

Task-aware Retrieval with Instructions

Akari Asai^{*†‡}, Timo Schick[†], Patrick Lewis[†], Xilun Chen[†], Gautier Izacard^{†♣},
Sebastian Riedel[♣], Hannaneh Hajishirzi^{‡♡}, Wen-tau Yih[†]

[†]Meta AI [‡]University of Washington [♣]ENS, PSL University & Inria

[♡]Allen Institute for AI [♣]University College London

Abstract

We study the problem of *retrieval with instructions*, where users of a retrieval system explicitly describe their intent along with their queries, making the system *task-aware*. We aim to develop a general-purpose task-aware retrieval systems using multi-task instruction tuning that can follow human-written instructions to find the best documents for a given query. To this end, we introduce the first large-scale collection of approximately 40 retrieval datasets with instructions, and present TART, a multi-task retrieval system trained on the diverse retrieval tasks with instructions. TART shows strong capabilities to adapt to a new task via instructions and advances the state of the art on two zero-shot retrieval benchmarks, BEIR and LOTTE, outperforming models up to three times larger. We further introduce a new evaluation setup to better reflect real-world scenarios, pooling diverse documents and tasks. In this setup, TART significantly outperforms competitive baselines, further demonstrating the effectiveness of guiding retrieval with instructions.

1 Introduction

Information retrieval (IR) is the task of finding *relevant* documents from a large collection of texts to fulfill a user’s information need, typically expressed in the form of a textual query (Singhal et al., 2001). The notion of relevance from the user’s perspective (i.e., *intent*) can be amorphous (Mizzaro, 1998), and a query alone may not fully capture user information needs (Ruthven and Lalmas, 2003; Taylor, 1962). As illustrated in Figure 1, given the same query, “*implementing batch normalization in Python*,” a user may want to retrieve a passage that describes how to do the task or to identify a similar query, or even to directly locate a code snippet.

Most existing work tries to learn the *implicit* intent from labeled data (e.g., pairs of queries and relevant documents), yielding separate models for




Figure 1: Overview of *retrieval with instructions*. User intents are not fully captured in query *q* only (top). Conventional approaches (bottom left) take a query as input and retrieve a document from a closed corpus using task-specific retrievers. Retrieval with instructions (bottom right) takes a query and explicit intent and retrieves documents aligning with the user’s expectations.

different intents (e.g., Figure 1 bottom left). This approach has several limitations. First, a vast number of annotated examples may be required to train a model to capture the task-specific notion of relevance. Second, a model trained on one specific task may not easily transfer to new tasks that are not closely related. Finally, separately trained retrievers do not model cross-task interdependence.

In this work we advocate for a new task formulation, *retrieval with instructions*, to *explicitly* model a user’s search intent. The goal of the system is to retrieve documents that are both relevant to the query and well-suited to the instructions (Figure 1 bottom right). In addition to the query, the retrieval system is given a natural language description of the search task (i.e., an instruction) that *explicitly* describes the user’s intent.

Despite active research in other settings, instruction-following models have not been sys-

tematically explored in retrieval, partly due to the lack of annotated resources. To facilitate research in retrieval with instructions, we introduce BERRI (**B**ank of **E**xplicit **R**etrieval **I**nstructions), a collection of approximately 40 retrieval datasets with instructions in a unified format.

We use BERRI to train TART (**T**ask-**a**ware **R**e**T**riever), an instruction-following single multi-task retrieval system that follows instructions to perform diverse tasks with different intents and is able to adapt to new retrieval tasks with no parameter updates. We employ two widely explored architectures: (1) TART-dual follows the popular dense dual-encoder architecture, which retrieves documents with high similarity scores that are derived using the inner products of the document and query embeddings, and (2) TART-full assumes a small set of documents retrieved by an existing system and reorders them using their probabilities of being relevant to the query according to the instruction, estimated by a cross-encoder.

The TART models, particularly TART-full, demonstrates strong *zero-shot* transfer abilities, yielding state-of-the-art results on two popular zero-shot retrieval benchmarks, BEIR (Thakur et al., 2021) and LOTTE-pooled (Santhanam et al., 2022). It outperforms systems using two times more parameters (Nogueira et al. 2020; Ni et al. 2021) as well as task-specific retrievers trained on millions of automatically generated examples (Dai et al., 2022). We further introduce a new evaluation setup, *cross-task cross-domain retrieval*, where a system needs to handle queries with diverse intents to find relevant documents from a large-scale, cross-domain pooled corpus, simulating challenges in real-world retrieval applications. In this under-explored setting, TART outperforms other strong state-of-the-art methods, demonstrating its ability to find documents in a large-scale open-domain corpus by leveraging explicit textual intents. Our analysis shows that training a model on diverse tasks with instructions and giving informative instructions at test time are crucial for better zero-shot performance and cross-task retrieval.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- *Retrieval with instructions*, a new formulation to model users’ intent *explicitly* (Section 3).
- BERRI, a new large-scale collection of retrieval datasets with instructions (Section 4).
- TART, an instruction-aware retriever built using BERRI that advances state-of-the-art per-

formance on zero-shot retrieval and cross-task cross-domain retrieval (Section 5).

2 Background and Related Work

Neural trainable document retrievers. Term-based document retrievers (e.g., BM25; Robertson and Zaragoza 2009) have proven effective at retrieving relevant documents from a target corpus. Recent neural retrievers (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2019; Khattab and Zaharia, 2020) show their superiority over those term-based retrievers across domains when training data is abundant (Luo et al., 2022; Asai et al., 2021; Petroni et al., 2021).

Zero-shot training of retrievers. Due to the high cost of annotating retrieval datasets for new target tasks, improving neural retrievers in zero-shot settings is an active area of study. Several major paradigms address data-scarce retriever training. The first line of work uses purely unsupervised approaches, such as pre-training neural retrievers on synthetic data (e.g., Contriever; Izacard et al. 2022). The second line of work trains a single retrieval system on large-scale supervised datasets such as MS MARCO (Bajaj et al., 2016) and then performs a transfer to new datasets (Izacard et al., 2022; Khattab and Zaharia, 2020; Santhanam et al., 2022; Nogueira et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2022). This method can often struggle with tasks unlike those used for training (Dai et al., 2022). To address this, the third paradigm trains customized retrievers for each task using unlabeled corpora, leveraging another model to automatically generate training data (Wang et al., 2022a). Dai et al. (2022) use task-specific templates and few-shot samples to automatically generate in-domain training queries given randomly sampled documents from the target corpus using FLAN (Wei et al., 2022a). While this approach can yield significant performance gains for some datasets, it often entails running massive LMs and training for customized retrievers, resulting in slow adaptation and high cost.

Retrieval with descriptions. To incorporate more fine-grained information needs, retrieval with descriptions or narratives (e.g., TREC 2004 Robust Track; Voorhees 2005) has been studied. Descriptions or narratives are more detailed natural language explanations that describe the information needs (i.e., desirable documents) for each query mainly for query disambiguation. However, early work shows that concatenating descriptions or nar-

ratives only marginally outperforms the baselines with titles only (Walker et al., 1998; Yates et al., 2021). More recent work (Dai and Callan, 2019, 2020) suggests that powerful encoders such as BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) could better incorporate rich linguistic context, boosting performance.

Instruction tuning. Training large language models (LLMs) with instructions or demonstrations on many tasks has proven very effective for zero- or few-shot transfer in a variety of settings (Wei et al., 2022a; Sanh et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2022; Chung et al., 2022; Min et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b).

However, such instruction tuning has not been systematically explored in retrieval for several reasons. First, large-scale instruction-annotated datasets (Bach et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b) do not include retrieval tasks.

Second, successful instruction-following LLMs are encoder-decoder or decoder-only models with tens of billions parameters. Applying them to retrieval tasks can be difficult since run-time efficiency is a major concern. Our work addresses these challenges. Unlike prior work that trains a retrieval model on a few relevant datasets in one domain (e.g., KILT; Maillard et al. 2021) with task IDs, we include diverse tasks in diverse domains and train a model using natural language *instructions*.

3 Task Formulation

This work introduces a new task formulation, *retrieval with instructions*, devised to overcome the issues of conventional retrieval approaches.

We are given a large collection of N documents $\mathcal{D} = \{d_1, \dots, d_N\}$, a search task instruction t and a query q . The problem of retrieval with instructions is to find a document $d \in \mathcal{D}$ that is relevant to q according to the instruction t . An example of this problem is shown in Figure 1 (bottom). Compared to the standard retrieval problem setting (e.g., Figure 1 (bottom left)), the difference is the explicit definition of *relevance* in the instruction t as additional input to the system: the notion of relevance often differs across tasks (Mizzaro, 1998) and may not be fully defined by the query q alone (Ruthven and Lalmas, 2003). Thus, retrieval with instructions lets us build retrieval systems that are very general and task-aware—changing their relevance measure by attending to the instruction—even if it has never been seen during training. Unlike prior

work that uses descriptions of desirable *documents* (e.g., TREC 2004 Robust Track; Voorhees 2005) for a target query, our instructions describe user intents relative to *tasks*, generalizing more tasks without expensive annotation costs.

This new formulation brings both new research challenges and opportunities. For instance, the retriever is now required to modify its search behavior according to the instructions. On the plus side, different datasets can be naturally grouped to train a single retriever, yielding benefits from cross-task interdependence, which has been observed in instruction tuning of LLMs. Compared to training a retriever on multiple tasks with task identifiers (Maillard et al., 2021), instructions provide greater flexibility and enable zero-shot transfer when the evaluation task does not resemble any of the training tasks. Furthermore, a multi-task instruction-following retriever obviates the need to host multiple task-specific retrievers.

As noted previously, multi-task training with instructions has not been studied in the area of retrieval due to the lack of resources and dedicated models. To facilitate the research on retrieval with instructions, we introduce the first large-scale retrieval benchmark with expert-written annotations (Section 4) and subsequently the multi-task instruction-following retrievers (Section 5).

4 BERRI: Collections of Instruction-annotated Retrieval Tasks

To facilitate research in retrieval with natural language instructions, we build a unified large-scale retrieval dataset, BERRI (**B**ank of **E**xplicit **R**etrieval **I**nstructions), which consists of instructions and instances from diverse domains and tasks.

