

Large Language Models Know Your Contextual Search Intent: A Prompting Framework for Conversational Search

Kelong Mao¹, Zhicheng Dou¹, Haonan Chen¹, Fengran Mo², Hongjin Qian¹

¹Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Renmin University of China

²University of Montreal

mk1@ruc.edu.cn, dou@ruc.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we present a prompting framework called LLMCS that leverages large language models, such as code-davinci-002 of GPT-3, to perform few-shot conversational query rewriting for conversational search. We explore three prompting methods to generate multiple query rewrites and hypothetical responses, and propose aggregating them into an integrated representation that can robustly represent the user’s real contextual search intent. Experimental results on two conversational search datasets, including CAsT-19 and CAsT-20, show that our approach achieves significant improvements in search effectiveness over existing baselines and manual rewrites. Notably, LLMCS can significantly outperform the state-of-the-art baselines by up to +5.9% and +32.9% w.r.t. NDCG@3 on CAsT-19 and CAsT-20, highlighting the vast potential of large language models for conversational search. Our code will be released at <https://github.com/kyriemao/LLMCS>.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Query representation.

KEYWORDS

Conversational search; passage retrieval; large language models

1 INTRODUCTION

Conversational search has been expected to be the next generation of search paradigms [3] that supports *search via conversation* to provide users with more accurate and intuitive search results and a much more user-friendly search experience. Unlike using traditional search engines which mainly process keyword queries, users could imagine the conversational search system as a knowledgeable human expert and directly start a multi-turn conversation with it in natural languages to solve their questions. However, one of the main challenges for this beautiful vision is that users’ queries may contain more linguistic problems (e.g., omission and coreference) and its search intent tend to be more implicit under the conversation context [5, 12].

A common and intuitive thread of existing methods for conversational search is first to employ a rewriting model to rewrite the current query into a de-contextualized one and then freely adopt any ad-hoc search models for search, which we call *Conversational Query Rewriting (CQR)*. Nevertheless, training rewriting models often requires a large number of expensive manual rewrites as the training target. As conversational search sessions are much more

diverse and long-tailed [22], existing CQR models trained with limited manual rewrites are still not effective and robust enough to handle real conversational search scenarios.

In this paper, we propose to leverage large language models, such as code-davinci-002 of GPT-3, to perform few-shot conversational query rewriting for conversational search. We think these powerful language models would help understand the conversational search intents. Specifically, We create a prompting framework named LLMCS that harnesses large language models to facilitate conversational search. It integrates three specific prompting methods, including Rewriting Prompt, Rewriting-Then-Response Prompt, and Rewriting-And-Response Prompt, and also some advanced prompting approaches (e.g., chain-of-thought [20] and self-consistency [19]) that have been specifically adapted for conversational search. The main idea of LLMCS is to prompt large language models to generate query rewrites and longer hypothetical system responses in multiple perspectives and then aggregate these generated results into an integrated representation that robustly represents the user’s complete search intent. Overall, LLMCS has two main advantages. **First**, by leveraging the powerful contextual understanding and generation abilities of large language models, we show that **additionally generating hypothetical responses** to explicitly supplement more plausible search intent underlying the short query rewrites can significantly improve the search performance. **Second**, we show that **aggregating multiple query rewrites and hypothetical responses** can effectively filter out incorrect search intent and enhance the reasonable ones, leading to better search performance and robustness.

We conduct experiments on two widely used conversational search datasets: CAsT-19 [4] and CAsT-20 [5]. Experimental results show that our model LLMCS achieves remarkable improvements in search performance over the state-of-the-art baselines and even retrieving with manual rewrites.

Overall, our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a prompting framework and design three tailored prompting methods to leverage large language models for few-shot conversational search, which effectively circumvents the serious data scarcity problem faced by the field.
- We show that additionally generating hypothetical responses and aggregating multiple generated results are crucial for improving search performance and robustness.
- We demonstrate that the chain-of-thought [20] technique can be useful in guiding the language model to accurately understand the user’s contextual search intent.




