

# UnWeaving the knots of GraphRAG – turns out VectorRAG is almost enough

Ryszard Tuora<sup>\*†</sup>, Mateusz Galiński<sup>\*†</sup>,  
Michał T. Godziszewski<sup>†</sup>, Michał Karpowicz<sup>†</sup>, Mateusz Czyżnikiewicz<sup>†</sup>,  
Adam Kozakiewicz<sup>†</sup>, Tomasz Ziętkiewicz<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Samsung AI Warsaw

<sup>\*</sup> Co-first authors

Correspondence: m.galinski@samsung.com, r.tuora@samsung.com

June 8, 2026

## Abstract

One of the key problems in Retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) systems is that chunk-based retrieval pipelines represent the source chunks as atomic objects, mixing the information contained within such a chunk into a single vector. These vector representations are then fundamentally treated as isolated, independent and self-sufficient, with no attempt to represent possible relations between them. Such an approach has no dedicated mechanisms for handling multi-hop questions.

Graph-based RAG systems aimed to ameliorate this problem by modeling information as knowledge-graphs, with entities represented by nodes being connected by robust relations, and forming hierarchical communities. This approach however suffers from its own issues with some of them being: orders of magnitude increased computational complexity in order to create graph-based indices, and reliance on heuristics for performing retrieval.

We propose UnWeaver, a novel RAG framework simplifying the idea of GraphRAG. UnWeaver disentangles the contents of the documents into entities which can occur across multiple chunks using an LLM. In the retrieval process entities are used as an intermediate way of recovering original text chunks hence preserving fidelity to the source material. We argue that entity-based decomposition yields a more distilled representation of original information, and additionally serves to reduce noise in the indexing, and generation process.

Furthermore we experimentally show that on end to end QA evaluation VectorRAG performs better than standard GraphRAG and almost as good as current SOTA graph-based solutions, for a fraction of the cost. <sup>1</sup>

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we propose **UnWeaver**, a novel RAG framework that achieves better than graph-like retrieval precision with-

out explicitly building a graph. The core idea is to provide to an LLM a query-relevant context based on vector similarity of an incoming query to the embeddings formed from the concatenated descriptions of equivalent entities (or, ideas) extracted from each document chunk. Based on that similarity of the query and the distilled entity-related content, distributed over all text chunks, query-relevant chunks are easily identified with a simple index (linear mapping). Then, the retriever produces relevant context from those chunks for LLM to perform well-grounded reasoning and accurate question answering.

The core novelty here is the concatenation of chunk-based (local) descriptions of equivalent entities extracted from each chunk separately. When transformed into embeddings, these aggregated entity descriptions filter out what is irrelevant while amplifying pertinent information in relevant chunks. The results of experimental studies support that claim by showing how facts and evidence in the produced context guide LLM towards good answers and support simple reasoning.

**Related work: VectorRAG vs GraphRAG** Large language models (LLMs) augmented with retrieval have become a cornerstone for knowledge-intensive tasks, from question answering to fact-checking. In a Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) framework, LLM is supplied with relevant external documents (or document fragments) as context, which helps ground its output in factual information. This approach has been shown to significantly reduce open-domain hallucinations by allowing the model to draw on up-to-date or domain-specific knowledge instead of relying solely on parametric memory [18]. The original RAG system by Lewis et al. [16] demonstrated improved accuracy on knowledge-intensive NLP tasks by retrieving supporting passages.

The effectiveness of a RAG-based system hinges on the quality of retrieval. Irrelevant or poorly chosen context can inject false or unrelated facts, increasing probability of factual errors or flawed reasoning in responses generated by LLM.

One of key limitations of standard RAG pipelines is their reliance on coarse-grained text chunks. Documents are typi-

<sup>1</sup>Code is available at [Github](#)

cally broken into fixed-length chunks that form the units of retrieval. While this helps the retrieved (hopefully) query-related context fit within LLM input limits, in practice these retrieved parts of available text may still contain superfluous or unrelated information. Consequently, RAG may amplify factual inaccuracies and hallucinations in generated responses, contrary to expectations [3]. Without external verification, LLMs generating response based on such a noisy context may follow off-topic details and incorporate them into their answers. Indeed, recent analyses confirm that filtering context yields noticeably more correct and concise answers [10].<sup>2</sup>

A promising way to address that problem is to incorporate structured knowledge graph (KG) into the RAG pipeline (see the survey [9]). The motivation for graph-based RAG (GraphRAG for short) is that a knowledge graph can represent information at a finer granularity. Knowledge graph essentially *unweaves* the source text into a graph of connected entities (e.g., people, places, concepts), with labeled edges representing discovered relationships (their strength, nature or description). Such graph-structured data can make it easier to reason over relevant facts without interference from unrelated context. In principle, the structured nature of a KG promises deeper and more contextual retrieval than flat text similarity search.

Despite their well-known advantages, GraphRAG solutions come with significant practical challenges. Constructing and maintaining a graph index of a large text corpus is a non-trivial endeavor. Unlike vector index in VectorRAG systems built directly on text embeddings, a graph index requires multiple complex steps. These include, e.g., running named entity recognition, extracting relational triples or entity links, and possibly performing clustering or ontology alignment to organize the graph. This added componential complexity means high development and computation costs. For instance, the MSGraphRAG pipeline [4] involves building an entire knowledge graph from the corpus, then performing hierarchical community detection on the graph and generating summaries for each cluster—an elaborate process with many moving parts.

