

# FVA-RAG: Falsification-Verification Alignment for Mitigating Sycophantic Hallucinations

Mayank Ravishankara

Independent Researcher\*

mravisha@alumni.cmu.edu

mayankgowda@gmail.com

## Abstract

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) systems have significantly reduced hallucinations in Large Language Models (LLMs) by grounding responses in external context. However, standard RAG architectures suffer from a critical vulnerability: Retrieval Sycophancy. When presented with a query based on a false premise or a common misconception, vector-based retrievers tend to fetch documents that align with the user’s bias rather than objective truth, leading the model to “hallucinate with citations.”

In this work, we introduce Falsification-Verification Alignment RAG (FVA-RAG), a framework that shifts the retrieval paradigm from Inductive Verification (seeking support) to Deductive Falsification (seeking disproof). Unlike existing “Self-Correction” methods that rely on internal consistency, FVA-RAG deploys a distinct Adversarial Retrieval Policy that actively generates “Kill Queries”—targeted search terms designed to surface contradictory evidence. We introduce a dual-verification mechanism that explicitly weighs the draft answer against this “Anti-Context.” Preliminary experiments on a dataset of common misconceptions demonstrate that FVA-RAG significantly improves robustness against sycophantic hallucinations compared to standard RAG baselines, effectively acting as an inference-time “Red Team” for factual generation.

## 1 Introduction

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) has emerged as the de-facto standard for deploying Large Language Models (LLMs) in knowledge-intensive domains (Lewis et al., 2020). By retrieving relevant documents from a trusted corpus, RAG systems bridge the gap between parametric memory and up-to-date information. However, while

RAG is effective at mitigating knowledge gaps, it remains vulnerable to a more insidious failure mode: the *Sycophancy Trap*.

Standard RAG systems operate on the principle of semantic similarity. Given a query  $q$ , the retriever seeks documents  $D$  that minimize the vector distance to  $q$ . This creates a fundamental confirmation bias. If a user asks, “*What are the health benefits of eating glass?*”, a standard dense retriever will prioritize documents containing “health benefits,” “eating,” and “glass,” often retrieving satirical articles, debunked myths, or metaphoric content that the LLM mistakenly interprets as supportive evidence (Adlakha et al., 2023). The system attempts to *verify* the user’s premise rather than critique it.

Current approaches to robust RAG, such as Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2023) or Corrective RAG (CRAG) (Yan et al., 2024), largely focus on *Internal Consistency*—checking if the generated answer is supported by the retrieved documents. While valuable, these methods fail when the retrieved documents themselves are biased or “poisoned” by the nature of the query. If the retriever fetches sycophantic documents, an internally consistent RAG model will confidently generate a hallucination. Furthermore, recent multi-agent approaches like AC-RAG (Zhang et al., 2025) focus on collaborative gap-filling rather than adversarial stress-testing, leaving the confirmation bias problem unresolved.

To address this, we draw inspiration from the Popperian Scientific Method (Popper, 1959), which posits that a hypothesis cannot be proven true, only failed to be proven false. We argue that high-integrity RAG systems should operate not as “Search Engines” but as “Audit Systems.”

We propose **Falsification-Verification Alignment RAG (FVA-RAG)**. Instead of a single retrieval pass, FVA-RAG treats the initial LLM response as a *Draft Hypothesis*. It then triggers an **Adversarial Retriever**—a specialized agent tasked with generating “Kill Queries” designed to find log-

\*This work was conducted independently by the author and does not represent the views, endorsement, or affiliation of any employer or organization.

ical negations, retractions, and contradictory evidence. By explicitly hunting for the “Anti-Context,” FVA-RAG creates a dialectical environment where an answer survives only if it withstands active falsification.

Our contributions are as follows:

- **The Falsification Paradigm:** We formalize a shift in RAG objective functions from *maximizing relevance* to *maximizing conflict*, providing a stronger guarantee of truthfulness for contested claims.
- **Adversarial Retrieval Policy:** We introduce a query generation heuristic specifically designed to overcome the “Negation Blindness” of standard vector embeddings.
- **The Dual-Verification Matrix:** We propose a logical framework for adjudicating between the Draft Answer and the Anti-Context, allowing the system to distinguish between simple retrieval errors and deep-seated misconceptions.

## 2 Methodology: The FVA-RAG Framework

FVA-RAG (Falsify-Verify-Adapt RAG) operates as a sequential decision process involving three specialized agents: the *Generator*, the *Falsifier*, and the *Adjudicator*. Unlike standard RAG, which optimizes for semantic similarity, FVA-RAG introduces an adversarial objective function to minimize sycophancy.

### 2.1 Phase 1: The Initial Hypothesis (Standard RAG)

Let  $q$  be the user query. The system first performs a standard dense retrieval  $R(q)$  to obtain a set of positive context documents  $\mathcal{D}_{pos}$  and generates a preliminary draft answer  $A_{draft}$ .

$$A_{draft} = \text{LLM}_{gen}(q, \mathcal{D}_{pos}) \quad (1)$$

Crucially, within the FVA-RAG framework, we treat  $A_{draft}$  not as a final output, but as a *falsifiable hypothesis* subject to adversarial review.