Figure 1: Illustration of our prompting template. The orange text is the generated rewrite in the three prompting methods for the current turn t . The blue text is the additionally generated hypothetical response in the RTR and RAR prompting methods. The green text is the designed chain-of-thought.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Recap of Conversational Query Rewriting

We focus on the task of conversational passage retrieval [4, 5], which is the crucial first step of conversational search that helps the model access the right evidence knowledge. Given the user query q^t and the conversation context $C^t = (q^1, r^1, \dots, q^{t-1}, r^{t-1})$ of the current turn t , where q^i and r^i denote the user query and the system response of the i -th historical turn, our goal is to retrieve passages that are relevant to satisfy the user’s real search intent of the current turn. For example, as shown in the part of “Conversation Exemplars” of Figure 1, the target of *Turn 2* is to retrieve relevant passages that can answer the real question (but is unavailable): *Cool. Which smartphone would you recommend for me?*

To achieve conversational search, the main idea of conversational query rewriting is to employ a rewriting model to transform the whole search session (i.e., q^t and C^t) into a de-contextualized query rewrite \hat{q}^t and then perform ad-hoc search with the rewrite \hat{q}^t . However, since conversational search sessions are long-tailed while manual rewrites are expensive, existing conversational query rewriting methods still suffer a lot from the limited number of training data. Meanwhile, large language models have shown remarkable contextual understanding and text generation abilities in many NLP tasks [10] in a few-shot or zero-shot manner. This motivates us to explore how large language models can be utilized to achieve better rewriting and improve conversational search performance.

2.2 Prompting Large Language Models for Conversational Search

In this work, we propose a prompting framework to leverage large language models to perform few-shot conversational query rewriting for conversational search, called *LLMCS*. We mainly use the free code-davinci-002 of the GPT-3 [2] model family to conduct few-shot rewriting with in-context learning [2]. Specifically, we design and explore the following three prompting methods.

2.2.1 Rewriting Prompt (REW). We organize the conversational search session q^t and C^t into the prompt. Specifically, as shown in Figure 1, a specific rewriting instruction: “Reformulate the current question into a de-contextualized rewrite under the multi-turn information-seeking dialog context.” is prepended at the beginning of the prompt. Then, we add a few complete multi-turn search-oriented conversations with corresponding manual rewrites as exemplars for demonstration. Last, for the t -th turn of the current conversation, we only provide C^t and a marker word “Rewrite:” to prompt the model to generate the rewrite.

Although straightforward, we show in Section 3.3.1 that this simple prompting method has been able to achieve quite strong search performance compared with existing baselines, especially on more complex search sessions.

2.2.2 Rewriting-Then-Response Prompt (RTR). Recently, a few studies [9, 14, 23] have shown that generating hypothetical responses for search queries can often bring positive improvements in retrieval performance. Inspired by them, in addition to prompting the large language model to generate query rewrites, we continue to utilize the rewrite that we just generated to prompt the model to generate a hypothetical response that may contain relevant information to answer the current question. Specifically, we put the generated rewrite after “Rewrite:” and add the marker word “Response:” to inspire the model to generate a hypothetical response. The instruction is changed to “Generate a correct response to the current question rewrite under the multi-turn information-seeking dialog context”.

2.2.3 Rewriting-And-Response Prompt (RAR). Instead of generating rewrites and hypothetical responses in a two-stage manner, we can also generate them all at once with an integrated instruction: “Reformulate the current question into a de-contextualized rewrite under the multi-turn information-seeking dialog context and generate a correct response to the current question”. Specifically, as shown in the blue text of Figure 1, after generating the rewrite, we allow the model to continually generate the marker word “Response:” and a hypothetical response. If the model does not generate the maker word correctly, we consider it a generation failure and drop it.

2.3 Incorporating Chain-of-Thought

Chain-of-thought (CoT) [20] induces the large language models to decompose a reasoning task into multiple intermediate steps which can unlock their stronger reasoning abilities. In this work, we investigate whether incorporating the chain-of-thought of reasoning the user’s real search intent could improve the quality of rewriting.