Furthermore, graph retrieval itself is less straightforward than vector similarity search. One cannot simply embed a query and do  $k$ -NN search over nodes. Instead, tailored algorithms or heuristics are needed to traverse or query the graph structure. Prior work has explored techniques like translating natural language questions into structured graph queries (in SPARQL or Cypher), performing multi-hop subgraph searches. But these often require dedicated graph database and careful hand-tuning of query logic. As a result, GraphRAG typically demands orders of magnitude more engineering effort and can suffer from scalability issues when dealing with millions of nodes or edges.

All that raises an intriguing question. Is it possible to obtain the benefits of graph-based retrieval—improved relevance

and reduced noise—without the heavy machinery of full-scale knowledge graphs?

**Contributions** The approach we propose in this paper leverages entity-centric retrieval inspired by knowledge graphs, yet it maintains the simplicity and speed of a standard vector-based pipelines (operating on refined text embeddings). That suggests there is really no need for complex and costly graph traversal or maintaining separate graph databases when documents contain separable ideas that can be named and described without much ambiguity.

Our experimental results show that UnWeaver yields higher answer accuracy and faithfulness compared to conventional chunk retrieval baselines, demonstrating a clear reduction in hallucinated or off-target details. Moreover, this is achieved with negligible additional latency, since the entity-indexing step is done offline and query-time retrieval remains a fast embedding lookup.

UnWeaver remains firmly rooted in a standard vector-RAG framework, but enriches each indexed chunk with distilled semantic signals instead of building an explicit graph. Each stored vector therefore implicitly carries a lightweight summary of its content (e.g., key entities). At query time, these enriched embeddings bias the search toward passages that share the same salient entities, effectively filtering out irrelevant context. As a result, UnWeaver’s retrieved context is far more coherent: it can mitigate data noise and reinforce logical coherence in its results, all while requiring no graph operations and preserving the efficiency of standard ANN search. In short, UnWeaver attains the benefits of GraphRAG-style structured retrieval (reduced noise, higher precision, etc.) within a pipeline that is close to pure vector-RAG.

Conceptually, UnWeaver redefines the vector index as an intelligent knowledge store, rather than a flat list of embeddings. Each stored vector is augmented with multi-level signals: alongside the raw text embedding we include a concise abstraction of the chunk’s key entities (a kind of mini-graph summary). This hybrid encoding lets the retriever match on deeper features: nearest neighbors are found not just by lexical similarity, but by shared conceptual relations – effectively capturing the intra- and inter-document connectivity that arises from explicit entity-relation structure. Crucially, these semantic gains come at no cost in scalability: the same ANN infrastructure is used, with only a lightweight preprocessing step to extract entity/relation features. In summary, UnWeaver can be thought of as not merely a compromise between GraphRAG and VectorRAG, but a principled extension of the VectorRAG paradigm that amplifies salient knowledge signals within a simple vector-retrieval framework. Furthermore, the addition of entity-based index to VectorRAG framework allows for better explainability of results since entities/ideas are inherently more explainable than raw passages of text that are returned indiscriminately by typical VectorRAG.

So, we make the following contributions in this paper.

**UnWeaver Framework:** We introduce UnWeaver, a novel RAG architecture that eradicates non-essential information from candidate retrieval chunks and focuses on salient, query-

<sup>2</sup>In fact, as demonstrated by Karpowicz [14], since there is no way to eliminate LLM hallucinations, we can only manage the related tradeoffs. Designing RAG systems is one of the most reasonable ways to do that, provided we have a good way of retrieving relevant knowledge (in a way aligned with our preferences).




Figure 1: Architecture of UnWeaver. Model operations, shown in red, rely on an LLM, whereas operations in orange are purely algorithmic.

relevant content. To our knowledge, this is one of the first frameworks to successfully combine entity-centric indexing with traditional vector retrieval for RAG. This architecture can be seen on Figure 1.

**Entity-Based Indexing Pipeline:** We develop an effective pipeline for building an entity-based index from unstructured text. This pipeline captures the core factual elements of documents (akin to a knowledge graph) without requiring full graph construction, thereby combining the precision and explainability of graph-based retrieval with the simplicity of standard dense retrieval.

**Improved Retrieval Fidelity:** Through comprehensive experiments on knowledge-intensive QA benchmarks, we demonstrate that UnWeaver significantly reduces retrieval noise and improves answer fidelity compared to standard GraphRAG approaches, both on single-hop and multi-hop questions. It outperforms baseline chunk retrieval methods in grounding LLM outputs to the correct sources, which in turn mitigates hallucinations and increases factual accuracy of the generated responses.

**Practical Insights for RAG:** We analyze the trade-offs between graph-augmented and purely text-based RAG, and discuss why UnWeaver’s strategy can achieve the best of both worlds. Our findings suggest that many benefits of GraphRAG can be attained with far less complexity. This has important implications for designing the next generation of efficient and

trustworthy RAG systems, indicating that graphs are not what you need if your goal is high-quality retrieval augmentation without undue overhead.