4.1 Unified Task and Instructions Scheme

Task format. Each task \mathcal{T} in BERRI consists of a corpus \mathcal{D} , queries $\mathcal{Q} = \{q_1, \dots, q_K\}$, and an instruction t , where K is the number of the queries included in the task. An instance of each task includes a query q , gold (relevant) documents d^+ , and negative (irrelevant) documents d^- . While in the normal retrieval setup, a system needs to learn an implicit intent from the training data (q, d^+, d^-) , in retrieval with instructions, an explicit intent t , which can be paraphrased in multiple ways, is given.

Instruction schema for retrieval. Informative and diverse instructions are key for successful in-

Dataset	Instruction
NQ	Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph that answers this question .
Med Simple	Your task is to find a simplified paragraph of this paragraph from a medical paper .
QReCC	Find a dialogue response from dialogue history to answer the user’s question .
Arguana	Retrieve a paragraph from an argument website that argues against the following argument .
SciFact	Find a sentence from a scientific paper to check if the statement is correct or not .
MultiLexSum	I want to find the one-sentence summary of this legal case .

Table 1: Example instructions for natural questions (NQ; Kwiatkowski et al. 2019), medical text simplification (Med Simple; Devaraj et al. 2021), QReCC (Anantha et al., 2021), Arguana (Wachsmuth et al., 2018), SciFact (Wadden et al., 2020) and MultiLexSum (Shen et al., 2022). Each instruction defines **intent**, **domain** and **unit**.

struction tuning (Sanh et al., 2022). An instruction that sufficiently describes an arbitrary retrieval task should include: **intent**, **domain** and **unit**. *Intent* describes how the retrieved text relates to the query, such as whether the text answers a question in the query or paraphrases it. *Domain* is the expected source or type of retrieved text, such as Wikipedia or PubMed articles. *Unit* defines the text block to retrieve, such as a sentence or a paragraph. Table 1 shows examples of instructions, and Appendix A.3 shows the full list of instructions.

4.2 Dataset Collection

Instead of being limited only to retrieval datasets (e.g., MS MARCO; Bajaj et al. 2016) or retrieval-centric tasks like open-domain question answering (QA; Chen and Yih 2020), BERRI includes several non-retrieval datasets (e.g., summarization) that can be repurposed as retrieval tasks. Figure 2 shows the source datasets BERRI includes. After collecting instances and adding instructions for each task, we conducted multiple post-processing steps to provide a set of query, gold documents and negative documents to facilitate future research. Table 5 shows the full list of datasets with references.

Selecting source datasets. We manually collect datasets from: (1) KILT (Petroni et al., 2021), (2) the Sentence-Transformers Training Data for Text Embedding Models¹, and (3) manual searches in ACL anthologies and huggingface datasets² to cover a diverse set of tasks and domains. Our initial list includes more than 60 datasets. For each dataset, we assess whether it is suitable for repurposing as a retrieval task. Specifically, we sample 20 instances from the candidate dataset and

check if the queries are self-contained.³ If the majority of queries fail this test, we exclude the corresponding dataset. Consequently, we use 37 datasets, including more than 5 million instances in total. For datasets that are orders of magnitude larger than other datasets (e.g., PAQ; Lewis et al. 2021), we randomly sample up to 300k instances, except for MS MARCO.⁴ BERRI covers diverse domains (e.g., Wikipedia, news, scientific papers, technology) and tasks (e.g., fact verification, simplified text retrieval, dialogue response retrieval, QA). See Appendix A.4 for more details.

Unification and instruction annotations. For tasks originally designed as retrieval tasks, we use the annotated gold documents as d^+ to a given query q . For non-retrieval tasks (e.g., summarization, QA), we use the original input sequence as a query q and the original output or given context as d^+ . For each dataset, the authors of this paper manually wrote up to 8 task-specific instructions; each task is annotated with 3.5 instructions on average. For datasets without preprocessed retrieval targets (e.g., KILT datasets use the unified Wikipedia corpus), we gather all positive and negative samples provided by the original dataset to build a single task-specific retrieval corpus \mathcal{D} . More details are described in Appendix Section A.2.

Optional hard negatives. Negative samples are crucial for training retrieval systems (Zhan et al., 2021). In addition to the randomly sampled negative samples (random negative documents), we introduce two types of challenging negative samples: hard negative documents d^{hard} and instruction-unfollowing negative documents $d^{unfollow}$. Figure 3

³For examples, finding a corresponding review text for the review title “I love this!” is under-specified.

⁴Prior work has shown that MS MARCO can be beneficial to many downstream retrieval tasks (Izacard et al., 2022).

¹<https://huggingface.co/datasets/sentence-transformers/embedding-training-data>

²<https://huggingface.co/docs/datasets/index>




Figure 2: Examples of datasets included in BERRI.




Figure 3: Examples of documents that are considered gold documents, hard negatives and instruction-unfollowing documents for two different query/instruction pairs. Dashed lines surround negative documents that should not be retrieved by retrieval models. d^+ , d^{hard} , $d^{unfollow}$ denote positive documents, hard negative documents and instruction-unfollowing documents, respectively.

shows two examples of gold documents, hard negatives and instruction-unfollowing documents.

We mine hard negative documents d^{hard} using an off-the-shelf retriever and then filter out false negative documents using an off-the-shelf reranker, following Qu et al. (2021). In particular, we retrieve top documents from the target corpus using Contriever (Izacard et al., 2022) and then add new documents whose normalized scores predicted by a cross-encoder model, ms-marco-MiniLM-L-12-v2⁵ are below 0.1 as hard negative documents.

We further introduce a new negative sampling strategy, instruction-*unfollowing* negative sampling, to make systems learn to *follow* instructions and retrieve documents that align with the specified intents. For instance, as shown in Figure 3, given an instruction “find an argument that argues for this debate topic”, a system should not retrieve Wikipedia paragraph about school uniforms. To obtain those instruction-unfollowing negative documents, we retrieve documents from a different task’s target corpus using the same off-the-shelf

Contriever, and consider all those documents to be negatives since they do not satisfy the instruction. More details about finding instruction-unfollowing negatives are in Appendix Section C.3.

5 TART: Multi-task Instructed Retriever

We now present our unified multi-task retriever TART (**T**ask-aware **Re**Triever) trained on BERRI via multi-task instruction-tuning.

5.1 Model Architecture

TART-dual. TART-dual adopts a dual-encoder architecture, where a single encoder encodes queries with instructions and documents independently. We use maximum inner product search (MIPS) over the embeddings to find relevant documents (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2019). Formally, the similarity scores between a query q and a document d , given an instruction t , is calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{s}(t, q, d) = \mathbf{E}([t; q])^T \mathbf{E}(d), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{E}(\cdot)$ is the embedding function⁶ and $[t; q]$

⁵<https://huggingface.co/cross-encoder/ms-marco-MiniLM-L-12-v2>

⁶We use a shared encoder since having separate encoders gave no additional gains in preliminary experiments.

is the concatenation of the instruction and query. For this model, document embeddings can be computed offline, improving inference efficiency at the cost of storage space (Yamada et al., 2021).

TART-full. The bi-encoder architecture is known to be less expressive since it enables only limited interactions between queries and documents (Khatab and Zaharia, 2020), especially when the training data is limited (Hofstätter et al., 2021). To address this issue, we also explore a cross-encoder architecture (Nogueira and Cho, 2019), which computes the relevance between a query and each document by jointly encoding them with cross-attention. A cross-encoder model is often prohibitively expensive to scale up to millions of documents, so we first run a light-weight off-the-shelf retrieval system (e.g., BM25 or a bi-encoder retrieval system) to retrieve the top documents. For each of these documents, our instruction-aware cross-encoder, TART-full, computes a similarity score between a query and the document d as:

$$s(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d}) = \text{FFN}(\mathbf{E}([\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{q}; \mathbf{d}])), \quad (2)$$

where FFN represents an additional feed-forward network that predicts whether the document follows the instruction and is related to the query.

We explored different encoder-only and encoder-decoder models to initialize our cross-encoder; we found that an encoder-only model that leverages the T0-3B encoder (Sanh et al., 2022) empirically leads to superior performance relative to other similar scale or smaller models, potentially due to its instruction-based pretraining, as found in prior work (Sachan et al., 2022b,a). We follow the EncT5 approach (Liu et al., 2021) and prepended each sequence with a start-of-sequence token to T0. The token representation is then fed to a newly initialized feed-forward network. Unlike MonoT5 (Nogueira et al., 2020), we use T0’s encoder only to reduce the number of parameters and improve inference efficiency.

5.2 Training TART

We train TART-full and TART-dual using the positive documents and negative documents in BERRI with instructions. We use three types of negative documents: randomly sampled negative documents, hard negative documents and instruction-unfollowing documents.

Training TART-dual. During training, we combine documents annotated with the queries in BERRI as well as in-batch negatives and train the model as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\log \frac{e^{s(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d}^+, \mathbf{t})}}{\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{B}} e^{s(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{t})}},$$

where \mathcal{B} denotes all documents in the same mini-batch (Karpukhin et al., 2020) including \mathbf{d}^+ and \mathbf{d}^- .

Training TART-full. Following prior work (Nogueira and Cho, 2019), TART-full with the cross entropy loss given $(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{i}, \mathbf{d})$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{d}^+} \log s(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d}) - \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{d}^-} \log(1 - s(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{d})).$$

Knowledge distillation from TART-full to TART-dual. The default hard negatives in BERRI rely on off-the-shelf models fine-tuned on MS MARCO; for some domains, the hard negative samples mined by those models can be less reliable. Especially for a smaller bi-encoder model, those false positive and negative samples can significantly diminish performance (Qu et al., 2021). We found that leveraging more powerful TART-full to denoise and obtain better negative and positive samples lets us distill knowledge from the powerful model to a smaller TART-dual, leading to performance gains. We first train TART-full on the annotated gold documents and the negative documents mined in BERRI. We then re-run the denoising process described in Section 4.2 with the newly trained cross-encoder. Importantly, unlike the initial denoising step, we now leverage instructions and update \mathbf{d}^{hard} and \mathbf{d}^+ based on more accurate TART-full predictions.