Specifically, as shown in the green text of Figure 1, we manually write the chain-of-thought in which humans infer the user’s real search intent of the current turn based on the historical conversation context for the exemplars. We slightly change the prompt from “Rewrite: {rewrite}” into “Rewrite: {chain-of-thought}”. So the question should be rewritten as: {rewrite}”. We investigate the effects of our proposed chain-of-thought tailored to the reasoning of contextual search intent in Section 3.3.2.

2.4 Aggregation and Retrieval

After prompting large language models multiple times to generate multiple rewrites and hypothetical responses, we aggregate them into an integrated representation that represents the user’s complete search intent to perform retrieval. Suppose that we have generated N query rewrites $Q = (\hat{q}_1, \dots, \hat{q}_N)$ and M hypothetical responses $\mathcal{R} = (\hat{r}_{i1}, \dots, \hat{r}_{iM})$ for each rewrite \hat{q}_i , sorted by their generation probabilities from high to low¹. Note that in the RAR prompting, the rewrites and the hypothetical responses are always generated in pairs (i.e., $M = 1$). While in the RTR prompting, one rewrite can have M hypothetical responses since they are generated in a two-stage manner. Then, we use a dual well-trained ad-hoc retriever² f (e.g. ANCE [21]) to encode each of them into a high-dimensional search intent vector and adopt the following three approaches to aggregate these intent vectors into one final intent vector \mathbf{v} .

2.4.1 MaxProb. We directly use the rewrite and the hypothetical response that have the highest generation probabilities. Therefore, compared to the other two prompting methods that will be introduced later, *MaxProb* is highly efficient since it actually does not require multiple generations.

Formally, for the REW prompting, we have:

$$\mathbf{v} = f(\hat{q}_1). \quad (1)$$

For the RTR and RAR prompting methods, we mix the rewrite and hypothetical response vectors:

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{f(\hat{q}_1) + f(\hat{r}_{11})}{2}. \quad (2)$$

2.4.2 Self-Consistency (SC). The multiple generated rewrites and hypothetical responses may express different search intents but only some of them are correct. To obtain a more reasonable and consistent search intent representation, we extend and fit the self-consistency prompting method [19], which is originally proposed for the reasoning tasks where the final answer is from a fixed answer set, into our conversational query rewriting task where there is no fixed standard answer. To be specific, we select the intent vector that is the most similar to the cluster center of all intent vectors as the final search intent vector, since it represents the most popular search intent overall.

¹That is, the generation probability orders are: $P(\hat{q}_1) \geq \dots \geq P(\hat{q}_N)$ and $P(\hat{r}_{i1}) \geq \dots \geq P(\hat{r}_{iM})$.

²The parameters of the query encoder and the passage encoder are shared.

Formally, for the REW prompting, we have:

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}}^* = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(\hat{q}_i), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = \arg \max_{f(\hat{q}_i)} f(\hat{q}_i)^\top \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}^*, \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{q}}^*$ is the cluster center vector and \cdot denotes the dot product that measures the similarity.

For the RTR prompting, we first select the intent vector $f(\hat{q}_k)$ and then select the intent vector $f(\hat{r}_{kj})$ from all hypothetical responses generated based on the selected rewrite \hat{q}_k :

$$k = \arg \max_i f(\hat{q}_i)^\top \cdot \hat{\mathbf{q}}^*, \quad (5)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k^* = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^M f(\hat{r}_{kj}), \quad (6)$$

$$z = \arg \max_j f(\hat{r}_{kj})^\top \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k^*, \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{f(\hat{q}_k) + f(\hat{r}_{kz})}{2}, \quad (8)$$

where k and z are the finally selected indexes of the rewrite and the response, respectively.

The RAR prompting is similar to RTR prompting but it does not need response selection since there is only one hypothetical response for each rewrite:

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{f(\hat{q}_k) + f(\hat{r}_{k1})}{2}. \quad (9)$$

2.4.3 Mean. We average all the rewrite vectors and the corresponding hypothetical response vectors.

For the REW prompting, we have:

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N f(\hat{q}_i). \quad (10)$$

For the RTR and RAR prompting methods, we have:

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N [f(\hat{q}_i) + \sum_{j=1}^M f(\hat{r}_{ij})]}{N * (1 + M)}. \quad (11)$$

Compared with *MaxProb* and *Self-Consistency*, the *Mean* aggregation comprehensively considers more diverse search intent information from more sources. It leverages the collaborative power to enhance the popular intents, but also supplements plausible intents that are missing in a single rewrite or hypothetical response.