## 2 Mathematics of UnWeaver

We begin with an informal description of the algorithm. The unstructured data are passed into a (possibly multimodal) generative language model after segmentation into chunks. The language model produces a structured output listing entities mentioned within the chunk along with their descriptions. An LLM outputs across the entire document base are then aggregated, to recognize recurring entities, while retaining links to their original sources (chunks). Each entity is assigned a vector by the embedder, based on the textual representation of its features, and these are inserted into the vector store. During retrieval, the query is compared to the entity vector store, to recover the most relevant entities. The links to original document sources are then recovered and aggregated (e.g. by means of voting), to produce the most relevant document chunks. The retrieved document chunks are passed into the generator LLM, to provide the final answer.

**Formalized Characterization** Assume we are given a text  $T$  (or a set of texts, documents, etc.) that will serve as the

data for our RAG task. Let  $C_T = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$  be the list of chunks that the aforementioned text  $T$  is divided into by some tokenizer – i.e.,  $C_T$  is simply the segmented version of our text  $T$ . That is the first (trivial) step of our framework.

In the second step, an LLM generates names of entities together with their descriptions, from the chunks, the result of which is  $n$  lists  $L_1, \dots, L_n$  of pairs in the following form – for each  $i \leq n$ :  $L_i = (e_1, \dots, e_{k_i})$ , where for each  $j \leq k_i$  the entity  $e_j$  has the form  $e_j = (n_j^i, d_j^i)$ , where  $n_j^i$  is a name of the entity, and  $d_j^i$  is the description of the entity, generated by the LLM from the chunk  $c_i$  (and, possibly, its internal parameters). We then glue the entities into equivalence classes of the relation of syntactic equivalence. In other words, we identify the entities  $e_a = (n_a, d_a)$  and  $e_b = (n_b, d_b)$ , if the corresponding names  $n_a$  and  $n_b$  are syntactically equivalent.

Next, given an entity  $e_a$ , and its equivalence class  $[e_a]_{\approx_{name}} = \{e_{a_1}, \dots, e_{a_k}\}$ ,<sup>3</sup> we define its representative  $\tilde{e}_a$  as the following pair:  $\tilde{e}_a := (n_a, \tilde{d}_a)$ , where  $\tilde{d}_a = d_{a_1} \frown d_{a_2} \frown \dots \frown d_{a_k}$  is the concatenation of the descriptions of the entity  $e_a$  (possibly from different chunks)<sup>4</sup>.

We can describe the details of the procedure, by which the choice of the representatives is being done, using the language of matrix equations. This way, we get a more fine-grained characterization of the mathematical mechanics of the algorithm.

We embed these elements of the quotient-list of entities  $\tilde{E} = \{\tilde{e}_1^1, \dots, \tilde{e}_{k_1}^1, \tilde{e}_1^2, \dots, \tilde{e}_{k_2}^2, \dots, \tilde{e}_1^n, \dots, \tilde{e}_{k_n}^n\}$ , into some  $l$ -dimensional vector space, using a specified embedder  $\mathcal{E}$ . For simplicity, let’s use  $m$  as the number of elements of the list  $\tilde{E}$ . This way, we obtain an  $m$ -element list of  $l$ -dimensional vectors  $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{E}) = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$ , where for each  $i \leq m$  we have  $v_i = \mathcal{E}(e_i)$ .

Additionally, we define an  $m \times n$ -dimensional binary matrix  $M_C = [t_{ij}]_{1 \leq i \leq m; 1 \leq j \leq n}$ , where each row corresponds to an entity  $\tilde{e}_i$ , and each column corresponds to a chunk  $c_j$ , and  $[t_{ij}] = 1$  iff the name  $n_i$  has been generated from the chunk  $c_j$ , that is:  $t_{ij} = 1$  if  $n_i$  appears in  $c_j$ , and 0 otherwise. Obviously, there can be more than one 1s in  $i$ -the verse of the matrix, if the name  $n_i$  occurs in more than one chunk.

Now, we perform the crucial step of the UnWeaver: given a query  $q$ , using a chosen similarity function  $\sigma$ , for each vector  $v_i$ ,  $i \leq m$ , we compute the similarity  $\sigma(v_i, \mathcal{E}(q))$  between the vector  $\mathcal{E}(e_i)$ , and the embedding of the query  $q$ . Now, given some  $k_0$ , we compute the  $k_0$  vectors  $v_i$  with the highest similarity scores  $\sigma(v_i, \mathcal{E}(q))$ , and we put  $q_i := 1$  if  $v_i$  is among the top- $k_0$  ones, otherwise we put  $q_i := 0$ , and we refer to the binary vector consisting of entries  $q_i$  as  $M_q$ . Then we multiply each  $i$ -th row of  $M_C$  by the  $i$ -th entry of  $M_q$ <sup>5</sup>, effectively filtering out the rows  $i$  of the matrix  $M_C$  which correspond to entities that are not semantically similar enough to the embed-

