul Bose was offered a role in India's first English-language television serial, A Mouthful of Sky -What other TV series has Rahul Bose starred in besides A Mouthful of Sky? -Rahul Bose also co-hosted BBC World's Style! with Laila Rouass. When was Rahul Bose on BBC besides BBC World's Style! with Laila Rouass? -In 1997, Bose was cast to play the role of Saleem Sinai in the BBC adaptation of Salman Rushdie's novel Midnight's Children. What did he do in 2003?</eoi>

<Reconstructor> (from Intent Reconstructor: qrec)

Search(Current status of Grey's Anatomy TV show)</eor>

<Instruction> Name three biometrics technologies.</eoi>

<Generator> (from Response Generator: alpaca)

1) Fingerprint recognition: This is a technology that identifies individuals by analyzing their unique fingerprint patterns. 2) Face recognition: This is a biometric technology that analyzes the facial features of an individual in order to identify or verify their identity. 3) Retinal scanning: This is a biometric technology that uses the unique pattern of blood vessels in an individual's retina in order to identify them.</eog>

<Instruction> Which film was released more recently, Kora Terry or Yi Yi?</eoi>

<Locator> -[Irrelevant]: [1] Lacking Supporting Facts -[Relevant]: [2] Kora Terry -Kora Terry is a 1940 German drama film directed by Georg Jacoby and starring Marika Röck, Will Quadflieg and Josef Sieber. -[Irrelevant]: [3] Lacking Supporting Facts -[Irrelevant]: [4] Lacking Supporting Facts -[Irrelevant]: [5] Lacking Supporting Facts -[Relevant]: [6] Yi Yi-Yi Yi is a 2000 Taiwanese drama film written and directed by Edward Yang.</eol>

<Generator> (from Response Generator: wikimultihop)

Yi Yi

[Cite]: [2] [6]</eog>

<Instruction> What is the name of this English musician, comedian, and actor, who narrated Dream Street?</eoi>

<retrieval>[1] Dream Street (UK TV series) -Dream Street is a British children's television series that ran from 6 May 1999 to 2002 on "CITV". The show is narrated by British comedian Russ Abbot, and was aimed at children aged from 2 to 7. The show featured talking toy vehicles, which were radio controlled in real time. The series aired back on CITV around 2008. -[2] Dream Street (UK TV series) -Dream Street is a British children's television series that ran from 6 May 1999 to 2002 on "CITV". The show is narrated by British comedian Russ Abbot, and was aimed at children aged from 2 to 7. The show featured talking toy vehicles, which were radio controlled in real time. The series aired back on CITV around 2008. -[3] Russ Abbot -Russ Abbot (born Russell A. Roberts; 18 September 1947) is an English musician, comedian and actor. He first came to public notice during the 1970s as the singer and drummer with British comedy showband the "Black Abbots", along with Leonard 'Lenny' Reynolds, later forging a prominent solo career as a television comedian with his own weekly show on British television. -[4] Dream Street (Janet Jackson album) -nDream Street is the second studio album by American musician Janet Jackson, released on October 23, 1984, by A&M Records. More pop than her debut album's "bubblegum soul" feel, the album wasn't the runaway success that Janet's father Joseph thought it would be, peaking at number one hundred forty-seven on the "Billboard" 200 in 1984. The album did have one modest hit for Jackson, the top ten R&B single, "Don't Stand Another Chance", produced by brother Marlon. Also, the video for the song "Dream Street", her first music video, was shot during the shooting of the TV show "Fame".</retrieval>

<Locator> (from Fact Loctor: wikimultihop)

[Relevant]: [1] Dream Street (UK TV series) -Dream Street is a British children's television series that ran from 6 May 1999 to 2002 on "CITV". -[Relevant]: [2] Dream Street (UK TV series) -The show is narrated by British comedian Russ Abbot, and was aimed at children aged from 2 to 7. -[Relevant]: [3] Russ Abbot -Russ Abbot (born Russell A. Roberts; 18 September 1947) is an English musician, comedian and actor. -[Relevant]: [4] Lacking Supporting Facts </eol>

Table 8: Examples of the short-trajectory subset.

Prompt used in ChatGPT for fact locator.

Instruction: Given an {instruction type}, answer, and external knowledge passage, your job is to determine whether the passage is relevant to the question and can provide useful information for obtaining the answer. If the passage meets this requirement, respond with [Relevant] and extract useful spans from the passage. The extracted spans consist of complete sentences to make the extracted span understandable standalone.

Question: Who won the 2016 ncaa football national championship?

Answer: The 2015 - 2016 season's ncaa national football championship game was played between the Clemson Tigers and the Alabama Crimson Tide on January 11, 2016. The Alabama Crimson Tide won the game by holding off the undefeated Clemson Tigers 45–40 in the fourth quarter.