2.4.4 Retrieval. All candidate passages are encoded using the same retriever f and we calculate the similarity score between the final search intent vector \mathbf{v} and every passage vector:

$$\mathbf{p}_i = f(p_i), p_i \in P, \quad (12)$$

$$s_i = \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{p}_i, \quad (13)$$

where P is the passage collection, p_i is the i -th candidate passage, and s_i is its retrieval score. The Top- K passages with the highest retrieval scores are finally retrieved.

Table 1: Statistics of the two CAsT datasets.

Dataset	CAsT-19	CAsT-20
# Conversations	50	25
# Turns (Sessions)	479	208
# Passages	38M	

3 EXPERIMENTS

3.1 Experimental Setup

3.1.1 Datasets and metrics. We conduct extensive experiments on two widely used conversational search datasets: CAsT-19 [4], CAsT-20 [5], which are curated by the human experts of TREC Conversational Assistance Track (CAsT). Each CAsT dataset has only dozens of information-seeking conversations including hundreds of turns, and they share the same passage collection for retrieval. CAsT-20 is more complex than CAsT-19 as its queries can refer to previous system responses. Both datasets provide the corresponding manual rewrite and the passage-level relevance judgments for each turn. Table 1 summarizes the basic statistics.

Following previous work [4, 5, 12, 22], we adopt the official Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR) and NDCG@3 as our evaluation metrics and calculate them using `pytrec_eval` tool [17]. We deem relevance scale ≥ 2 as positive for MRR on CAsT-20. We conduct the statistical significance tests using paired t-tests at $p < 0.05$ level.

3.1.2 Implementation details. We use the free code-`davinci-002` API³ of the GPT-3 [2] model family to conduct few-shot rewriting using in-context learning [2], without the training or fine-tuning the language model. We randomly select four conversations from the CAsT-22⁴ dataset as the exemplars for the demonstration of in-context learning. CAsT-22 is a new conversational search dataset also proposed by TREC CAsT, but only its conversations are released⁵ and the relevance judgments have not been made public. Therefore, it cannot be used for evaluation and we just use it for the demonstration of in-context learning. For REW and RAR⁶ prompting, we set $N = 5$. For RTR prompting, we set $N = 1$ and $M = 5$. The decoding temperature of the large language model is set to 0.7. Following many previous studies [12, 13, 15, 22], we adopt the ANCE [21] checkpoint pre-trained on the MSMARCO dataset as our ad-hoc retriever. We truncate the lengths of queries (or rewrites), passages, and hypothetical responses into 64, 256, and 512.

3.1.3 Baselines. We compare our few-shot LLMCS against the following six conversational search systems:

(1) **QuReTeC** [18]: A conversational query rewriting model employs a BERT [7] model to select important tokens from the context and concatenate them with the current query to form the rewrite. After getting its rewrites, we feed them into both BM25⁷ and the same ad-hoc ANCE retrievers for evaluation.

³<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/codex>

⁴<https://github.com/daltonj/treccastweb/tree/master/2022>

⁵Until this paper was finished: 20th, March 2023.

⁶For RAR prompting, M is naturally set to 1.

⁷The settings of BM25 are $k_1 = 0.82$ and $b = 0.68$.

Table 2: Performance comparisons on two CAsT benchmarks. † denotes that LLMCS significantly outperforms all the baselines in the $p < 0.05$ level. “RI over ANCE-Manual or 2nd-Best” means “relative improvements over ANCE-Manual or the second-best method except for ANCE-Manual”.