ding of the query, that is we consider the intermediate filtering matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} q_1 t_{11} & q_1 t_{12} & \dots & q_1 t_{1n} \\ q_2 t_{21} & q_2 t_{22} & \dots & q_2 t_{2n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ q_m t_{m1} & q_m t_{m2} & \dots & q_m t_{mn} \end{bmatrix},$$

and we delete the rows  $i$  for which  $q_i = 0$ , so that we obtain the modified matrix  $M'_C$ , which is a final filtered version of the binary matrix  $M_C$  with the same number of columns  $n$ , yet possibly a (much) smaller number of non-zero rows  $m'$ :

$$M'_C = \begin{bmatrix} q_{1'} t_{1'1} & q_{1'} t_{1'2} & \dots & q_{1'} t_{1'n} \\ q_{2'} t_{2'1} & q_{2'} t_{2'2} & \dots & q_{2'} t_{2'n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ q_{m'} t_{m'1} & q_{m'} t_{m'2} & \dots & q_{m'} t_{m'n} \end{bmatrix} \\ = \begin{bmatrix} t_{1'1} & t_{1'2} & \dots & t_{1'n} \\ t_{2'1} & t_{2'2} & \dots & t_{2'n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ t_{m'1} & t_{m'2} & \dots & t_{m'n} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the last equality holds, since all the  $q_i$ 's are equal to 1. Finally, after depriving the non-sufficiently similar entities of their voting rights, we perform a multi-winner approval election, where the set of remaining (non-filtered) entities (i.e., the entities  $\tilde{e}_i$ , for which  $q_i = 1$ ) are the set of voters, and the set of chunks  $\{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  is the set of candidates. Each row of the matrix  $M'_C$  corresponds to an approval ballot of the voter  $i$ , i.e., we postulate the the voter  $i$  approves of the chunk  $j$  iff  $t_{ij} = 1$ . We compute the election, according to some chosen committee approval-based election rule<sup>6</sup>, assuming we need to choose a set of  $r$  chunks for some fixed  $r < n$ . The query response is then based only on the selected  $r$  chunks.

**Benefits** Observe that the solution is by far not ad-hoc. Already on the conceptual level, there are many benefits of entity-based representation:

- The conceptual model of entities is a ubiquitous element of human cognitive architecture, which supports the idea that this method of representing knowledge is efficient. Additionally, its naturality makes the functioning of the system more explainable and user-friendly.
- The same entity can occur in multiple chunks, which allows to integrate information, facilitating multi-hop question answering. These chunks can represent different spatiotemporal states, different contexts, or possibly different states-of-knowledge, allowing for modeling dynamics. Additionally, thanks to the discriminatory nature of UnWeaver, we easily get rid of superfluous or unrelated information contained in noisy coarse-grained chunks.
- Entities are naturally represented as belonging to a hierarchy of types (ontology). This allows for handling queries which require aggregation, i.e. exhaustive search over a selected domain of objects.
- The lack of limits of the number of entities extracted per chunk makes it possible to disentangle an arbitrary number of topics from a chunk therefore solving the inherent problem of mixing topics in naive vector representation of chunks.

<sup>3</sup>Without loss of generality, we may assume that the numbering  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  is an increasing subsequence of the ordering  $1, \dots, n$ , i.e., that it is in accordance with the numbering of the chunks.

<sup>4</sup>The descriptions might be shortened by an LLM if the surpass some length threshold. This is important from the point of view of scalability.

<sup>5</sup>In other words, we pick the  $i$ -th row of  $M_q$ , which happens to be a vector of length 1, so without loss of generality we use the only scalar that is in this row.