6 Experiments

We evaluate our instruction-following retrieval systems TART on zero-shot retrieval (Section 6.1) and in a challenging new evaluation setup, *cross-task cross-domain retrieval* (Section 6.2), comparing them with state-of-the-art models in Section 6.3.

6.1 Zero-shot Retrieval Evaluations

To evaluate the models’ ability to perform zero-shot transfer via *instructions*, we run experiments on two widely used zero-shot transfer evaluation benchmarks: **BEIR** (Thakur et al., 2021) and

Task	$ q $	$ C $	Domain	Query	Gold documents
Ambig QA (Min et al., 2020)	1,172	18,809	Wikipedia	question	duplicated question
WIKIQA (Yang et al., 2015)	369	26,196	Wikipedia	question	answer sentence
SciFact (Wadden et al., 2020)	300	5183	Science	claim	scientific paper paragraph
GooAQ-Technical (Khashabi et al., 2021)	1,000	4,086	Technical	question	StackOverflow answer
LinkSo-Python (Liu et al., 2018)	1,000	485,413	Technical	question	StackOverflow question
CodeSearchNet-Python (Husain et al., 2019)	1,000	457,414	Code	comment	Python code

Table 2: Cross-task cross-domain evaluation. Example pairs of queries and documents are shown in Table 8. In addition to the corpora listed above, we add the Natural Questions corpus data from BEIR (Thakur et al., 2021), which consists of 2,681,468 documents from Wikipedia.

LOTTE-pooled (Santhanam et al., 2022). Notably, none of the evaluation datasets and instructions overlap with BERRI. Moreover, many tasks differ significantly from tasks used during training (e.g., argument retrieval). **BEIR** is a collection of diverse retrieval tasks in multiple domains (e.g., Wikipedia, biomedical) where the retrieval target is restricted to the target corpus in a single domain. We used publicly available datasets. Following Dai et al. (2022), we exclude Natural Questions, MS MARCO, HotpotQA, FEVER and CQADupStack from our evaluation targets for fair comparison since they are included either in T0-3B pretraining or in our multi-task training dataset.

LOTTE-Search samples GooAQ (Khashabi et al., 2021) questions whose answers come from certain forums in StackExchange. We evaluate our model in the pooled setup, where documents come from forums in diverse domains (e.g., cooking, technical). GooAQ is not included in our training set. In LOTTE, our instructions specify which *forum domains* our system should retrieve evidence from (e.g., “Retrieve a *cooking* StackExchange forum post that answers this question”).

Metrics. Following Thakur et al. (2021), for BEIR, we use NDCG@10 as our primary metric and also report Recall@100 as well as precision@1. For LOTTE-pooled, we use Success@5 (= Recall@5) as our primary metric, as in the original paper (Santhanam et al., 2022).

6.2 Cross-task Cross-domain Evaluation

Normal retrieval datasets often assume that a system must deal with only a single intent and a closed corpus, which may oversimplify real-world scenarios: users’ intents can be diverse, requiring searching in a truly open-domain environment that includes diverse documents (Piktus et al., 2021). We introduce a more realistic evaluation setup, *cross-*

task cross-domain zero-shot evaluation, where several retrieval tasks with different intents are pooled to form a single retrieval target containing diverse documents. Thus, this setup requires a system not only to adapt to new task in a zero-shot manner, but it also tests a system’s ability to model users’ intents expressed in natural languages.

Tasks and queries. Our cross-task cross-domain evaluation covers six datasets across three domains, namely, Wikipedia, Science and Technical (Table 2) domains. The key challenge here includes datasets with different search intents that may not always be obvious from the queries alone.

A pooled corpus. For the primary *pooled* setup, we combine all documents from different tasks and the BEIR NQ Wikipedia corpus to form a single retrieval corpus, consisting of approximately 3.7 million documents. We also report the simplified *closed* setup performance as an oracle setup, where a system retrieves only from the original task corpus, which is similar to BEIR.

Metrics. We report NDCG@10 on both pooled and closed setups for each task. In addition, we evaluate the performance gap between the closed and pooled setups and refer to it as *robustness*. A smaller gap means that the model is distracted less by the documents from undesirable corpora.

6.3 Baselines

We compare TART with various state-of-the-art methods. The first group we consider are unsupervised models that are not trained or trained only on unlabeled text; these include **Contriever** (Izacard et al., 2022) and **BM25**. We also compare TART with **UPR** (Sachan et al., 2022a), which reranks the Contriever results using a pretrained T0-3B.

The second group trains retrievers and rerankers on MS MARCO or a few large-scale datasets and

	model size & rerank			BEIR										LOTTE	
	Ret.	Gen.	K	TREC	NFC	FQA	ARG	TOU	DBP	SCD	CLI	SCF	Avg.	Search-Pooled	
BM 25	0	0	0	65.6	32.5	23.6	31.5	36.7	31.3	15.8	21.3	66.5	36.0	48.3	
Contriever	110M	0	0	27.4	31.7	24.5	37.9	19.3	29.2	14.9	15.5	64.9	29.3	55.5	
UPR [†]	3B	0	0	60.4	33.3	45.0	50.3	21.3	33.8	17.3	9.5	69.6	37.8	—	
Contriever (MS)	110M	0	0	59.6	32.8	32.9	44.6	23.0	41.3	16.5	23.7	67.7	38.0	66.0	
Contriever+CE [†]	133M	0	100	70.1	34.4	36.7	41.3	29.8	47.1	17.1	25.8	69.2	41.3	73.5	
ColBERT-v2	110M	0	0	73.8	33.8	35.6	47.9	26.3	44.6	15.8	17.6	69.3	40.5	71.6	
BM25 + MonoT5 (3B) [†]	3B	0	1000	79.6	38.4	51.2	28.8	20.0	47.8	18.4	28.9	77.7	43.4	—	
GTR-11B	4.8B	0	0	50.1	34.2	46.7	54.0	25.6	40.8	16.1	27.0	63.5	39.8	—	
GPL	66M×9	220M	0	72.6	—	32.8	—	—	—	—	—	66.4	—	—	
Promptagator	110M ×9	175B	0	72.7	33.4	40.4	53.8	26.6	36.4	16.3	21.4	62.3	40.4	—	
Promptagator (rank) [†]	220M ×9	175B	200	76.0	36.0	45.9	53.1	27.8	41.3	19.1	22.6	73.6	43.9	—	
TART-dual	110M	0	0	62.6	33.7	33.7	48.9	20.1	41.5	14.2	13.8	69.0	37.4	56.8	
TART-full[†]	1.5B	0	100	71.7	34.0	42.2	49.8	31.2	45.1	17.5	30.0	75.8	44.1	75.7	

Table 3: Zero-shot retrieval results on BEIR and LOTTE-Search (pooled). [†] indicates the models using cross-encoder-based reranking models. The first group of models use no labeled data during training. The second group uses MS MARCO at training time but have no customized task-specific data. The third group trains individual retrieval systems using automatically generated data. TREC, NFC, FQA, ARG, TOU, DBP, SCD, CLI, SCF indicates TREC-COVID (Voorhees et al., 2021), FIQA (Maia et al., 2018), NF Corpus (Boteva et al., 2016), Arguana (Wachsmuth et al., 2018), Touche-2020 (Bondarenko et al., 2020), DBpedia (Hasibi et al., 2017), SciDocs (Cohan et al., 2020), Climate- Fever (Diggelmann et al., 2020), and SciFact (Wadden et al., 2020), respectively. “×9” of GPL, Promptagator means that those models train customized models for each of the datasets.

	AMB		WQA		SCF		GAT		LSO		CSP		Avg.		Δ
	cl	pl	cl	pl	cl	pl	cl	pl	cl	pl	cl	pl	cl	pl	cl-pl
Contriever	96.8	93.8	80.9	54.1	67.7	57.4	73.2	59.8	28.0	26.7	36.7	36.1	63.9	54.6	9.3
Contriever+CE	96.6	47.4	78.2	58.4	69.1	61.7	75.4	66.0	32.1	31.4	42.0	40.2	65.5	50.9	13.4
TART-dual	96.3	95.3	80.2	63.1	70.1	66.2	75.0	65.0	23.0	23.4	31.3	31.3	60.5	53.6	6.9
TART-full	91.1	90.5	82.1	52.5	74.7	66.2	80.5	68.6	25.1	24.9	51.4	51.4	67.5	59.1	8.4

Table 4: Cross-task retrieval results. Δ shows the performance gap between the averaged pooled performance and the averaged closed performance. AMB, WQA, SCF, GAT, LSO, CSP denote AmbigQA, WikiQA, SciFact, GooAQ-Technical, LinkSO-Python, and CodeSearchNet-Python, respectively.

directly transfers them to new tasks with no domain adaptations. These include **MonoT5** (Nogueira et al., 2020), **Contriever-MS MARCO** and **Contriever-MS MARCO + Cross Encoder** (Izacard et al., 2022), **ColBERT v2** (Santhanam et al., 2022) and **GTR** (Ni et al., 2021).

The final group of models are specialized retrievers trained for each task on additional task-specific data that was automatically generated given the target corpus. **Promptagator** (Dai et al., 2022) generates large amount of in-domain data using a 175 billion parameter FLAN (Wei et al., 2022a) model, and **GPL** (Wang et al., 2022a) generates them using DocT5Query (Nogueira et al., 2019).

6.4 Experimental Settings

We initialize TART-full from the T0-3B encoder (Sanh et al., 2022) and sample positive and negative passages with a 1:4 ratio. We train TART-

full up to 10k steps and take the best checkpoint based on development split performance. We initialize TART-dual from a Contriever-MS MARCO checkpoint (Izacard et al., 2022) and train up 30k steps. Per-GPU batch size is 16, and for each positive document, we sample in total 5 negative passages; 90% of them are randomly sampled from \mathcal{D} , and 10% are sampled from denoised d^{hard} and $d^{unfollow}$ in addition to the in-batch negative documents (Karpukhin et al., 2020).