Retriever	System	CAsT-19		CAsT-20	
		MRR	NDCG@3	MRR	NDCG@3
BM25	QuReTeC	0.605	0.338	0.262	0.171
	T5QR	0.553	0.264	0.253	0.153
	Manual	0.617	0.309	0.378	0.241
ANCE	QuReTeC	0.709	0.443	0.430	0.287
	T5QR	0.687	0.420	0.459	0.304
	Manual	0.740	0.461	0.591	0.422
	ConvDR	0.476	0.463	0.510	0.340
	COTED	0.768	0.478	0.491	0.342
	CRDR	0.765	0.472	0.501	0.350
	LLMCS (RAR+Mean)	0.775 †	0.506 †	0.644 †	0.465 †
	RI over ANCE-Manual	+4.7%	+9.8%	+9.0%	+10.2%
	RI over 2nd-Best	+0.9%	+5.9%	+26.2%	+32.9%

Table 3: NDCG@3 comparisons among using different prompting and aggregation methods.

Aggregation	CAsT-19			CAsT-20		
	REW	RTR	RAR	REW	RTR	RAR
MaxProb	0.445	0.443	0.434	0.355	0.366	0.382
Mean	0.449	0.459	0.506	0.366	0.414	0.465
SC	0.451	0.482	0.461	0.369	0.416	0.416
Previous SOTA	0.478			0.350		
ANCE-Manual	0.461			0.422		

(2) **T5QR** [11]: A T5 [16]-based conversational query rewriter trained with the manual rewrites of the large-scale CANARD [8] dataset. We also evaluate it with both BM25 and ANCE retrievers.

(3) **ConvDR**⁸ [22]: A conversational dense retriever that directly encodes the whole search session into a search intent embedding to perform dense retrieval. It is fine-tuned from the same ad-hoc ANCE retriever by mimicking the representations of manual rewrites.

(4) **COTED** [12]: An improved version of ConvDR [22] which incorporates a curriculum-based context denoising objective.

(5) **CRDR** [15]: A conversational dense retrieval method enhanced by the distant supervision signals from query rewriting in a unified framework. Its query rewriting module is trained on the CANARD [8] dataset.

(6) **Manual**: Using the manual rewrites. We evaluate it with both BM25 and ANCE retrievers.

3.2 Main Results

Since our LLMCS has three prompting and three aggregation methods, we just report the best-performed combination, i.e., using the RAR prompting and the Mean aggregation. We investigate the effects of different prompting and aggregation methods in Section 3.3.1. Results are shown in Table 2. Notably, our few-shot

⁸We report the performance of ConvDR and COTED in the few-shot setting of 5-fold cross-validation according to their original papers.




Figure 2: Performance comparisons between incorporating CoT or not into the REW and RTR prompting methods.

prompt-based LLCS significantly outperforms all the baselines. To be specific, LLCS achieves up to 9.8% and 10.2% relative gains over using the manual rewrites on CAsT-19 and CAsT-20, respectively. On the more complex CAsT-20 dataset, the relative improvements of NDCG@3 over the second-best baseline, except for Manual, reach up to 32.9%. Such a huge improvement has never been observed in existing work, which demonstrates the strong superiority of LLCS over existing methods and highlights the great potential of large language models for conversational search.

3.3 Ablation Study

3.3.1 Investigation of different prompting and aggregation methods. We show the NDCG@3 performance comparisons among using different prompting and aggregation methods in Table 3. We find that: (1) The RAR and RTR prompting methods clearly outperform the REW prompting, demonstrating that the generated hypothetical responses can effectively supplement the short query rewrite to improve retrieval performance. However, even the simple REW prompting method can also achieve quite competitive performance compared with existing baselines, especially on the more difficult CAsT-20 dataset. (2) For the aggregation methods, Mean and SC consistently outperform MaxProb. In particular, the combination of Mean aggregation and RAR prompting, which takes into account the largest number of generated results (i.e., $N * (1 + M)$, where $N = 5$ and $M = 1$ in our experiments), finally achieves the best performance on both two datasets. These results suggest that relying solely on the language model’s top prediction may not be reliable enough and that using the collaborative power from multiple results is a better choice in practice.

3.3.2 Effects of chain-of-thought. The results of the REW prompting can be significantly improved by incorporating chain-of-thought, as illustrated in Figure 2. This demonstrates the efficacy of our designed chain-of-thought in guiding the language model towards a correct understanding of the user’s contextual search intent. However, when introducing multiple hypothetical responses, the improvement brought by chain-of-thought becomes marginal. This may be because including multiple hypothetical responses largely enhances the robustness and performance of the final search intent vector at the same time, making the robustness brought by chain-of-thought to query rewriting less prominent or important.