Table 1: QA performance of RAG methods

dataset	Method	FC		LLM Tokens				Embedder Tokens	
		$\mu \uparrow$	$\sigma^2$	prompt		completion		index $\downarrow$	query
				index $\downarrow$	query $\downarrow$	index $\downarrow$	query $\downarrow$		
COVID-QA (1234 questions)	<b>UnWeaver</b>	<b>0.3823</b>	$1.32e^{-5}$	1466k	994k	4043k	<b>230k</b>	2224k	17k
	<b>UnWeaverPPR</b>	0.3701	$4.37e^{-6}$	1466k	1173k	4043k	285k	2224k	17k
	VectorRAG	0.3790	$6.02e^{-6}$	-	<b>922k</b>	-	359k	<b>476k</b>	17k
	RAPTOR	0.3643	$8.04e^{-6}$	<b>770k</b>	2649k	<b>389k</b>	305k	730k	17k
	GraphRAG	0.3092	$3.66e^{-6}$	25882k	7051k	14239k	282k	20455k	17k
	HippoRAG2	0.3735	$6.06e^{-6}$	7520k	5260k	7658k	646k	2076k	17k
	ClosedBook	0.2135	$1.50e^{-6}$	-	153k	-	283k	-	17k
Oracle	0.4765	$3.77e^{-6}$	-	765k	-	258k	-	17k	
eManual (522 questions)	<b>UnWeaver</b>	<b>0.4811</b>	$2.47e^{-5}$	98k	940k	198k	96k	105k	5.7k
	<b>UnWeaverPPR</b>	0.4514	$1.39e^{-5}$	98k	1072k	198k	106k	105k	5.7k
	VectorRAG	0.4793	$2.16e^{-5}$	-	<b>343k</b>	-	<b>83k</b>	<b>36k</b>	5.7k
	RAPTOR	0.4466	$2.17e^{-5}$	<b>57k</b>	1177k	<b>30k</b>	115k	60k	5.7k
	GraphRAG	0.3424	$5.87e^{-6}$	1428k	3266k	687k	112k	1063k	5.7k
	HippoRAG2	0.4680	$1.43e^{-5}$	468k	2500k	356k	278k	104k	5.7k
	ClosedBook	0.1793	$5.01e^{-6}$	-	64k	-	105k	-	5.7k
Oracle	0.5318	$2.30e^{-6}$	-	345k	-	90k	-	5.7k	
Tech-QA (596 questions)	<b>UnWeaver</b>	0.3135	$7.54e^{-6}$	<b>3747k</b>	2384k	<b>4446k</b>	<b>158k</b>	2411k	55k
	<b>UnWeaverPPR</b>	0.3123	$2.53e^{-6}$	<b>3747k</b>	<b>2140k</b>	<b>4446k</b>	194k	2411k	55k
	VectorRAG	0.3218	$7.86e^{-6}$	-	2354k	-	161k	3026k	55k
	RAPTOR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GraphRAG	0.2847	$4.19e^{-6}$	49270k	5944k	35704k	163k	54016k	55k
	HippoRAG2	<b>0.3448</b>	$1.34e^{-5}$	7814k	5690k	6258k	564k	<b>4448k</b>	55k
	ClosedBook	0.2052	$4.20e^{-6}$	-	118k	-	218k	-	55k
Oracle	0.3367	$1.66e^{-6}$	-	2996k	-	195k	-	55k	
MuSiQue (2417 questions)	<b>UnWeaver</b>	0.2028	$4.60e^{-6}$	<b>985k</b>	1861k	2678k	<b>882k</b>	1327k	54k
	<b>UnWeaverPPR</b>	0.1946	$3.88e^{-6}$	<b>985k</b>	2320k	2678k	986k	1327k	54k
	VectorRAG	0.2007	$1.47e^{-6}$	-	<b>1851k</b>	-	883k	<b>285k</b>	54k
	RAPTOR	0.1858	$1.29e^{-6}$	440k	6024k	<b>915k</b>	1150k	450k	54k
	GraphRAG	0.1353	$7.65e^{-6}$	41002k	18943k	27046k	1137k	10330k	54k
	HippoRAG2	<b>0.2196</b>	$1.01e^{-6}$	2616k	10431k	2723k	1778k	1070k	54k
	ClosedBook	0.1476	$9.82e^{-6}$	-	321k	-	1641k	-	54k
Oracle	0.2176	$2.02e^{-6}$	-	1097k	-	664k	-	54k	

### 3 Experimental Results

We evaluate the quality of RAG systems on downstream QA task with a selection of three datasets included in the distantly supervised RAGBench suite [6]. Our choice of datasets consist of COVID-QA, eManual and Tech-QA in order to cover different, single-hop, QA scenarios. To that we add MuSiQue [19] in order to cover multi-hop questions.

To identify the pitfalls and / or inefficiencies of graph-based RAG systems we compare our method against Microsoft’s GraphRAG [9], HippoRAG2 [8] as well as RAPTOR [17].

GraphRAG was the system that sparked the domain of graph-based RAG systems, it performs a multi step indexing procedure that first extracts entities and relations and then builds a hierarchical communities using those entities. During retrieval it relies on heuristics to select communities, relations and entities in order to perform QA.

HippoRAG [7] as well as its successor HippoRAG2 are often on the forefront of the RAG systems SOTA. The successor constructs graph similar to how UnWeaver does it, with the

difference that it creates entity-entity edges, which UnWeaver forgoes. At retrieval time it searches the created graph using Personalized PageRank using the top-k most similar entities to the query as the seed as well as variety of other heuristics.

Recently RAPTOR emerged and has been one of the dominant systems in graph-based RAGs in terms of its performance. It builds its index by recursively clustering summaries of chunks, it then makes use of that tree to perform QA.

The last system we compare against as baseline is VectorRAG [16] that created the domain of RAG systems in the first place.

All the methods are indexed and queried with GPT-OSS-120B LLM and embedded with Qwen3-Embedding-4B. To evaluate the quality of QA we employ calculation of Factual Correctness (F1) from RAGAS [5], with the judge also being GPT-OSS-120B. FC F1 is calculated from FC recall and FC precision which in turn are calculated by performing claim decomposition, via LLM, on both the ground truth answer as well as the system’s answer. To account for inherent stochasticity of LLMs we perform 5 evaluation runs in order to get mean and variance of the mean FC for each method. To eliminate the effect of

<sup>6</sup>This could be e.g., Approval, Proportional Approval, or Chamberlin-Courant.

response formatting on FC score we fix the query prompt across all the methods to be the same. Finally we report the results of closed book as well as oracle querying in order to show the theoretical minimum and maximum achievable in this metric. The results are listed in Table 1.