We use 8 GPUs to train TART-full and 64 GPUs to train TART-dual. At inference time, to retrieve the initial document candidates for TART-full, we use Contriever-MS MARCO and rerank the top 100 documents.⁷ Table 9 shows the full list of

⁷We found that combining TART-full with the original Contriever performs better than combining TART-full with TART-dual, possibly because TART-full uses the hard negative samples retrieved by Contriever’s top-retrieved results.

instructions used for the evaluation datasets. More details are available in Appendix C.1.

7 Results

7.1 Zero-shot Evaluation Results

As shown in Table 3, TART-full significantly outperforms larger models and customized models trained on millions of synthetically generated in-domain data, advancing the state of the art on BEIR and LOTTE. Unlike prior methods that require additional data generation, TART only requires a single human-written instruction for each task at test time to adapt to a new task. Compared to other methods using cross-encoder-based reranking models (e.g., BM25 + MonoT5), TART-full uses a much smaller number of paragraphs to be re-ranked, which significantly reduces latency caused by reranking at test time.

The large performance gain from Contriever-MS MARCO to TART-dual on six out of the nine BEIR tasks (e.g., SciFact, Arguana) shows the effectiveness of instructions and knowledge distillations from a larger to a smaller model. On the other hand, for the other three datasets (e.g., Touche-2020, Climate-FEVER), TART-dual shows large performance deterioration, degrading average performance. We hypothesize that model capacity (i.e., BERT-base encoder) and limited interactions between the query and document embeddings could be major bottlenecks. Prior work on instruction training in LLMs has shown that smaller models often do not get as much benefit as larger ones from instructions and increasing dataset size, possibly due to their limited model capacities (Chung et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b).

For LOTTE-pooled, TART-full significantly outperforms prior state of the art by a large margin. We found that simply adding instructions at test time does not help, indicating that our instruction models do not simply exploit lexical matching. See more detailed results in Section 8.1.

7.2 Cross-task Cross-domain Evaluation

Table 4 shows the models’ cross-task cross-domain performance. Contriever and Contriever+Cross Encoder (CE) show competitive closed performance in the closed setup, as in BEIR, but they struggle in the pooled setup due to their inability to handle human instructions. Especially Contriever+CE shows a large performance drop on AmbigQA-pooled by retrieving documents instead of queries due to the

biases from fine-tuning on MS MARCO only.

TART-full shows the best closed performance and pooled performance, indicating its strong zero-shot adaptation and cross-task abilities. We found that a model can flexibly change its behavior based on the instructions, as shown in Table 11.

Although the closed setting performance of TART-dual underperforms Contriever, TART-dual shows strong performance on the pooled setup, resulting in the best robustness among all. This indicates that even smaller models can be guided by instructions, although they may have limited capabilities of zero-shot transfer to new task due to the limited model capacity.

8 Analysis

We conduct a set of analyses to understand the factors that contribute to the models’ ability to follow instructions, in particular, the effects of instructions (Section 8.1), dataset scale (Section 8.2) and model scale (Section 8.3). Our analysis in this section focuses on the more powerful TART-full.

8.1 Effects of Instructions

Ablating instructions. To analyze the effectiveness of instructions, we compare model-cross with three variants: (a) *train without instructions, test with instructions* prepends instructions at test time only to test if the models leverage keyword matching only at test time; (b) *train with instructions, test without instructions* uses TART-full without instructions at test time; (c) *train without instructions, test without instructions* does not use instructions at all during training and test time.

Figure 4 shows the performance of those baselines. On all benchmarks, ablating instructions during training or test time causes notable performance drop. We also see that a model trained with instructions but given no instruction at test time still yield a few performance improvements over the model trained completely without instructions, indicating the effectiveness of incorporating instructions during multi-task training. Removing instructions at test time from TART-full, which is trained with instructions, significantly degrades performance, possibly because the discrepancies between training and test time.

Robustness toward instructions. We evaluate TART-full’s robustness towards diverse instructions. Figure 5 shows the performance variance




Figure 4: Ablations of instructions. w/o I (train), w/o I (test) and w/o I (train & test) indicate the ablations (a), (b) and (c), respectively.




Figure 5: Performance variance across different instructions. Blue circles indicate performance without instructions at test time, while red circles indicate performance with different instructions. “PT”, “Cont”, “+CE” denote Promptagator, Contriever and Contriever+CE.




Figure 6: Analysis of dataset and model scale.

given multiple different instructions. The blue circles represent the performance with no instruction. Instructions significantly improves model performance without instructions. Although different instructions give small performance variance, TART-full often outperforms other competitive baselines when informative and correct instructions are given. We also observe larger performance deterioration when inaccurate instructions are given. See Table 15 for individual instructions and performance.

8.2 Dataset Scale

To assess the effectiveness of diverse datasets, we conduct dataset ablation experiments, where we




Figure 7: Dataset ablation results. Wikipedia-only denotes TART-full performance trained on Wikipedia-based datasets only. QA-only denotes the model trained on QA datasets only.

ablate datasets during training. Following prior work on language models instruction tuning, we conduct these experiments based on the number of datasets (Wang et al., 2022b) and task clusters (Wei et al., 2022a). In addition, we run ablations based on the number of domains, where we ablate datasets based on their source domains. Figures 6a and 7 show these experiments’ results.

Number of datasets. Figure 6a shows the average performance on four BEIR datasets of TART-full trained on randomly sampled 5, 10 and 20 datasets. We observe that increasing the number of the training datasets helps the instruct retriever to perform better. In addition to domain and task diversity, the diversity of instructions observed during training may also improve performance.

Task diversity. As shown in Figure 7, task diversity is a key to improve models’ zero-shot transfer performance. QA only struggles on Arguana, where the tasks significantly differ from QA.

Domain diversity. Figure 7 also shows that having more diversity in training datasets’ domains is also crucial, especially when the target datasets are in non-general domains. For instance, a model trained only on Wikipedia datasets struggles on Touche-2020 or SciFact, where retrieval targets come from argument collection websites and scientific papers, respectively.

8.3 Model Scale

We test different TART-full sizes to see how model scale affects final performance. Prior work has shown that scaling up re-ranking models often improves reranking performance (Rosa et al., 2022), and models’ instruction-following abilities improve as models get larger (Wang et al., 2022b; Sanh et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022b). We investigate how model scale affects the ability to generalize to new tasks and follow instructions. For a fair comparison, we

train TART-full using different T5 LM-Adapt (base, large and XL) and evaluate the final performance using them to rerank the top 100 Contriever results.

Figure 6b shows TART-full’s average performance across different model scales. We observe clear performance improvements by increasing model size as observed in prior work on LLM.

9 Conclusion

This paper lays the foundation for building a general-purpose instructable retriever. We introduced a new problem, *retrieval with instructions*, to model users’ intents explicitly, which are often only implicitly learned in conventional retrieval. We introduced BERRI, the first large-scale retrieval dataset with expert-written annotations. Building upon BERRI, we trained the first multi-task instruction-following retrieval system, TART, adopting two widely used architectures. TART advances the state of the art on the popular zero-shot retrieval benchmarks BEIR and LOTTE as well as on our newly introduced challenging evaluation setup, cross-task cross-domain evaluation. Our analysis shows that key factors to building a successful multi-task retrieval system include informative instructions that sufficiently describe the retrieval tasks at inference time, diversity in data and model scale.

Acknowledgements

We thank Allen School NLP and Meta AI researchers for their insightful discussions, and Jeff Dalton, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Sandy Kaplan and Yizhong Wang for their helpful feedback on this paper and discussions.

References

- Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. [Open-domain question answering goes conversational via question rewriting](#). *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Akari Asai, Xinyan Yu, Jungo Kasai, and Hanna Hajishirzi. 2021. [One question answering model for many languages with cross-lingual dense passage retrieval](#). *Proceedings of Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Stephen Bach, Victor Sanh, Zheng Xin Yong, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Nihal V. Nayak, Abheesht Sharma, Taewoon Kim, M Saiful Bari, Thibault Fevry, Zaid Alyafeai, Manan Dey, Andrea Santilli, Zhiqing Sun, Srulik Ben-david, Canwen Xu, Gunjan Chhablani, Han Wang, Jason Fries, Maged Alshaibani, Shanya Sharma, Urmish Thakker, Khalid Almubarak, Xiangru Tang, Dragomir Radev, Mike Tian-jian Jiang, and Alexander Rush. 2022. [Prompt-Source: An integrated development environment and repository for natural language prompts](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*.
- Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Alina Stoica, Saurabh Tiwary, and Tong Wang. 2016. [MS MARCO: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset](#).
- Alexander Bondarenko, Maik Fröbe, Meriem Beloucif, Lukas Gienapp, Yamen Ajjour, Alexander Panchenko, Chris Biemann, Benno Stein, Henning Wachsmuth, Martin Potthast, and Matthias Hagen. 2020. [Overview of touché 2020: Argument retrieval: Extended abstract](#). In *Proceedings of Experimental IR Meets Multilinguality, Multimodality, and Interaction: 11th International Conference of the CLEF Association*.
- Vera Boteva, Demian Gholipour, Artem Sokolov, and Stefan Riezler. 2016. [A full-text learning to rank dataset for medical information retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th European Conference on Information Retrieval*.
- Isabel Cachola, Kyle Lo, Arman Cohan, and Daniel Weld. 2020. [TLDR: Extreme summarization of scientific documents](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*.
- Danqi Chen and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts*.
- Xilun Chen, Kushal Lakhotia, Barlas Oğuz, Anchit Gupta, Patrick Lewis, Stan Peshterliev, Yashar Mehdad, Sonal Gupta, and Wen-tau Yih. 2022. [Salient phrase aware dense retrieval: Can a dense retriever imitate a sparse one?](#) In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Xinlei Chen, Hao Fang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Saurabh Gupta, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2015. [Microsoft coco captions: Data collection and evaluation server](#).
- Hyung Won Chung, Le Hou, Shayne Longpre, Barret Zoph, Yi Tay, William Fedus, Eric Li, Xuezhi Wang, Mostafa Dehghani, Siddhartha Brahma, Albert Webson, Shixiang Shane Gu, Zhuyun Dai, Mirac Suzgun, Xinyun Chen, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan

- Narang, Gaurav Mishra, Adams Yu, Vincent Zhao, Yanping Huang, Andrew Dai, Hongkun Yu, Slav Petrov, Ed H. Chi, Jeff Dean, Jacob Devlin, Adam Roberts, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, and Jason Wei. 2022. [Scaling instruction-finetuned language models](#).
- Arman Cohan, Sergey Feldman, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Daniel Weld. 2020. [SPECTER: Document-level representation learning using citation-informed transformers](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Zhuyun Dai and Jamie Callan. 2019. [Deeper text understanding for IR with contextual neural language modeling](#). In *Proceedings of the 42nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Zhuyun Dai and Jamie Callan. 2020. [Context-aware document term weighting for ad-hoc search](#). In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*.
- Zhuyun Dai, Vincent Y. Zhao, Ji Ma, Yi Luan, Jianmo Ni, Jing Lu, Anton Bakalov, Kelvin Guu, Keith B. Hall, and Ming-Wei Chang. 2022. [Promptagator: Few-shot dense retrieval from 8 examples](#).
- Ashwin Devaraj, Iain Marshall, Byron Wallace, and Junyi Jessy Li. 2021. [Paragraph-level simplification of medical texts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Thomas Diggelmann, Jordan L. Boyd-Graber, Jannis Bulian, Massimiliano Ciaramita, and Markus Leipold. 2020. [CLIMATE-FEVER: A dataset for verification of real-world climate claims](#). In *Proceedings of Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning Workshop at NeurIPS*.
- Emily Dinan, Stephen Roller, Kurt Shuster, Angela Fan, Michael Auli, and Jason Weston. 2019. [Wizard of wikipedia: Knowledge-powered conversational agents](#). In *Proceedings of International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Matthew Dunn, Levent Sagun, Mike Higgins, V Ugur Guney, Volkan Cirik, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2017. [SearchQA: A new q&a dataset augmented with context from a search engine](#).
- Anthony Fader, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Oren Etzioni. 2014. [Open question answering over curated and extracted knowledge bases](#). In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*.
- Angela Fan, Yacine Jernite, Ethan Perez, David Grangier, Jason Weston, and Michael Auli. 2019. [ELI5: Long form question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Katja Filippova and Yasemin Altun. 2013. [Overcoming the lack of parallel data in sentence compression](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Antonio Gulli. 2004. [Ag’s corpus of news articles](#).
- Felix Hamborg, Norman Meuschke, Corinna Breiter, and Bela Gipp. 2017. [news-please: A generic news crawler and extractor](#). In *Proceedings of the 15th International Symposium of Information Science*.
- Faegheh Hasibi, Fedor Nikolaev, Chenyan Xiong, Krisztian Balog, Svein Erik Bratsberg, Alexander Kotov, and Jamie Callan. 2017. [Dbpedia-entity v2: A test collection for entity search](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Christopher Hidey and Kathy McKeown. 2016. [Identifying causal relations using parallel Wikipedia articles](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Sebastian Hofstätter, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Allan Hanbury. 2021. [Efficiently teaching an effective dense retriever with balanced topic aware sampling](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Hamel Husain, Ho-Hsiang Wu, Tiferet Gazit, Miltiadis Allamanis, and Marc Brockschmidt. 2019. [Code-searchnet challenge: Evaluating the state of semantic code search](#).
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. [Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. 2019. [PubMedQA: A dataset for biomedical research question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [TriviaQA: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.

- 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*.
- Daniel Khashabi, Amos Ng, Tushar Khot, Ashish Sabharwal, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Chris Callison-Burch. 2021. [GooAQ: Open question answering with diverse answer types](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*.
- Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. [ColBERT: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert](#). In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Mahnaz Koupaee and William Yang Wang. 2018. [Wikihow: A large scale text summarization dataset](#).
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Matthew Kelcey, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina N. Toutanova, Llion Jones, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural Questions: a benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association of Computational Linguistics*.
- Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Patrick Lewis, Yuxiang Wu, Linqing Liu, Pasquale Minervini, Heinrich Küttler, Aleksandra Piktus, Pontus Stenetorp, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [PAQ: 65 million probably-asked questions and what you can do with them](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Frederick Liu, Siamak Shakeri, Hongkun Yu, and Jing Li. 2021. [EncT5: Fine-tuning t5 encoder for non-autoregressive tasks](#).
- Xueqing Liu, Chi Wang, Yue Leng, and ChengXiang Zhai. 2018. [LinkSO: A dataset for learning to retrieve similar question answer pairs on software development forums](#). In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM SIGSOFT International Workshop on NLP for Software Engineering*.
- Man Luo, Arindam Mitra, Tejas Gokhale, and Chitta Baral. 2022. [Improving biomedical information retrieval with neural retrievers](#). In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Macedo Maia, Siegfried Handschuh, André Freitas, Brian Davis, Ross McDermott, Manel Zarrouk, and Alexandra Balahur. 2018. [WWW'18 open challenge: Financial opinion mining and question answering](#). In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018*.
- Jean Maillard, Vladimir Karpukhin, Fabio Petroni, Wen-tau Yih, Barlas Oguz, Veselin Stoyanov, and Gargi Ghosh. 2021. [Multi-task retrieval for knowledge-intensive tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Sewon Min, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2022. [MetaICL: Learning to learn in context](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Sewon Min, Julian Michael, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. [AmbigQA: Answering ambiguous open-domain questions](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Stefano Mizzaro. 1998. [How many relevances in information retrieval?](#) *Interacting with Computers*.
- Shashi Narayan, Shay B. Cohen, and Mirella Lapata. 2018. [Don't give me the details, just the summary! topic-aware convolutional neural networks for extreme summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Jianmo Ni, Chen Qu, Jing Lu, Zhuyun Dai, Gustavo Hernández Ábrego, Ji Ma, Vincent Y Zhao, Yi Luan, Keith B Hall, Ming-Wei Chang, et al. 2021. [Large dual encoders are generalizable retrievers](#).
- Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. [Passage re-ranking with bert](#).
- Rodrigo Nogueira, Zhiying Jiang, Ronak Pradeep, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. [Document ranking with a pre-trained sequence-to-sequence model](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*.
- Rodrigo Nogueira, Wei Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. [Document expansion by query prediction](#).
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#).
- Ankit Pal, Logesh Kumar Umapathi, and Malaikanan Sankarasubbu. 2022. [Medmcqa: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning*.

- Fabio Petroni, Aleksandra Piktus, Angela Fan, Patrick Lewis, Majid Yazdani, Nicola De Cao, James Thorne, Yacine Jernite, Vladimir Karpukhin, Jean Maillard, Vassilis Plachouras, Tim Rocktäschel, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [KILT: a benchmark for knowledge intensive language tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Dmytro Okhonko, Samuel Broscheit, Gautier Izacard, Patrick Lewis, Barlas Oğuz, Edouard Grave, Wen-tau Yih, and Sebastian Riedel. 2021. [The web is your oyster—knowledge-intensive nlp against a very large web corpus](#).
- pushshift. 2021. [Npr corpus](#).
- Yingqi Qu, Yuchen Ding, Jing Liu, Kai Liu, Ruiyang Ren, Wayne Xin Zhao, Daxiang Dong, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. [RocketQA: An optimized training approach to dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. [SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Soumik Rakshit. 2019. [Yahoo answers dataset](#).
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. [Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. 2009. [The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond](#). *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*.
- Guilherme Moraes Rosa, Luiz Bonifacio, Vitor Jeronimo, Hugo Abonizio, Marzieh Fadaee, Roberto Lotufo, and Rodrigo Nogueira. 2022. [No parameter left behind: How distillation and model size affect zero-shot retrieval](#).
- Alexander M. Rush, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. [A neural attention model for abstractive sentence summarization](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Ian Ruthven and Mounia Lalmas. 2003. [A survey on the use of relevance feedback for information access systems](#). *The Knowledge Engineering Review*.
- Devendra Singh Sachan, Mike Lewis, Mandar Joshi, Armen Aghajanyan, Wen-tau Yih, Joelle Pineau, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2022a. [Improving passage retrieval with zero-shot question generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Devendra Singh Sachan, Mike Lewis, Dani Yogatama, Luke Zettlemoyer, Joelle Pineau, and Manzil Zaheer. 2022b. [Questions are all you need to train a dense passage retriever](#).
- Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Arun Raja, Manan Dey, M Saiful Bari, Canwen Xu, Urmish Thakker, Shanya Sharma Sharma, Eliza Szczechla, Tae-woon Kim, Gunjan Chhablani, Nihal Nayak, Debajyoti Datta, Jonathan Chang, Mike Tian-Jian Jiang, Han Wang, Matteo Manica, Sheng Shen, Zheng Xin Yong, Harshit Pandey, Rachel Bawden, Thomas Wang, Trishala Neeraj, Jos Rozen, Abheesht Sharma, Andrea Santilli, Thibault Fevry, Jason Alan Fries, Ryan Teehan, Teven Le Scao, Stella Biderman, Leo Gao, Thomas Wolf, and Alexander M Rush. 2022. [Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization](#). In *Proceedings of International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. [ColBERTv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Abigail See, Peter J. Liu, and Christopher D. Manning. 2017. [Get to the point: Summarization with pointer-generator networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*.
- Kornel Csernai Shankar Iyer, Nikhil Dandekar. 2012. [First quora dataset release: Question pairs](#).
- Zejiang Shen, Kyle Lo, Lauren Yu, Nathan Dahlberg, Margo Schlanger, and Doug Downey. 2022. [Multi-lexsum: Real-world summaries of civil rights lawsuits at multiple granularities](#). In *Proceedings of the 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Amit Singhal et al. 2001. [Modern information retrieval: A brief overview](#). *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin*.
- Robert S. Taylor. 1962. [The process of asking questions](#). *American Documentation*.
- Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. [BEIR: A heterogeneous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models](#). In *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.