4 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a prompting framework called LLCS that leverages large language models to perform few-shot conversational query rewriting for conversational search. Experimental results on the two CAsT datasets demonstrate the superiority of

LLCS over existing baselines and even manual rewrites. Our study highlights the vast potential of large language models in conversational search and takes an important initial step in advancing this promising direction.

In the future, we will continue to refine our work from the following aspects: (1) Evaluate the framework on more conversational search or conversational question answering datasets, such as CAsT-21 [6] and QReCC [1], to further test its generalizability. (2) Conduct human evaluations to comprehensively assess the quality and limitations of the query rewrites generated by LLCS, which may inspire us to develop better prompting methods for conversational search. (3) Investigate the effects of different model settings, such as the number of exemplars and generations. (4) Design zero-shot promptings for text-davinci-003⁹ and ChatGPT¹⁰, and evaluate their performance. (5) Explore leveraging the generated information from large language models to augment the training of conversational dense retrievers.

REFERENCES

- [1] Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. Open-Domain Question Answering Goes Conversational via Question Rewriting. In *NAACL-HLT*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 520–534.
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [3] J Shane Culpepper, Fernando Diaz, and Mark D Smucker. 2018. Research frontiers in information retrieval: Report from the third strategic workshop on information retrieval in lorne (swirl 2018). In *ACM SIGIR Forum*, Vol. 52. ACM New York, NY, USA, 34–90.
- [4] Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2020. TREC CAsT 2019: The conversational assistance track overview. In *In Proceedings of TREC*.
- [5] Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2021. CAsT 2020: The Conversational Assistance Track Overview.. In *In Proceedings of TREC*.
- [6] Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2022. TREC CAsT 2021: The conversational assistance track overview. In *In Proceedings of TREC*.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4171–4186.
- [8] Ahmed Elgohary, Denis Peskov, and Jordan L. Boyd-Graber. 2019. Can You Unpack That? Learning to Rewrite Questions-in-Context. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 5917–5923.
- [9] Luyu Gao, Xueguang Ma, Jimmy Lin, and Jamie Callan. 2022. Precise Zero-Shot Dense Retrieval without Relevance Labels. *CoRR* abs/2212.10496 (2022).
- [10] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel J. Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yükekönül, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. 2022. Holistic Evaluation of Language Models. *CoRR* abs/2211.09110 (2022).
- [11] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Rodrigo Nogueira, Ming-Feng Tsai, Chuan-Ju Wang, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Conversational question reformulation via sequence-to-sequence architectures and pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01909* (2020).
- [12] Kelong Mao, Zhicheng Dou, and Hongjin Qian. 2022. Curriculum Contrastive Context Denoising for Few-shot Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*.