In order to decouple the knowledge representation part from the retrieval part of UnWeaver, we’ve tested a modification of UnWeaver that utilizes Personalised PageRank at retrieval time instead of using weighted voting via identified entities.

Across all datasets the top 3 ranking of methods always involve HippoRAG2, VectorRAG and UnWeaver, with variance in individual placements in that ranking. On the other end of the spectrum is GraphRAG which always occupies the last spot. On COVID-QA and eManual UnWeaver is the best system, while on Tech-QA<sup>7</sup> and MuSiQue it’s HippoRAG2.

The surprising fact is that VectorRAG is the main competitor across these datasets, with other Graph-based approaches lagging behind in terms of Factual Correctness. This can be partially explained by the architectural similarity of VectorRAG to the procedure for generating the original datasets.

On Tech-QA and MuSiQue we can observe that not relying on source material, like VectorRAG, UnWeaver or Oracle do, and instead using transformed output, like HippoRAG2, GraphRAG and RAPTOR do, can yield good results in terms of QA. However on COVID-QA and eManual we can observe the exact opposite, showcasing the vulnerability of evaluation of RAG systems based on the type of dataset used. Although relying on too heavily transformed output, which GraphRAG is infamous for, might have devastating consequences as it can be seen by its FC being lower than that of pure LLM without context provided to it, so the ClosedBook one.

The quality of answers should be also evaluated in tandem with Token Usage to estimate the cost and latency of indexing and querying the data. With the exception for eManual, UnWeaver uses nearly the same amount of tokens in the query phase as VectorRAG, which is the most efficient system, thereby providing the lowest query latency. Furthermore the main graph-based competitor of UnWeaver, HippoRAG2, uses anywhere from  $\sim 1.5\times$  to  $\sim 2.75\times$  as many tokens during indexing. This makes UnWeaver cheaper to deploy in production setting since it manages to achieve reduction both in prompt as well as completion tokens<sup>8</sup> compared to HippoRAG2.

## References

- [1] Adi Ben-Israel and Thomas NE Greville. *Generalized inverses: theory and applications*. Springer, 2003.

<sup>7</sup>On Tech-QA dataset, we were unable to produce results using RAPTOR despite numerous attempts. The problem was numerical instability in calculation of Gaussian Mixture Models that are the backbone of RAPTOR’s clustering procedure.

<sup>8</sup>With the exception for MuSiQue where both UnWeaver and HippoRAG2 consumed around the same amount of completion tokens.

- [2] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Introduction to applied linear algebra: vectors, matrices, and least squares*. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [3] Zuzanna Dubanowska, Maciej Żelazczyk, Michał Brzozowski, Paolo Mandica, and Michał P. Karpowicz. Representation-based broad hallucination detectors fail to generalize out of distribution. In *EMNLP 2025. ACL, August 2025*.
- [4] Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, Dasha Metropolitan, Robert Osazuwa Ness, and Jonathan Larson. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization, 2025.
- [5] Shahul Es, Jithin James, Luis Espinosa-Anke, and Steven Schockaert. Ragas: Automated evaluation of retrieval augmented generation, 2025.
- [6] Robert Friel, Masha Belyi, and Atindriyo Sanyal. Rag-bench: Explainable benchmark for retrieval-augmented generation systems, 2025.
- [7] Bernal Jiménez Gutiérrez, Yiheng Shu, Yu Gu, Michihiro Yasunaga, and Yu Su. Hipporag: Neurobiologically inspired long-term memory for large language models, 2025.
- [8] Bernal Jiménez Gutiérrez, Yiheng Shu, Weijian Qi, Sizhe Zhou, and Yu Su. From rag to memory: Non-parametric continual learning for large language models, 2025.
- [9] Haoyu Han, Yu Wang, Harry Shomer, Kai Guo, Jiayuan Ding, Yongjia Lei, Mahantesh Halappanavar, Ryan A. Rossi, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Xianfeng Tang, Qi He, Zhigang Hua, Bo Long, Tong Zhao, Neil Shah, Amin Javari, Yinglong Xia, and Jiliang Tang. Retrieval-augmented generation with graphs (graphrag), 2025.
- [10] Hailey Joren, Jianyi Zhang, Chun-Sung Ferng, Da-Cheng Juan, Ankur Taly, and Cyrus Rashtchian. Sufficient context: A new lens on retrieval augmented generation systems, 2025.
- [11] Michał P. Karpowicz. Nash equilibrium design and price-based coordination in hierarchical systems. *Int. J. Appl. Math. Comput. Sci.*, 22(4):951–969, 2012.
- [12] Michał P. Karpowicz. On the Design of the TCP/AQM Traffic Flow Control Mechanisms. *Journal of Telecommunications and Information Technology*, 2012.
- [13] Michał P. Karpowicz. A theory of meta-factorization. *ArXiv*, abs/2111.14385, 2021.
- [14] Michał P. Karpowicz. On the fundamental impossibility of hallucination control in Large Language Models. *ArXiv*, abs/2506.06382, 2025.