- 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*.
- Ellen Voorhees. 2005. [Overview of the trec 2004 robust retrieval track](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Text REtrieval Conference*.
- Ellen Voorhees, Tasmeer Alam, Steven Bedrick, Dina Demner-Fushman, William R. Hersh, Kyle Lo, Kirk Roberts, Ian Soboroff, and Lucy Lu Wang. 2021. [TREC-COVID: Constructing a pandemic information retrieval test collection](#). *SIGIR Forum*.
- Henning Wachsmuth, Shahbaz Syed, and Benno Stein. 2018. [Retrieval of the best counterargument without prior topic knowledge](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- David Wadden, Shanchuan Lin, Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, Madeleine van Zuylen, Arman Cohan, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2020. [Fact or fiction: Verifying scientific claims](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- S. Walker, Stephen Robertson, M. Boughanem, G. J. F. Jones, and K. Sparck Jones. 1998. [Okapi at trec-6: Automatic adhoc, vlc, routing, filtering and qsdr](#). In *The Sixth Text REtrieval Conference*.
- Kexin Wang, Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, and Iryna Gurevych. 2022a. [GPL: Generative pseudo labeling for unsupervised domain adaptation of dense retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*.
- Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Anjana Arunkumar, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Atharva Naik, David Stap, et al. 2022b. [Super-NaturalInstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ nlp tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. 2022a. [Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners](#). In *Proceedings of International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, Ed H. Chi, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Oriol Vinyals, Percy Liang, Jeff Dean, and William Fedus. 2022b. [Emergent abilities of large language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Survey Certification.
- Ikuya Yamada, Akari Asai, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2021. [Efficient passage retrieval with hashing for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*.
- Yi Yang, Wen-tau Yih, and Christopher Meek. 2015. [WikiQA: A challenge dataset for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- 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*.
- Andrew Yates, Rodrigo Nogueira, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. [Pretrained transformers for text ranking: Bert and beyond](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Jingtao Zhan, Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Jiafeng Guo, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2021. [Optimizing dense retrieval model training with hard negatives](#). In *SIGIR '21: The 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Sheng Zhang, Xiaodong Liu, Jingjing Liu, Jianfeng Gao, Kevin Duh, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. [ReCoRd: Bridging the gap between human and machine commonsense reading comprehension](#).

Appendix

A Further BERRI Details

A.1 Dataset List

Table 5 shows all datasets we used in RIB. Table 6 provides references for these datasets.

A.2 Details of Dataset Unification

As shown in Table 5, some datasets were not originally retrieval datasets (e.g., summarization datasets). We describe how we convert these into the unified retrieval task format.

QA. For QA datasets, where each instance consists of a query, a gold context and answers, we assume the original gold context as the gold document used as a positive sample during training. For some exceptional datasets, we performed additional preprocessing. We found that ReCoRD instances are occasionally self-containing due to the nature of the cloze-style QA; therefore, for ReCoRD, we replace the original place holder with the gold answer and use this original question with the answer as the query and the original context as a gold document. For MedMCQA, we use the source exam question as the query and the answer evidence as the positive document.

Summarization. For summarization datasets, we use target summarizations as the gold document and source text as the query.

Text simplifications. For text simplification datasets, we use source (often more complex) sentences as the query and simplified sentences as the gold document.

Code search. We use source comment as the query and the corresponding implication as the gold document. We exclude the python subset from BERRI as we use it for cross-task cross-evaluation.

A.3 Instructions for BERRI

Table 7 show the full list of the instructions in BERRI. Note that we present only one instruction for each dataset. Full list of the instructions will be released in our repository.

A.4 BERRI Statistics

We conduct analyses on BERRI to understand its domain and intent diversities.




Figure 8: The task distributions of the datasets included in BERRI.




Figure 9: The domain distributions of the datasets included in BERRI.

Intents. Open-ended intents are diverse and hard to classify into fixed sets of categories. As a proxy for intents, Figure 8 shows the distributions of the source task categories. QA is the most representative category, while summarization and question duplication detection are also common due to their abundance in large-scale datasets. On the other hand, around 50 % of the tasks do not belong to those top three categories, such as code search or caption generations, which contribute to the diversity of BERRI. We also find that traditional non-retrieval tasks, such as sentence simplification or dialogue, can be repurposed as retrieval tasks. In Section 8.2, we analyze the effect of training data task diversity.

Domains. Our dataset covers diverse domains. Figure 9 shows that Wikipedia (e.g., NQ), web (e.g., MS MARCO) and Community QA (e.g., Wikihow) news(e.g., CNN/Daily) dominate, while we also have some expert domains (e.g., medical, legal, technical). We found that although many expert domain datasets are smaller than the ones in general domains like Wikipedia, adding those high-quality expert domain datasets helps the system learn to adapt to those domains or unseen expert domains with a similar writing style (e.g., scientific papers).

dataset	domain	task	unit
1. Altlex	wikipedia	sentence paraphrase	sentence
2. StackExchange (title → title)	community forum	duplicated questions	title
3. StackExchange (query → answer)	community forum	QA	answer body
4. Yahoo Answers (title → answers)	community forum	QA	answer body
5. MS MARCO	web	QA	paragraph
6. ELI5	web	QA	answer paragraph
7. WikiHow	community forum	QA	answer paragraph
8. SearchQA	web	QA	search snippets
9. AGNews	News	summarization	news summary
10. NPR	News	summarization	news summary
11. CodeSearchNet (java)	code	code search	Java code
12. CodeSearchNet (ruby)	code	code search	Ruby ode
13. CodeSearchNet (JavaScript)	code	code search	Java Script code
14. CodeSearchNet (Go)	code	code search	Go code
15. PAQ	Wikipedia	QA	paragraph
16. Sentence Compression	misc.	sentence compression	sentence
17. CNN Daily Mail	news	summarization	news summary
18. XSUM	news	summarization	news summary
19. Coco captions	image captions	caption generations	captions
20. Quora Duplicated Questions	community forum	duplicated questions	questions
21. CCNews	news	summarization	news summary
22. FEVER (KILT)	Wikipedia	fact verification	paragraph
23. HotpotQA (KILT)	Wikipedia	QA	paragraph
24. NQ (KILT)	Wikipedia	QA	paragraph
25. TriviaQA (KILT)	Wikipedia	QA	paragraph
26. WoW-KILT (knowledge)	Wikipedia	knowledge-grounded dialogue	paragraph
27. WoW-KILT (response)	Wikipedia	knowledge-grounded dialogue	dialogue response
28. medical simplification	medical	sentence simplification	sentence
29. SciTLDR	science	summarization	paper summarization
30. PubMedQA	medical& science	QA	abstract
31. MedMCQA	medical	QA	answer explanation
32. Gigaword	web	headline retrieval	headline
33. ReCoRD	news	QA	news summary
34. MultiLexSum	legal	summarization	legal case summary
35. Qrecc	Wikipedia	conversational QA	response
36. OQA	Wikipedia	duplicated questions	question
37. SQuAD	Wikipedia	QA	paragraph

Table 5: The complete list of datasets included in BERRI. Table 6 shows references for them.

<i>datasets used in BERRI</i>
Altlex* (Hidey and McKeown, 2016), StackExchange (duplicate questions, question-title, question-question) (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019), Yahoo Answers* (Rakshit, 2019), MSMARCO* (Bajaj et al., 2016), ELI5* (Fan et al., 2019), WikiHow* (Koupaee and Wang, 2018), SearchQA* (Dunn et al., 2017), AG News* (Gulli, 2004), NPR* (pushshift, 2021), CodeSearchNet* (Husain et al., 2019), PAQ* (Lewis et al., 2021), Sentence Compression* (Filippova and Altun, 2013), CNN Daily Mail* (See et al., 2017), XSUM* (Narayan et al., 2018), COCO captions* (Chen et al., 2015), Quora Duplicated Questions (Shankar Iyer, 2012), CC News* (Hamborg et al., 2017), SQuAD* (Rajpurkar et al., 2016), FEVER [†] (Thorne et al., 2018), HotpotQA [†] (Yang et al., 2018), Natural Questions [†] (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), TriviaQA [†] (Joshi et al., 2017), Wizard of Wikipedia [†] (Dinan et al., 2019), Medical Simplification Dataset (Devaraj et al., 2021), SCITLDR (Cachola et al., 2020), PubMedQA (Jin et al., 2019), MedMCQA (Pal et al., 2022), Gigaword (Rush et al., 2015), ReCoRD (Zhang et al., 2018), MultiLexSum (Shen et al., 2022), Qrecc (Anantha et al., 2021), OQA (Fader et al., 2014).
<i>datasets used during evaluations</i>
TREC-COVID (Voorhees et al., 2021), FIQA (Maia et al., 2018), NF Corpus (Boteva et al., 2016), Arguana (Wachsmuth et al., 2018), Touche-2020 (Bondarenko et al., 2020), DBPedia (Hasibi et al., 2017), SciDocs (Cohan et al., 2020), Climate-Fever (Diggelmann et al., 2020), SciFact (Wadden et al., 2020), GooAQ (Khashabi et al., 2021), LinkSO (Liu et al., 2018), AmbigQA (Min et al., 2020), WIKIQA (Yang et al., 2015).

Table 6: References for datasets used in BERRI and evaluations. We use the preprocessed versions available on the SentenceTransformers (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) embedding data page ⁸ for the datasets with *. We use the preprocessed versions from KILT (Petroni et al., 2021) for the datasets with [†].

