Assignment 4: Simplified Agentic RAG System with LangGraph

1. Background

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) combines a knowledge base (KB) with a large language model (LLM) so the model can ground its answers in factual, pre-indexed content.

An "agentic" RAG system adds a simple self-review loop: after producing an initial answer, the model checks its own output against the KB, identifies any missing or incorrect pieces, and (if needed) retrieves a bit more context to refine its response.

In this assignment, you will build a lighter-weight agentic RAG pipeline using LangGraph's Graph API. You will:

- $1. \ Load\ a\ small\ JSON\ based\ KB\ (\verb|self_critique_loop_dataset.json|)\ of\ software\ best-practice\ snippets.$
- 2. Index those snippets into a vector store for fast semantic search.
- 3. Define a LangGraph graph containing:
 - o A retriever node (fetches top-k relevant snippets),
 - A single LLM-generator node (produces an answer using retrieved context),
 - o A self-critique node (checks if the answer is complete), and
 - o A refinement node (if critique finds gaps, retrieve one more snippet and regenerate).
- 4. Expose a minimal interface (Jupyter notebook or simple Python script) to enter a question and see the end-to-end pipeline run (initial answer → critique → optional refinement → final answer).

2. Problem Statement & Detailed Tasks

"Build a simplified Agentic RAG system using LangGraph that, for any user question about software engineering best practices, retrieves up to 5 relevant KB snippets, generates an initial LLM answer, self-critiques it, and—only when necessary—retrieves one extra snippet to refine the answer, finally returning a citation-backed response."

2.1. Detailed Tasks

- 1. Preprocessing & Indexing
 - Load the KB: Read self_critique_loop_dataset.json (≈30 entries). Each entry has:

```
"doc_id": "KB001",
  "question": "What are best practices for debugging?",
  "answer_snippet": "When debugging, start with a minimal reproducible test, use logging, and apply divide-and-conquer to
  "source": "debugging_guide.md",
  "last_updated": "2024-01-10"
}
```

- o Compute Embeddings: Use OpenAl's text-embedding-3-small (or a local sentence-transformer) to embed each answer_snippet.
- Upsert to Vector Store: Choose Pinecone, Weaviate, or Qdrant. Create an index (e.g. kb_index) and upsert each record:

```
{
  "id": "<doc_id>",
  "vector": <embedding array>,
  "metadata": { "source": "<filename>", "last_updated": "<date>" }
}
```

- o Confirm all ~30 entries are indexed.
- 2. LangGraph Graph Definition Create a file named agentic_rag_simplified.py (or define inside a Jupyter notebook). In it, define a LangGraph graph with these four nodes:
 - 1. Retriever Node
 - Name: retrieve_kb
 - Type: "vector_retriever" (wraps a simple Python function).

- Input:
 - user_question: str
- Operation:
 - 1. Embed user_question.
 - 2. Query the vector index for the top 5 most similar <code>answer_snippet</code> vectors.
 - $\textbf{3. Return a list of up to 5 hits, each } \{ \texttt{"doc_id": <id>, "answer_snippet": <text>, "source": <filename> } \}.$
- Output:
 - kb_hits: List[Dict]

2. LLM Answer Node

- Name: generate_answer
- Type: LLMChainNode
- Inputs:
 - user_question: str
 - kb hits: List[Dict]
- Prompt Template (example):

```
You are a software best-practices assistant.

User Question:
{user_question}

Retrieved Snippets:
{for hit in kb_hits: print(f"[{hit['doc_id']}] {hit['answer_snippet']}")}

Task:

Based on these snippets, write a concise answer to the user's question.

Cite each snippet you use by its doc_id in square brackets (e.g., [KB004]).

Return only the answer text.
```

- LLM Settings:
 - Model: gpt-4 (or gpt-3.5-turbo)
 - Temperature: 0
- Output:
 - initial_answer: str