- [15] Frank P Kelly, Aman K Maulloo, and David Kim Hong Tan. Rate control for communication networks: shadow prices, proportional fairness and stability. *Journal of the Operational Research society*, 49(3):237–252, 1998.
- [16] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks, 2021.
- [17] Parth Sarthi, Salman Abdullah, Aditi Tuli, Shubh Khanna, Anna Goldie, and Christopher D. Manning. Raptor: Recursive abstractive processing for tree-organized retrieval, 2024.
- [18] Kurt Shuster, Spencer Poff, Moya Chen, Douwe Kiela, and Jason Weston. Retrieval augmentation reduces hallucination in conversation, 2021.
- [19] Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. Musique: Multihop questions via single-hop question composition, 2022.



where  $\mathbf{V}^+$  is the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. Notice that to find a list of  $k$  embeddings of the extracted entity descriptions that are nearest to  $\mathbf{q}$ , it is in fact enough to calculate the Euclidean distance

$$\|\mathbf{V}(:, s) - \mathbf{q}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{V}(:, s) - (\hat{\mathbf{q}} + \mathbf{e})\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{V}(:, s) - \hat{\mathbf{q}}\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{e}\|_2^2,$$

which follows from the Pythagorean theorem for orthogonal vectors  $\mathbf{V}(:, s) - \hat{\mathbf{q}}$  and  $\mathbf{e}$  (projection error). Then, the relevant database entries are index by

$$\hat{\sigma} = \text{Arg}_k \min(k)_{s=1, \dots, S} (\|\mathbf{V}(:, s) - \mathbf{q}\|)_{s=1}^S.$$

We write  $\min(k)$  (or  $\max(k)$ ) to denote  $k$  best (min or max) elements of the list of numbers that follows.

The relevant context is now given by retrieval matrix

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{C}(:, \hat{\sigma})_{K \times k},$$

a submatrix built from columns  $\hat{\sigma}$  in of matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ .

Similarly, for the search based on cosine similarity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma} &= \text{Arg} \max(k)_{s=1, \dots, S} (\tilde{\mathbf{V}}(:, s)^T \tilde{\mathbf{q}})_{s=1}^S \\ \text{for } \tilde{\mathbf{V}}(:, s) &= \frac{\mathbf{V}(:, s)}{\|\mathbf{V}(:, s)\|} \text{ and } \tilde{\mathbf{q}} = \frac{\mathbf{q}}{\|\mathbf{q}\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the relevant context is also given by

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{C}(:, \tilde{\sigma})_{K \times k}.$$

The retrieval matrix is a binary matrix such that  $r_{ij} = 1$  is chunk  $i$  contains description  $j$  that is one of top- $k$  descriptions of ideas (entities of equivalence class) relevant to the query. Notice, that the same chunk may contain many such descriptions, an observation motivating our next step going beyond basic retrieval.

## C Alignment

The retrieval framework we have developed provides an interesting setting for retrieval alignment control. Notice that matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ , or its retrieval submatrix  $\mathbf{R}$ , can be interpreted as a routing matrix in the following well studied aggregate utility maximization problem:

$$\text{maximize } \sum_{s=1}^S U_s(x_s) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{R}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{f} \text{ and (optionally) } -\mathbf{I}_S \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0}_{S \times 1}.$$

The related Lagrange function is then

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{s=1}^S U_s(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T (\mathbf{R}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{f}) + \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \mathbf{x}.$$

For a detailed study of the solutions to the problem, see e.g. [11, 12].

We want to find an optimal distribution  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = [x_1, \dots, x_S]^T$  of the strength of ideas (representatives of equivalence classes identified in  $\mathbf{T}$ ) over the relevant document chunks (containing those ideas). However, the strength of ideas in each chunk cannot exceed an imposed upper bound  $\mathbf{f}$  that controls the distribution. That strength, defined by a given  $\mathbf{x}$ , is described by the product

$$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_1^* \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{r}_K^* \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x},$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_k^*$  denotes row  $k$  of the matrix.

It follows from the KKT optimality conditions, that a solution  $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$  to the aligned retrieval problem satisfies the following system of inequalities:

$$U'_s(\bar{x}_s) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K r_{is} \bar{\lambda}_i, \text{ with equality for } \bar{x}_s > 0, s = 1, \dots, S,$$

where  $\bar{\lambda}_s$  denotes Lagrange multiplier for the mixing strength constraint  $\mathbf{r}_k^* \mathbf{x} \leq f_k$  in chunk  $k = 1, \dots, K$ .

It is now clear that selecting the utility function  $U_s$  for each equivalence class (or extracted idea), together with the vector  $\mathbf{f}$ , allows for controlling the retrieval alignment. One theoretically elegant example includes

$$U_s(x_s) = \gamma_s(\mathbf{q}) \log(x_s) \text{ for } \gamma_s = \gamma_s(\mathbf{q}).$$

Here, weight  $\gamma_s$  could depend on the relevance of the available database entries in  $\mathbf{V}$  for given query  $\mathbf{q}$  vector. For example, we could set

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{q}.$$

Then, optimal distribution of chunks is given by the well recognized interpretable closed-form solution (reachable in a convergent iterative auction-like process, e.g., see [15]):

$$\bar{x}_s = \frac{\gamma_s}{\sum_{i=1}^K r_{is} \bar{\lambda}_i} = \frac{\mathbf{V}(:, s)^T \mathbf{q}}{\sum_{i=1}^K r_{is} \bar{\lambda}_i}.$$

Another straightforward and elegant approach we can propose, defines retrieval alignment as a constrained least squares problem:

$$\text{minimize } \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}\|_2^2 \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}.$$

If  $\mathbf{f}$  belongs to the column space of  $\mathbf{V}$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$  has independent rows, and  $[\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{C}^T]^T$  has independent columns, then the problem has a unique and interpretable closed form solution  $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}})$  meeting the KKT linear matrix equation  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} & \mathbf{C}^T \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{q} \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix}$ . For the study of general and randomized solutions to that equation see e.g. [1, 2, 13].