Dataset	Instruction
1. Altlex	Retrieve a sentence from Wikipedia that simplifies the following
2. SE (title → title)	I want to find a related question asked in StackExchange. Can you find one for me?
3. SE (title → title)	StackExchange is a community QA forum for diverse topics including technical or science. Help me to find a question body that duplicates with my question
4. YahooAnswers	Retrieve the most voted answer for this question from Yahoo Answers.
5. MSMARCO	I want to know the answer to the question. Can you find good evidence on the web?.
6. ELI5	You have to answer a why / how question from users. Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph that provides a good evidence for the answer.
7. WikiHow	Find a detailed paragraph from WikiHow that explains how-to to achieve
8. SearchQA	Pick up the top web search results' snippets for the following question.
9. AGNews	Find a news summary sentence corresponding to the following header.
10. NPR	Given a news article headline published at npr.org, find a corresponding summary of the news
11. CodeSearchNet (Java)	Match the following natural language instruction to Java codes
12. CodeSearchNet (ruby)	Retrieve ruby codes from GitHub commit history that implement this feature
13. CodeSearchNet (JavaScript)	Find a java script code implementation on GitHub for the following natural language instructions
14. CodeSearchNet (Go)	Can you find a Go implementation of this?
15. PAQ	Can you answer my question by finding an article on the web?
16. Sentence Compression	You have to match this long sentence to a shorter compressed one
17. CNN Daily Mail	The following sentences are the summaries of an news article. Find the source news article.
18. XSUM	Retrieve a news article that is summarized as following.
19. Coco captions	Can you find an image caption talking about the same image as.
20. Quora Dup. Questions	Check if a Quora question is duplicated with this question.
21. CC News	I want to know the details of this news. Can you find a detailed news article on this for me?
22. FEVER	Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph to verify this claim
23. HotpotQA	Find a paragraph that provides useful information to answer this question
24. NQ	Retrieve passages from Wikipedia to answer
25. TriviaQA	I want to find an answer for this Trivia question. Can you find some paragraphs that provide evidence from Wikipedia?
26. WoW-Knowledge	Find an Wikipedia paragraph related to the following conversation topic.
27. WoW-Response	Find a meaningful dialogue response to answer the user's question
28. Medical Simplification	Please retrieve a medical paper summary that is written in a simple language so that my patient can understand
29. SciTLDR	Find a sentence-length summary of this paper.
30. PubMedQA	Help me to find a highly related pubmed paper to answer this question.
31. MedMCQA	Find the explanation for the correct answer of this medical question.
32. Gigaord	Retrieve a extremely short summary of the following Gigaword article.
33. Record	Find a News article to verify the following sentence
34. MultiLexSum	Map this legal case summary to a sentence-long summary
35. Qrecc	You need to find a good response from a collection of previous responses and help users to know this topic more
36. OQA	Find a question that is paraphrased of this
37. SQuAD	Find a Wikipedia paragraph that answer the question

Table 7: Full list of the instructions for the BERRI datasets. We present one instruction per dataset. All of the instructions are available at our Github repository.

B Further Detail about Cross-task Cross-domain Evaluation

Query and corpus creations. For AmbigQA, we use the official development split, including

1,172 queries, as the official test split annotations are not publicly available. We use all paraphrased questions for all train and development sets to form the retrieval corpus. For WIKIQA, we combine the development split and test split available at

Dataset	q	d^{gold}
WIKIQA	Who plays henry tudor in the white princess?	Jacob Collins-Levy as Henry VII, the King of England, Elizabeth's husband
Ambig	Who played lead guitar for the rolling stones?	Who played lead guitar for the rolling stones from since 1962?
SciFact	The risk of male prisoners harming themselves is ten times that of female prisoners.	5-6% of male prisoners and 20-24% of female inmates self-harmed every year (scientific paper).
GooAQ-tech	project facet java version 1.8 is not supported eclipse mars?	You can remove and create it again, or just update it. It is because Java version in your Project Facet is 1.8 make it 1.7. Go to Project Properties -> Project Facets and on right side checkboxes, select java checkbox(It might be already selected) and select the version as 1.7.
LinkSO	could use batch normalization tensorflow	trying implement batch normalization layer tensor flow problem running train step using tf moments get mean variance test time
CodeSearch	Create a Basilisp function, setting meta and supplying a with_meta	<pre>def _basilisp_fn(f): assert not hasattr(f, "meta") f._basilisp_fn = True f.meta = None f.with_meta = partial(_fn_with_meta, f) return f</pre>

Table 8: Cross-task cross-domain evaluation examples data.

Dataset	Instruction
TREC-COVID	Retrieve Scientific paper paragraph to answer this question
NF Corpus	Retrieve Scientific paper paragraph to answer this question
FIQA	Find financial web article paragraph to answer
Arguana	Retrieve an argument that counter argues the following paragraph
Touche	You have to retrieve an argument to this debate question
DBPedia	Retrieve an Wikipedia introduction paragraph of the following entity
SCIDOCS	Find scientific paper titles that are related to the following
Climate-Fever	I want to know if the following claim is true or not. Retrieve Wikipedia paragraph on climate changes for this.
SciFact	Retrieve a scientific paper sentence to verify if the following claim is true
WIKIQA	Retrieve an answer sentence from Wikipedia
AmbigQA	Retrieve a question that is similar to this
SciFact	Retrieve scientific evidence to verify this claim
GooAQ-technical	Find a StackExchange forum that answers this question
Codesearchnet-py	Retrieve a python code that implements the following feature.
Linkso-Py	You have to find a python implementation of this

Table 9: Full list of the instructions used for evaluations.

the huggingface datasets,⁹ and we use the question and answer sentence pairs that are labeled as 1 as the queries for evaluations, and use the answer sentences as the gold documents. Regarding the retrieval target, we use all sentences available in the WIKIQA dataset, including the sentences that are labeled as 0. For LinkSO, we use the original datasets' test split for the python domain, and sample 1,000 queries.¹⁰ We find questions that

are labeled as duplicated, and use their corpus as our retrieval target. For GooAQ-technical, we sample 1,000 GooAQ questions whose answers are from stackoverflow.com. As 20% of the sampled GooAQ tech queries share the same answer posts, we remove the duplicated paragraphs. For CodeSearchNet-Python, we use the comments describing the codes as queries and the corresponding python codes as positive documents. We sample 1,000 queries from the test split.

⁹https://huggingface.co/datasets/wiki_qa

¹⁰<https://sites.google.com/view/linkso>

Examples. Examples of the cross-task cross-domain evaluation setup are shown in Table 8. As shown, queries themselves often do not fully indicate the users’ intents. By specifying users’ intents as explicit textual instructions, our model can effectively perform multi-task retrieval over a single pooled corpus.

Human evaluations of quality. To access the possibility of having false negative passages, we run an off-the-shelf retrieval system to retrieve the top 10 documents for randomly sampled 20 questions for each task, and we evaluate if any of negative passages, especially from the non-target corpus, are indeed positive. We found that the false negative ratio is less than 10%.

C Modeling Details

C.1 Hyperparameters of TART

TART-dual. We set the learning rate to be 1×10^{-5} and warm up steps to be 1,000. The softmax temperature is set to 0.05. The batch size is 1024. We use 7 negative samples per instance; 10% of the time we use hard negative or instruction-unfollowing negatives, while 90% of the time we use negative documents that are randomly sampled from the same target corpus. The maximum document chunk length is set to 256.

TART-full. To train a cross-encoder using the T0-3B encoder, we set the maximum sequence length to 512 and the batch size to 1, increasing the gradient accumulation steps to 8. We set the drop out rate to 0.1 and the learning rate to 1×10^{-5} .

C.2 Instructions for Evaluations

Table 9 lists the instructions used for the BEIR, LOTTE and the cross-task cross-domain evaluation.

C.3 Negative Sampling

Mining instruction-unfollowing samples. To sample instruction-unfollowing samples, given a query from a target dataset, we retrieve the top 20 documents from another task’s corpus using Contriever-MS MARCO. For instance, given a Pub-MedQA, a system should not retrieve a document from a Wikipedia paragraph. A list of source target task and retrieval corpus combinations is shown in Table 10.

Sampling d^- for TART-full training. Challenging negative samples help a system to effectively learn the task. On the other hand, prior work also shows that it can lead to large performance drops in out-of-domain datasets and having both randomly sampled negative documents and carefully designed negative documents is a key to build a system that is competitive in both in-domain and out-of-domain retrieval (Ni et al., 2021). To effectively combine the negative documents during training, we first combine random samples and hard negative samples, and then we randomly sample 4 negative documents per one positive document. The number of instruction-unfollowing documents, if applicable, is limited to less than 20% of the negative documents, and we set the maximum number of instruction-unfollowing samples from certain combinations listed in Table 10 up to 10k.

D Further Results and Analyses

D.1 Qualitative Results on Cross-task Cross-domain Evaluation

Table 11 shows the qualitative examples given different instructions on the cross-task cross-domain evaluation datasets, and Table 12 compare TART-full with Contriever MS MARCO.

D.2 Analysis of Instruction Effectiveness

Full results of instruction ablations. Table 13 shows the full BEIR results of ablating instructions in Section 8.1, and Table 14 shows the ones on LOTTE and the cross-task cross-domain evaluation. On all of the benchmark, removing instructions at training or test time largely hurts the performance, indicating the effectiveness of instructions.

Examples of prompts with performance. Table 15 shows the instructions and TART-full performance on three BEIR datasets. We also provides comparison of the model performance when uninformative instructions are given in Table 16. We see that more informative and related instructions often result in strong performance, while irrelevant instructions degrades it.

D.3 Analysis on Model and Dataset Scale

Table 17 shows the NDCG@10 across different model scales. We compare the TART-full initialized with different sizes of T5-LM-adapt for a fair comparison. We see in general that larger models perform better.

dataset	expected output	instruction-unfollowing corpus
Gigaword	article summary	Wikipedia paragraph
Medical Paragraph Simplification	simplified text of medical cases	Wikipedia paragraph
MS MARCO	web answers	OQA questions
OQA	similar questions	Yahoo Answers answer
PubMedQA	medical paper abstract	Wikipedia paragraph
Qrecc	dialogue responses	Wikipedia paragraph
Quora	duplicated questions	Wikipedia paragraph
sentence compression	simplified sentence	Wikipedia paragraph
StackExchange (question→answer) title	StackExchange answer	StackExchange title
StackExchange (title →title) title	StackExchange title	StackExchange answer
Yahoo Answers	Yahoo Answers answer	Wikipedia paragraphs

Table 10: The list of the combinations of the dataset and corresponding instruction-unfollowing corpora to mine instruction-unfollowing negative documents.