3. Self-Critique Node

- Name: critique_answer
- Type: LLMChainNode
- Inputs:
 - user_question: strinitial_answer: str
 - kb_hits: List[Dict]
- Prompt Template (example):

```
You are a critical QA assistant. The user asked: {user_question}

Initial Answer:
{initial_answer}

KB Snippets:
{for hit in kb_hits: print(f"[{hit['doc_id']}] {hit['answer_snippet']}")}

Task:
Determine if the initial answer fully addresses the question using only these snippets.

- If it does, respond exactly: COMPLETE

- If it misses any point or cites missing info, respond: REFINE: <short list of missing topic keywords>

Return exactly one line.
```

LLM Settings:

- Model: gpt-4
- Temperature: 0

Output:

■ critique_result: str (either "COMPLETE" or "REFINE: ...")

4. Refinement Node

- Name: refine_answer
- Type: LLMChainNode
- Inputs:
 - user_question: str
 - initial_answer: str
 - critique_result: str
 - kb_hits: List[Dict]

Operation:

- ${\tt 1. \ Extract \ missing-topic \ keywords \ from \ {\tt critique_result \ (e.g., \ "cache \ invalidation")}.}$
- 2. Build a new query string:

```
new_query = f"{user_question} and information on {missing_keywords}"
```

3. Call the same retriever function to get one additional snippet (top_k=1) for that new_query.

■ Prompt Template (example):

```
You are a software best-practices assistant refining your answer. The user asked: {user_question}

Initial Answer:
{initial_answer}

Critique: {critique_result}

Additional Snippet:
[Code to display the single additional snippet's doc_id and text]

Task:
Incorporate this snippet into the answer, covering the missing points.
Cite any snippet you use by doc_id in square brackets.
Return only the final refined answer.
```

LLM Settings:

- Model: gpt-4
- Temperature: 0

- Output:
 - refined_answer: str
- 5. Graph Control Flow
 - Wire nodes in sequence:

```
1. retrieve\_kb \rightarrow generate\_answer \rightarrow critique\_answer.
```

- 2. Add a simple Decision node (or an if check in your driver script) that:
 - If critique_result == "COMPLETE", take initial_answer as final.
 - If critique_result.startswith("REFINE"), call the refinement logic (retrieve+refine) to produce refined_answer.
- 3. Wrap whichever answer (initial or refined) into a JSON response:

```
{ "answer": "<final_answer_text>" }
```

3. Tools & Technologies

- LangGraph (Graph API)
 - Define nodes (retriever + LLM chains + decision logic) and connect them in a directed graph.
- Vector Database (choose one)
 - o Chroma, Weaviate, or Qdrant for storing and querying embeddings.
- Embeddings
 - OpenAl's text-embedding-ada-002 (or a publicly available sentence-transformer of your choice).
- OpenAl LLM
 - Use gpt-4 (or gpt-4o-mini) via the OpenAl Python SDK.
 - \bullet $\,$ All calls should specify ${\tt temperature=0}.$
- Python ≥ 3.10
 - o Develop either in a Jupyter notebook (.ipynb) or as a small folder of .py modules, then zip them up.
- Pip-installed packages:

```
langgraph
openai
pinecone-client # or weaviate-client / qdrant-client
pydantic
```

4. Sample Input Queries

Use these queries to test the entire pipeline. Log each step (hits, initial answer, critique, possible refinement).

- 1. "What are best practices for caching?"
 - Expect retrieval of snippets such as "KB003: [Snippet about caching patterns]" and so on.
 - Initial answer cites one or two KB IDs (e.g., [KB003]).
 - \circ Critique might return ${\tt REFINE:}$ cache invalidation if that subtopic was missing.
 - $\bullet \ \ \text{Refinement then retrieves one snippet on invalidation ($\tt KB013$) and produces a final answer citing both $\tt [KB003]$ and $\tt [KB013]$. }$
- 2. "How should I set up CI/CD pipelines?" $\,$
 - Expect hits like KB007, KB017.
 - Initial answer cites those snippets.
 - Critique likely returns COMPLETE.
 - o Final JSON just returns the initial answer.
- 3. "What are performance tuning tips?"
 - Expect hits KB002, KB012.
 - Initial answer might cite [KB002].