Passage: The 2016 College Football Playoff National Championship was a bowl game that determined a national champion of NCAA Division I FBS college football for the 2015 season. It was played at University of Phoenix Stadium in Glendale, Arizona on January 11, 2016, and was the culminating game of the 2015–16 bowl season. The game was played between the winners of two pre-designated semifinal bowls played on December 31, 2015: the No. 1 Clemson Tigers, who beat the No. 4 Oklahoma Sooners 37–17 at the Orange Bowl, coached by Dabo Swinney in his 8th season, and the No. 2 Alabama Crimson Tide, who shut out the No. 3 Michigan State Spartans 38–0 at the

Rating: [Relevant]

Extracted span: It was played at University of Phoenix Stadium in Glendale, Arizona on January 11, 2016, and was the culminating game of the 2015–16 bowl season.

Question: Where was three billboards outside ebbing missouri film?

Answer: Principal filming for Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri was in Sylva, North Carolina. The actual billboards for the film were put in a pasture near Black Mountain, North Carolina, and the billboard scenes were filmed there because that location was better.

Passage: actual sign appeared in the film. The musical score was written by Carter Burwell, who had also supplied the score for McDonagh's films "In Bruges" and "Seven Psychopaths". As well as Burwell's score, the film features songs by ABBA, Joan Baez, The Felice Brothers, the Four Tops, Monsters of Folk, and Townes Van Zandt. "Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri" premiered in competition at the 74th Venice International Film Festival on September 4, 2017. It also had screenings at the 2017 Toronto International Film Festival, the 2017 San Sebastián International Film Festival (where it won the Audience Award), the BFI London

Rating: [Irrelevant]

Extracted span: None

Question: {input}

Answer: {output}

Passage: {text}

Rating:

Table 9: Prompt examples used in ChatGPT for fact locator of long-trajectory subset.

Prompt used in ChatGPT for intent reconstructor.

Instruction: Given a question, provide knowledge search intent to help better retrieve the answer from external document on the web (e.g., Wikipedia). Split the intent with ';' and write an explanation.

Question: Which magazine was started first Arthur's Magazine or First for Women?

Search Intent: Arthur's Magazine publication year; First for Women publication year

Explanation: By splitting the search into two parts, each focusing on the foundation date of the respective magazines. This approach allows for a direct comparison of their start dates to determine which magazine was started first.

Question: What is the legal age of marriage, without parental consent or other authorization, in Nebraska?

Search Intent: legal age of marriage in Nebraska without parental consent

Explanation: This intent directly targets the core of the question, ensuring that the search results will specifically address the legal stipulations surrounding marriage age in Nebraska, making it easier to provide a precise answer.

Question: Californian rock band Lit recorded A Place in the Sun in 1995, but what's their best known song?

Search Intent: Californian rock band Lit's most famous and popular songs

Explanation: The search focuses on identifying the most popular or well-recognized song by the Californian rock band Lit. This does not require information about the album A Place in the Sun or its recording date, but rather seeks to find which song by Lit is generally considered their biggest hit or most iconic track.

Question: {input}

Search Intent:

Table 10: Prompt examples used in ChatGPT for intent reconstructor of long-trajectory subset.

Prompt used in ChatGPT for intent reconstructor.

Instruction: Given a question, answer and chat history separated by new lines, provide a knowledge search intent for the question to help better obtain answers from external documents on the web (e.g., Wikipedia). The intent needs to consider important and necessary contextual information from history so that it can be fully understood.

Question: Which magazine was started first Arthur’s Magazine or First for Women?

Search Intent: Arthur’s Magazine publication year; First for Women publication year

Explanation: By splitting the search into two parts, each focusing on the foundation date of the respective magazines. This approach allows for a direct comparison of their start dates to determine which magazine was started first.

Question: What is the legal age of marriage, without parental consent or other authorization, in Nebraska?

Search Intent: legal age of marriage in Nebraska without parental consent

Explanation: This intent directly targets the core of the question, ensuring that the search results will specifically address the legal stipulations surrounding marriage age in Nebraska, making it easier to provide a precise answer.

Question: Californian rock band Lit recorded A Place in the Sun in 1995, but what’s their best known song?

Search Intent: Californian rock band Lit’s most famous and popular songs

Explanation: The search focuses on identifying the most popular or well-recognized song by the Californian rock band Lit. This does not require information about the album A Place in the Sun or its recording date, but rather seeks to find which song by Lit is generally considered their biggest hit or most iconic track.

Question: {input}

Search Intent:

Table 11: Prompt examples used in ChatGPT for intent reconstructor of long-trajectory subset.