---

**Algorithm 1** Aligned Retrieval with UnWeaver

---

**Require:** Document  $\mathbf{T}$ , query  $q_{\text{text}}$ , embedding operator  $\mathcal{E}: \mathcal{T}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^P$

**Ensure:** Context chunks

```
1: Preprocessing:
2:  $[\mathbf{T}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{T}_K] \leftarrow \text{Tokenize}(\mathbf{T})$ 
3: Extract entities and descriptions:  $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow [\mathbf{a}_{ij}]_{i=1, \dots, K}^{j=1, \dots, n}$ ,  $\mathbf{W} \in \{0, 1\}^{K \times n}$ 
4: Identify equivalence classes:  $\{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(S)\}$ 
5: for  $s = 1$  to  $S$  do ▷ Representatives of equivalent classes
6:    $\mathbf{P}_s \leftarrow \mathbf{I}_n(:, \sigma(s))$ 
7:    $\mathbf{c}_s \leftarrow \text{sign}(\mathbf{W}\mathbf{P}_s\mathbf{1})$ 
8:    $\mathbf{v}_s \leftarrow \mathcal{E}(\text{concat}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_s))$ 
9: end for
10:  $\mathbf{C} \leftarrow [\mathbf{c}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{c}_S] \in \{0, 1\}^{K \times S}$ 
11:  $\mathbf{V} \leftarrow [\mathbf{v}_1 | \dots | \mathbf{v}_S] \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times S}$ 
12: Query Processing:
13:  $\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathcal{E}(q_{\text{text}})$ 
14:  $\gamma \leftarrow \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{q}$  ▷ Relevance scores for Retrieval Alignment
15: Retrieval Alignment:
16: if method = Utility-Based then
17:   Find:  $\arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \geq 0} \sum_{s=1}^S \gamma_s \log(x_s)$  s.t.  $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{f}$ 
18:   Initialize:  $\lambda \leftarrow \mathbf{1}_K / K$ 
19:   for  $t = 1$  to  $t_{\text{max}}$  do
20:      $\mathbf{x} \leftarrow [\gamma_s / (\mathbf{C}(:, s)^T \lambda)]_{s=1}^S$  ▷ Primal update
21:      $\rho \leftarrow \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}$ 
22:      $\lambda \leftarrow \text{UpdatePrices}(\lambda, \rho, \mathbf{f})$  ▷ Dual update
23:     if  $\|\rho - \mathbf{f}\|_\infty < \epsilon$  then break
24:     end if
25:   end for
26: else if method = CLS then
27:   Find:  $\arg \min_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}\|_2^2$  s.t.  $\mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}$ 
28:   Solve:  $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{V} & \mathbf{C}^T \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{q} \\ \mathbf{f} \end{bmatrix}$ 
29: end if
30: Context Retrieval:
31:  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{TopK}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{x}, k')$  ▷ Best equivalence classes
32:  $\mathcal{I} \leftarrow \{i : \exists s \in \mathcal{S}, c_{is} = 1\}$  ▷ Relevant chunks
33: return  $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ 
```

---

## D Numerical Example

Suppose we have already decomposed document  $\mathbf{T}$  into  $K = 2$  chunks, and we extracted with an LLM entities forming  $S = 3$  equivalent ideas (or equivalence classes). Let us assume that the distribution of those ideas in the chunks is

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and their concatenated descriptions are represented by the following matrix of embedding

$$\mathbf{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0.5 \\ 0 & 1 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Given query  $\mathbf{q} = [1 \ 1]^T$ , we want to retrieve relevant chunks of text that are well aligned with our preferences for context generation. We set the budget of ideas in each chunk to  $\mathbf{f} = [1 \ 1]^T$  and demand  $L = 2$  to be kept in the retrieved context.

With this simple settings, we get

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{V}^T \mathbf{q} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and the retrieval alignment problem becomes:

$$\text{maximize } \sum_{s=1}^S \log(x_s) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{f}.$$

It can be verified rather easily, that KKT conditions are satisfied for

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 3 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

From that we conclude that the aligned retrieval generates context consisting of the relevant chunks

$$\bar{\sigma} = \{1, 2\}.$$

## E Prompts

This is the query prompt that was used across all methods.

```
Role: System
Content:
  You are a question answering system.
  Please make sure that the answer is correct and complete.
  At the same time avoid redundancy and irrelevant information.
  Please try to answer the question in Single Sentence.

  Do so based on the following context:

  {context}

Role: User
Content:
  {question}
```