- Critique may respond REFINE: profiling tools if missing that detail.
- Refinement retrieves a profiling snippet (KB022) and final answer cites [KB002] and [KB022].

4. "How do I version my APIs?"

- Expect hits KB005, KB015.
- Initial answer cites [KB005].
- Critique could be REFINE: semantic versioning if not mentioned.
- o Refinement snippet (KB015) added, final answer cites both IDs.

5. "What should I consider for error handling?"

- Expect hits KB009, KB019.
- Initial answer cites [KB009].
- Critique probably returns COMPLETE if logging, retries, and exception best practices are covered.
- Final answer is the same as the initial.

Deliverables

You may submit **either** a single Jupyter notebook (.ipynb) showing all steps **or** a ZIP folder containing:

1. Python Code Files

- index_kb.py
 - $\blacksquare \ \ Loads \ {\tt self_critique_loop_dataset.json}, \ \ computes \ \ embeddings, \ and \ \ upserts \ \ records \ to \ your \ chosen \ vector \ DB.$
- $\verb| o agentic_rag_simplified.py| (or modules under a folder named agentic_rag/) \\$
 - Defines the LangGraph graph with the four nodes:
 - 1. retrieve kb
 - 2. generate_answer
 - 3. critique_answer
 - 4. refine_answer
 - Contains any helper functions (e.g., building new_query for refinement).
- executor.py (optional if you did a pure Python approach)
 - Prompts the user for a question, runs the LangGraph graph, prints the final JSON.
- requirements.txt

```
langgraph
openai
pinecone-client  # or weaviate-client / qdrant-client
pydantic
```

2. Jupyter Notebook (if you choose the notebook route)

- Should contain all cells that:
 - 1. Import required libraries and set up API keys (e.g., $OPENAI_API_KEY$).
 - 2. Run index_kb.py logic to create embeddings and upsert.
 - 3. Define the LangGraph graph inline (preferably in its own cell).
 - 4. Execute the graph on each of the 5 sample queries, showing:
 - kb_hits (initial retrieval),
 - $lacktrian initial_answer,$
 - critique_result,
 - (if needed) refined_answer,
 - Final JSON response.
- o Include commentary/memos in Markdown cells that explain each step.

3. Readme or Top-Cell Explanation

- o Brief instructions on how to run your notebook or execute the Python scripts.
- Outline any environment variables needed (OPENAI_API_KEY, PINECONE_API_KEY, etc.).

6. Notes & Tips

- Keep It Simple: Do not over-engineer. One retrieval pass, one critique, at most one extra snippet for refinement.
- Citation Format: Whenever the LLM references a snippet, it must write [KBXXX] exactly. If a citation is missing or incorrect, the self-critique node should flag it as a gap.
- Prompt Consistency: Always set temperature=0 to ensure repeatable outputs.
- Decision Logic: You can implement the "COMPLETE vs. REFINE" check as a simple Python if statement in your driver code rather than a separate LangGraph decision node—either approach is fine.
- Logging: For each query, print out (or display) in your notebook:
 - 1. Retrieved KB IDs & snippets,
 - 2. Initial answer,
 - 3. Critique result,
 - 4. (If used) refined answer,
 - 5. Final JSON output.
- Testing: Before wiring the full graph, manually test:
 - retrieve_kb_entries("test question", top_k=3)
 - o A small "Answer Generation" prompt by itself,
 - o A small "Self-Critique" prompt by itself,
 - o A quick "Refinement" prompt by itself.
- Reproducibility: Pin your library versions in requirements.txt to avoid mismatched LLM or vector-DB client behavior.

Good luck! This simplified assignment will give you a hands-on, clear path to building an agentic RAG pipeline—without excessive complexity.