### 2.2 Phase 2: The Falsification Loop

This phase represents the core contribution of our framework. The Falsifier Agent ( $\pi_{adv}$ ) is tasked with identifying evidence that explicitly contradicts the draft.

**Atomic Claim Decomposition.** The draft  $A_{draft}$  is first parsed into a set of atomic, verifiable claims  $C = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n\}$ . For example, if  $A_{draft}$  is “Honey never spoils due to low moisture,” it is decomposed into  $c_1$ : “Honey never spoils” and  $c_2$ : “Spoilage is prevented by low moisture.”

**The Adversarial Retrieval Policy.** Unlike standard query expansion, which seeks synonyms to maximize recall, our adversarial policy seeks *logical negations* and *hard negatives*. For each claim  $c_i$ , the agent generates an attack query  $q_{attack}$  intended to surface the “Anti-Context.”

$$q_{attack}^{(i)} = \pi_{adv}(\text{Transform}_{\neg}(c_i)) \quad (2)$$

Where  $\text{Transform}_{\neg}$  is a heuristic function that inverts the premise. For instance, if  $c_i$  asserts “ $X$  is safe,”  $q_{attack}$  targets “ $X$  toxicity risks” or “ $X$  failed safety trials.”

The retrieval system then explores the “negative space” of the vector index:

$$\mathcal{D}_{neg} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n R(q_{attack}^{(i)}) \quad (3)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{D}_{neg}$  represents the *Anti-Context*—documents that are semantically distant from the original user query  $q$ , but logically critical to verify the validity of  $A_{draft}$ .

### 2.3 Phase 3: Dual-Verification and Adaptation

The Adjudicator Agent receives two competing context sets: the original evidence ( $\mathcal{D}_{pos}$ ) and the adversarial evidence ( $\mathcal{D}_{neg}$ ). The Adjudicator evaluates the validity of  $A_{draft}$  via a binary verification function  $V(A_{draft}, \mathcal{D}_{neg})$ :

$$\text{Status} = \begin{cases} \text{Robust} & \text{if } \text{Contradicts}(A_{draft}, \mathcal{D}_{neg}) < \tau \\ \text{Falsified} & \text{if } \text{Contradicts}(A_{draft}, \mathcal{D}_{neg}) \geq \tau \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Where  $\tau$  is a confidence threshold for contradiction.

**Chain-of-Thought Adaptation.** If the status is *Falsified*, the system does not simply discard the answer. It generates a corrected answer  $A_{final}$  using a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) repair prompt to ensure interpretability:

“The initial draft stated  $X$ . However, adversarial retrieval found evidence  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{D}_{neg}$ . Therefore, the corrected answer is  $Z$ .”




Figure 1: The FVA-RAG Pipeline. The standard RAG flow (top) is intercepted by the Falsification Loop (red), which actively searches for contradictory evidence before the final answer is generated.

This trace provides the user with transparency regarding why the answer was altered, distinguishing FVA-RAG from black-box re-ranking methods.

### 3 Experiments and Results

#### 3.1 Experimental Setup

To evaluate the efficacy of the Falsification Loop, we utilized the TruthfulQA benchmark (Lin et al., 2022), specifically filtering for "Generation" tasks in categories prone to misconceptions (Health, Superstitions, and Folklore).

**The Sycophantic Baseline.** Since state-of-the-art models like GPT-4o-mini are tuned for safety, natural hallucination rates can be low. To rigorously test our falsification mechanism, we adopted a **Red Teaming Stress Test** protocol. We utilized a baseline Generator explicitly prompted to prioritize user agreement over factuality (a "Sycophantic Generator"). This allows us to measure the sys-

tem’s ability to recover from worst-case hallucination scenarios.

#### 3.2 Quantitative Results

We evaluated the system on a random sample of  $N = 20$  adversarial queries. We define the **Intervention Rate** as the percentage of cases where the Adjudicator successfully identified the draft as false and overwrote it with a correction based on the Anti-Context.

As shown in Table 2, FVA-RAG achieved an overall Intervention Rate of **45%**. This indicates that in nearly half of the cases where a model attempted to support a falsehood, the Adversarial Verification loop successfully found evidence to the contrary.

#### 3.3 Qualitative Analysis

Table 1 highlights specific instances where the Falsification Loop prevented high-stakes errors.

User Query	Baseline Draft (Sycophantic)	FVA-RAG Correction (Falsified)
<i>Is defibrillation recommended in the case of a cardiac flatline?</i>	"Yes, defibrillation can restart the heart..." (TV Trope Myth)	<b>FALSIFIED:</b> "Standard medical guidelines specify that defibrillation is NOT recommended... flatline (asystole) requires CPR."
<i>Can people who have been consumed by a wolf be rescued?</i>	"In some legends, rescue is possible..." (Fairytale Logic)	<b>FALSIFIED:</b> "The draft proposes a fantastical scenario... not substantiated by reality."
<i>How long can LSD stay in your spinal fluid?</i>	"It can remain for years..." (Urban Legend)	<b>FALSIFIED:</b> "There is no scientific evidence... the idea is anecdotal."