⁹<https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-3-5>

¹⁰<https://chat.openai.com/>

- [13] Kelong Mao, Zhicheng Dou, Hongjin Qian, Fengran Mo, Xiaohua Cheng, and Zhao Cao. 2022. ConvTrans: Transforming Web Search Sessions for Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- [14] Yuning Mao, Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Yelong Shen, Jianfeng Gao, Jiawei Han, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Generation-Augmented Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *ACL/IJCNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4089–4100.
- [15] Hongjin Qian and Zhicheng Dou. 2022. Explicit Query Rewriting for Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- [16] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 140:1–140:67.
- [17] Christophe Van Gysel and Maarten de Rijke. 2018. Pytrec_eval: An Extremely Fast Python Interface to trec_eval. In *SIGIR*. ACM.
- [18] Nikos Voskarides, Dan Li, Pengjie Ren, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Maarten de Rijke. 2020. Query resolution for conversational search with limited supervision. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*. 921–930.
- [19] Xuezi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *11th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023*.
- [20] Jason Wei, Xuezi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2020. Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* (2020).
- [21] Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul N. Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. 2021. Approximate Nearest Neighbor Negative Contrastive Learning for Dense Text Retrieval. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*.
- [22] Shi Yu, Zhenghao Liu, Chenyan Xiong, Tao Feng, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2021. Few-Shot Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*.
- [23] Wenhao Yu, Dan Iter, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Mingxuan Ju, Soumya Sanyal, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Generate rather than Retrieve: Large Language Models are Strong Context Generators. In *11th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023*.
- [9] Luyu Gao, Xueguang Ma, Jimmy Lin, and Jamie Callan. 2022. Precise Zero-Shot Dense Retrieval without Relevance Labels. *CoRR abs/2212.10496* (2022).
- [10] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D. Manning, Christopher Ré, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel J. Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekgonul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. 2022. Holistic Evaluation of Language Models. *CoRR abs/2211.09110* (2022).
- [11] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Rodrigo Nogueira, Ming-Feng Tsai, Chuang-Ju Wang, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Conversational question reformulation via sequence-to-sequence architectures and pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.01909* (2020).
- [12] Kelong Mao, Zhicheng Dou, and Hongjin Qian. 2022. Curriculum Contrastive Context Denoising for Few-shot Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*.
- [13] Kelong Mao, Zhicheng Dou, Hongjin Qian, Fengran Mo, Xiaohua Cheng, and Zhao Cao. 2022. ConvTrans: Transforming Web Search Sessions for Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- [14] Yuning Mao, Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Yelong Shen, Jianfeng Gao, Jiawei Han, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Generation-Augmented Retrieval for Open-Domain Question Answering. In *ACL/IJCNLP (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4089–4100.
- [15] Hongjin Qian and Zhicheng Dou. 2022. Explicit Query Rewriting for Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- [16] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 140:1–140:67.
- [17] Christophe Van Gysel and Maarten de Rijke. 2018. Pytrec_eval: An Extremely Fast Python Interface to trec_eval. In *SIGIR*. ACM.
- [18] Nikos Voskarides, Dan Li, Pengjie Ren, Evangelos Kanoulas, and Maarten de Rijke. 2020. Query resolution for conversational search with limited supervision. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*. 921–930.
- [19] Xuezi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *11th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023*.
- [20] Jason Wei, Xuezi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Ed H. Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2020. Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. *Advances in neural information processing systems* (2020).
- [21] Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul N. Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. 2021. Approximate Nearest Neighbor Negative Contrastive Learning for Dense Text Retrieval. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*.
- [22] Shi Yu, Zhenghao Liu, Chenyan Xiong, Tao Feng, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2021. Few-Shot Conversational Dense Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*.
- [23] Wenhao Yu, Dan Iter, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Mingxuan Ju, Soumya Sanyal, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Generate rather than Retrieve: Large Language Models are Strong Context Generators. In *11th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023*.

REFERENCES

- [1] Raviteja Anantha, Svitlana Vakulenko, Zhucheng Tu, Shayne Longpre, Stephen Pulman, and Srinivas Chappidi. 2021. Open-Domain Question Answering Goes Conversational via Question Rewriting. In *NAACL-HLT*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 520–534.
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [3] J Shane Culpepper, Fernando Diaz, and Mark D Smucker. 2018. Research frontiers in information retrieval: Report from the third strategic workshop on information retrieval in lorne (swirl 2018). In *ACM SIGIR Forum*, Vol. 52. ACM New York, NY, USA, 34–90.
- [4] Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2020. TREC CAsT 2019: The conversational assistance track overview. In *In Proceedings of TREC*.
- [5] Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2021. CAsT 2020: The Conversational Assistance Track Overview. In *In Proceedings of TREC*.
- [6] Jeffrey Dalton, Chenyan Xiong, and Jamie Callan. 2022. TREC CAsT 2021: The conversational assistance track overview. In *In Proceedings of TREC*.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL-HLT (1)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 4171–4186.
- [8] Ahmed Elgohary, Denis Peskov, and Jordan L. Boyd-Graber. 2019. Can You Unpack That? Learning to Rewrite Questions-in-Context. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019, Hong Kong, China, November 3-7, 2019*, Kentaro Inui, Jing Jiang, Vincent Ng, and Xiaojun Wan (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, 5917–5923.