Query: how to calculate the distance between two points using longitude and latitude	
Instruction	Top document
Retrieve an answer post from StackOverflow to this question	SELECT getDistance(lat1,lng1,lat2,lng2) as distance FROM your_table. Here's a MySQL function that will take two latitude longitude pairs, and give you the distance in degrees between the two points. It uses the Haversine formula to calculate the distance.
Find a similar question asked in StackOverflow	tried implementing formula good two points testing yet code working distance returns.
Query: When did the kim family come to power?	
Instruction	Top document
find an answer sentence	Kim came to lead the Soviet-backed North's provisional government, becoming the first premier of its new government, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (commonly known as North Korea), in 1948. He started the Korean War in 1950 with hopes to reunify the region. (Wikipedia)
Find a similar question	When did the kim family come to power in North Korea? (Ambig QA)
Query: 10% of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) deaths happen in newborns aged less than 6 months	
Instruction	Top document
retrieve a scientific paper paragraph to verify this	Despite declines in prevalence during the past two decades, sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) continues to be the leading cause of death for infants aged between 1 month and 1 year in developed countries. Behavioural risk factors identified in epidemiological studies include prone and side positions for infant sleep, smoke exposure, soft bedding and sleep surfaces, and overheating. (Scientific paper)
Find a Wikipedia paragraph to verify this	By definition, SIDS deaths occur under the age of one year, with the peak incidence occurring when the infant is at 2 to 4 months of age. (Wikipedia)

Table 11: Examples of the model's predictions given different instructions with the same query. The queries and documents are from our cross-domain cross-task evaluation datasets.

Table 18 shows the full BEIR results of TART-full trained on varying numbers of datasets. We see that as we increase the number of datasets used during training, model performance often improves, which is consistent with previous work on instruction-tuning in LLMs (Wang et al., 2022b).

Query: 10% of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) deaths happen in newborns aged less than 6 months. Instructions: Retrieve a scientific paper abstract to verify this	
Contriever ✗ By definition, SIDS deaths occur under the age of one year, with the peak incidence occurring when the infant is at 2 to 4 months of age. This is considered a critical period because the infant’s ability to rouse from sleep is not yet mature (Wikipedia paragraph)	TART-full ✓ Despite declines in prevalence during the past two decades, sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) continues to be the leading cause of death for infants aged between 1 month and 1 year in developed countries. Behavioural risk factors identified in epidemiological studies include prone and side positions for infant sleep, smoke exposure, soft bedding and sleep surfaces, and overheating. (paper)
Query: Which city will host the next winter Olympics? Instructions: find an answer from Wikipedia	
Contriever ✗ Where will the next winter olympics be held 2018? (Ambig question)	TART-full ✓ The host city for the 2022 Winter Olympics, is Beijing in northern China, elected on 31 July 2015, at the 128th IOC Session in Kuala Lumpur. Beijing will be the first city ever to have hosted both the Summer and Winter Olympics. The 2022 Winter Olympics will take place between 4 and 20 February 2022. (Wikipedia paragraph)
Query: use batch normalization tensorflow Instructions: Can you find python code implementing this?	
Contriever ✗ could use batch normalization tensorflow would like use batch normalization tensorflow since found source code re norefferer core ops nn ops cc however find documented different semantics mlp cnn sure exactly bn find method called either c code copied reference (StackOverflow post)	TART-full ✓ <pre>def batch_norm(inputs , training , data_format): outputs = tf.layers. batch_normalization(inputs=inputs , axis=1, momentum=_BATCH_NORM_DECAY, epsilon=_BATCH_NORM_EPSILON, center=True , scale=True , training=training , fused=True) return outputs</pre> (Github code)
Query: how many planets is jupiter away from the sun? Instructions: Can you find an answer sentence to this question for me?	
Contriever ✗ Jupiter is the only planet whose barycenter with the Sun lies outside the volume of the Sun, though by only 7% of the Sun’s radius.[80] The average distance between Jupiter and the Sun is 778 million km (about 5.2 times the average distance between Earth and the Sun, or 5.2 AU) (Wikipedia paragraph)	TART-full ✓ Jupiter is the fifth planet from the Sun and the largest planet in the Solar System . (Wikipedia answer sentence)
Query: Who won the final hoh big brother 20? Instructions: a question similar to this	
Contriever <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Who won the Final HoH in the American reality show Big Brother 20? (AmbigQA) ✓ Who won the final vote in the British reality show Celebrity Big Brother 20? (AmbigQA) ✗ Caleb Reynolds was a castaway on Survivor: Kaōh Rōng; he was medically evacuated from the game, and placed 15th. Nicole Franzel returned as a HouseGuest on Big Brother 18 where she was crowned the winner and became the first female winner to win against a male in the final 2. (Wikipedia paragraph) 	TART-full <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Who won the final vote in the British reality show Celebrity Big Brother 20? (AmbigQA) ✓ Who is left in the American big brother house at the end of the season 20? (AmbigQA) ✓ Who won the Final HoH in the American reality show Big Brother 20? (AmbigQA)

Table 12: We compare TART-full outputs with the Contriever-MS MARCO (Izacard et al., 2022) predictions on cross-domain cross-task datasets. We shows the top one prediction for the first four examples, and show the top three predictions for the bottom examples. ✓ mean that the documents follow instructions while ✗ mean that the documents do not satisfy the instructions.

	Using instructions		BEIR										
	at training	at test	TREC	NFC	FQA	ARG	TOU	DBP	SCD	CLI	SCF	avg.	best
TART-full	✓	✓	72.8	34.6	42.0	50.0	35.3	46.1	18.4	35.2	73.7	44.4	5
Ablations	✓	✓	61.1	21.9	38.4	39.8	23.6	36.1	15.0	24.7	65.2	36.2	0
			67.6	34.9	40.6	39.5	20.5	47.1	17.5	39.8	75.4	42.5	3
			57.2	37.1	41.3	50.0	18.3	41.3	18.3	32.5	73.2	41.1	2

Table 13: The full results of the instruction ablations on BEIR. TREC, NFC, FQA, ARG, TOU, DBP, SCD, CLI, SCF indicate TREC-COVID, FIQA, NF Corpus, Arguana, Touche-2020, DBPedia, SciDocs, Climate-Fever, and SciFact, respectively.

	Using instructions		LOTTE	Cross-Task Cross-Domain						
	at training	at test		AMB	WQA	SCF	GAT	LSO	CSP	avg.
TART-full	✓	✓	75.7	90.5	52.5	66.2	68.6	24.9	51.4	59.1
Ablations	✓	✓	68.5	59.3	54.4	61.7	62.0	15.1	46.8	49.9
			70.5	40.1	47.2	64.0	69.5	25.5	43.7	48.3
			69.9	34.5	32.5	60.8	58.2	24.2	49.3	43.3

Table 14: : Instruction ablations on LOTTE (Search pooled) and Cross-task Cross-domain (pooled) evaluation. AMB, WQA, SCF, GAT, LSO, CSP denotes AmbigQA, WikiQA, SciFact, GooAQ-Technical, LinkSO-Python, and CodeSearchNet-Python, respectively.

Dataset	Instruction	NDCG@10
SciFact	Find a scientific paper sentence to verify this questions	75.4
	Retrieve a scientific paper abstract to verify this claim	75.7
	can you retrieve a reliable scientific evidence to check if the following claim is true or not?	74.3
	please retrieve evidence for me to verify the following	73.8
	a scientific paper sentence supporting or refuting the following statement	74.7
Touche-2020	retrieve an argument paragraph to answer this question	30.6
	retrieve a paragraph to answer this debate question	30.9
	Find a opinion to this debate question	29.5
	retrieve a argument paragraph that supports this debate question to this debate question	31.2
Climate-FEVER	Retrieve a scientific paper abstract to verify the following claim	29.3
	Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph to answer this question	30.4
	Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph to verify the following claim about climate change	30.8
	I want to know if the following claim is true or not. Can you find a Wikipedia evidence?	30.6
	Find a Wikipedia paragraph to verify the following claim	30.8

Table 15: Performance on SciFact, Climate-FEVER and Touche-2020 with different instructions.

Dataset	Instruction	NDCG@10
SciFact	✓ Retrieve a scientific paper abstract to verify this claim	75.7
	✗ Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph to verify the following claim	74.0
	[NULL]	69.1
Arguana	✓ Retrieve an article that contradict the following paragraph	50.6
	✗ Retrieve a Wikipedia paragraph that answers this question	47.3
	[NULL]	39.8
Touche-2020	✓ Retrieve an argument for this topic	29.6
	✗ retrieve a wikipedia passage that answers this question	26.7
	[NULL]	22.1

Table 16: Full list of the instructions used for evaluations. [NULL] means that at inference time, no instruction is given to TART-full. ✓ means a correct instruction, while ✗ means incorrect instructions.

model size		BEIR										
		TREC	NFC	FQA	ARG	TOU	DBP	SCD	CLI	SCF	avg.	best
T5-LM-base	110M	62.9	29.7	33.9	37.8	30.8	38.6	15.1	29.2	70.7	38.7	0
T5-LM-large	385M	73.3	34.2	40.2	47.1	32.8	45.3	18.2	35.2	74.9	43.7	3
T5-LM-XL	1.5B	71.6	33.1	41.8	43.1	34.0	46.0	18.5	38.3	75.5	44.7	6

Table 17: Zero-shot retrieval results for different sizes of TART-full on BEIR. TREC, NFC, FQA, ARG, TOU, SCD, CLI, SCF indicate TREC-COVID, FIQA, NF Corpus, Arguana, Touche-2020, DBPedia, SciDocs, Climate-Fever, and SciFact, respectively.

dataset number		BEIR										
		TREC	NFC	FQA	ARG	TOU	DBP	SCD	CLI	SCF	avg.	best
T5-LM-XL	5	63.3	28.3	37.6	47.8	24.3	42.3	17.0	30.8	73.4	40.5	0
T5-LM-XL	10	68.8	30.5	39.5	47.5	29.4	46.7	18.2	26.9	76.0	42.6	3
T5-LM-XL	20	71.0	33.7	41.7	48.7	33.2	46.1	18.2	29.8	74.7	44.1	6

Table 18: Zero-shot retrieval results for different training dataset scales of TART-full on BEIR. TREC, NFC, FQA, ARG, TOU, SCD, CLI, SCF indicate TREC-COVID, FIQA, NF Corpus, Arguana, Touche-2020, DBPedia, SciDocs, Climate-Fever, and SciFact, respectively.