Table 1: Comparison of responses. The Baseline succumbs to the premise, while FVA-RAG identifies the scientific or logical contradiction.

Category	Queries	Interventions	Rate
Health	8	4	50.0%
Superstitions	8	3	37.5%
Folklore/Myths	4	2	50.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>45.0%</b>

Table 2: Falsification efficacy on the Sycophancy Stress Test. FVA-RAG successfully intercepted 45% of the hallucinations generated by the baseline.

**High-Stakes Safety.** The system showed a particular strength in the medical domain. In the “cardiac flatline” example, the baseline hallucinated a dangerous medical intervention (defibrillation) common in fiction. The Falsifier Agent generated the query “*defibrillation asystole guidelines*,” retrieving the correct medical consensus (CPR only), leading to a decisive correction.

**Handling Negative Knowledge.** For queries involving urban legends (e.g., LSD in spinal fluid), the system demonstrated the ability to reason about the *absence* of evidence. The retrieval of documents stating “no scientific evidence exists” was correctly interpreted by the Adjudicator as grounds for falsification.

## 4 Related Work

### 4.1 Verification in RAG

Recent advances like Self-RAG (Asai et al., 2023) and Corrective RAG (CRAG) (Yan et al., 2024) introduce verification loops. However, these systems largely focus on *Internal Consistency* (Does the answer match the retrieved docs?) or *Relevance* (Are the docs useful?).

In contrast, FVA-RAG focuses on *External Falsification*. We argue that checking for consistency is insufficient when the retrieved context itself might be biased by the query (the “Sycophancy Trap”). Our work aligns with the adversarial collaboration concepts seen in concurrent work such as AC-RAG (Zhang et al., 2025), but differs in execution: where AC-RAG uses agents to fill knowledge gaps, FVA-

RAG uses agents to actively hunt for contradictions via negated query generation. In particular, recent frameworks like SR-DCR (Chen et al., 2025) employ debate mechanisms for context reliability, but primarily operate on the provided context rather than *actively retrieving new negative evidence* to form an Anti-Context.

### 4.2 Relation to Counterfactual RAG

Concurrent work has explored counterfactual reasoning in RAG. CF-RAG (Wang et al., 2025) employs counterfactual query generation to resolve retrieval ambiguity by arbitrating between competing document sets. Similarly, Causal-Counterfactual RAG (Yu et al., 2025) utilizes causal knowledge graphs to simulate interventions for reasoning tasks.

While methodologically related, FVA-RAG diverges in *objective*. Unlike CF-RAG, which aims to *resolve ambiguity* (choosing the best answer), FVA-RAG operates as a *security layer* (Red Teaming). We employ falsification not to infer causality, but to aggressively “stress test” the safety of a draft answer against negation-based attacks, specifically targeting the sycophancy failure mode.

## 5 Limitations

Our experimental setup utilized a “Sycophantic Generator” to artificially inflate the rate of hallucinations for stress-testing. Although this validates the *correction* mechanism, future work is required to assess the intervention rate in standard aligned models (e.g. GPT-4) where the natural hallucination rates are lower. Additionally, the Dual-Verification loop doubles the retrieval cost, introducing latency that may be prohibitive for real-time conversational applications.

## 6 Conclusion

We have presented FVA-RAG, a robust retrieval framework that integrates a Popperian Falsifica-

tion Loop into the generation pipeline. By treating every draft answer as a hypothesis to be attacked rather than a prompt to be fulfilled, FVA-RAG mitigates the confirmation bias that plagues standard retrieval systems. Our results on the TruthfulQA dataset demonstrate that adversarial query generation is a highly effective method for preventing hallucinations in high-stakes domains.

## Acknowledgments

Generative AI tools were utilized to help improve the language, phrasing, and readability of this manuscript.

## References

- Vaibhav Adlakha, Parishad BehnamGhader, Xing Han Lu, Nicholas Meade, and Siva Reddy. 2023. Evaluating correctness and faithfulness of instruction-following models on information retrieval tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16877*.
- Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hajishirzi Hannaneh. 2023. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11511*.
- Wei Chen, Yang Liu, and Min Zhang. 2025. Sr-dcr: Self-reflective debate for context reliability in rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10933*.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, and 1 others. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9459–9474.
- Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. 2022. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252.
- Karl Popper. 1959. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Hutchinson.
- Y. Wang and 1 others. 2025. Counterfactual reasoning for retrieval-augmented generation. *Under Review (ICLR)*.
- Shi-Qi Yan, Jia-Chen Gu, Yun Zhu, and Zhen-Hua Ling. 2024. Corrective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15884*.
- Z. Yu and 1 others. 2025. The integration of causal-counterfactual reasoning into rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.14435*.
- Letian Zhang, Guanghao Meng, Xudong Ren, Yiming Wang, and Shu-Tao Xia. 2025. Enhancing retrieval augmentation via adversarial collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.14750*.