

# Comparing Neighbors Together Makes it Easy: Jointly Comparing Multiple Candidates for Efficient and Effective Retrieval

Jonghyun Song<sup>†</sup>, Cheyon Jin<sup>†</sup>, Wenlong Zhao<sup>◇</sup>, and Jay-Yoon Lee<sup>†</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Seoul National University    <sup>◇</sup> University of Massachusetts Amherst  
{hyeongoon11, cheyonjin, lee.jayyoon}@snu.ac.kr    {wenlongzhao}@umass.edu

## Abstract

A common retrieve-and-rerank paradigm involves retrieving a broad set of relevant candidates using a scalable bi-encoder, followed by expensive but more accurate cross-encoders to a limited candidate set. However, this small subset often leads to error propagation from the bi-encoders, thereby restricting the performance of the overall pipeline. To address these issues, we propose the Comparing Multiple Candidates (CMC) framework, which compares a query and multiple candidate embeddings jointly through shallow self-attention layers. While providing contextualized representations, CMC is scalable enough to handle multiple comparisons simultaneously, where comparing 2K candidates takes only twice as long as comparing 100. Practitioners can use CMC as a lightweight and effective reranker to improve top-1 accuracy. Moreover, when integrated with another retriever, CMC reranking can function as a *virtually enhanced retriever*. This configuration adds only negligible latency compared to using a single retriever (*virtual*), while significantly improving recall at K (*enhanced*). Through experiments, we demonstrate that CMC as a virtually enhanced retriever, significantly improves Recall@k (+6.7, +3.5%-p for R@16, R@64) compared to the initial retrieval stage on the ZeSHEL dataset. Meanwhile, we conduct experiments for direct reranking on entity, passage, and dialogue ranking. The results indicate that CMC is not only faster (11x) than cross-encoders but also often more effective, with improved prediction performance in Wikipedia entity linking (+0.7%-p) and DSTC7 dialogue ranking (+3.3%-p). The code and link to datasets are available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/cmd/>

## 1 Introduction

The two-stage approach of retrieval and reranking has become a predominant approach for open-domain question answering (ODQA) (Nogueira

and Cho, 2019; Agarwal et al., 2022b; Shen et al., 2022; Qu et al., 2020), entity linking (EL) (Wu et al., 2020; Zhang and Stratos, 2021; Xu et al., 2023), and dialogue systems (Mele et al., 2020). Typically, bi-encoders (BE) are used to efficiently retrieve relevant candidates among a large set of documents (e.g. knowledge base), and then cross-encoders (CE) effectively rerank only a confident subset of candidates already retrieved by BE (Nogueira and Cho, 2019) (Figure 1.a-b).

The two-stage approach, although widely used, has limitations: it has an innate trade-off between efficiency and effectiveness and is susceptible to error propagation. When inaccurate BE retrieve too few candidates, the framework risks missing the gold candidates. Once the ground truth is not retrieved, no subsequent reranking can consider the gold candidates anymore, leading to the failure of the entire system. In contrast, simply increasing the number of candidates introduces another problem of slow processing time that limits scalability under time constraints. Furthermore, increasing the number of candidates for CE does not necessarily improve end-to-end accuracy<sup>1</sup> (Wu et al., 2020). Therefore, the retrieval framework poses a dilemma for users between the inaccurate performance of BE and the slow runtime of CE.

To resolve this problem, several studies have explored various strategies to find an optimal balance in the efficiency-effectiveness tradeoff. Khattab and Zaharia (2020); Zhang and Stratos (2021); Cao et al. (2020); Humeau et al. (2019) have enhanced bi-encoder architectures by adding an interaction component between the query and the candidate. However, these late interaction models require to save multiple vector embeddings for each candidate in advance, or only utilize single query-candidate interaction without considering the relationships

<sup>1</sup>We also confirm this in the experiments. See appendix E.6.




Figure 1: Overview of ranking model architectures for sequence retrieval tasks. Model (a), (b), and (c) are existing architectures. Model (d) is our proposed ‘Comparing Multiple Candidates (CMC)’ architecture, which computes compatibility scores by comparing the embeddings of a query and  $K$  multiple candidates via self-attention layers. Contrary to (a)-(c), our model can process multiple documents at once rather than conducting multiple forward passes of (query, candidate) pair for each document.

between candidates (Figure 1.c).

In this paper, we present a novel reranking framework CMC, which stands for Comparing Multiple Candidates (Figure 1.d). CMC is designed to improve both accuracy and scalability by comparing multiple candidates along with the query simultaneously. It compares a query and multiple pre-computed candidate embeddings jointly through a few layers of bi-directional self-attention layers. In other words, CMC only takes one forward pass for single input (query, candidate<sub>1</sub>, ..., candidate<sub>k</sub>), while CE and other late interaction models take  $k$  separate forward passes for multiple input pairs (query, candidate<sub>1</sub>), ..., (query, candidate<sub>k</sub>). The proposed configuration of CMC maintains both the *efficiency* of BE by using pre-computed candidate embeddings, and the *effectiveness* of CE by using attention mechanisms between query and multiple candidates (Figure 1.d).

Practitioners can use CMC as a fast and effective reranker, capable of enhancing top-1 retrieval ( $\uparrow R@1$ ). Also, its efficiency enables CMC to function as a *virtually enhanced retrieval system*. When integrated with another retriever, such as BE, CMC efficiently identifies better candidates (*enhanced*;  $\uparrow R@K$ ) from a large pool with minimal additional latency (*virtual*; Figure 2). As slow cross-encoders can only process a limited number of candidates, filtering higher-quality candidates with CMC contributes to minimizing the error propagation in the retrieval process.

In experiments, we evaluate CMC on Zero-SHOT Entity-Linking dataset (ZeSHEL; Logeswaran et al. (2019)) to investigate the performance as a virtually enhanced retriever. The results show that CMC

provides higher recall than existing state-of-the-art retrievers (+3.5 Recall@64 points) at marginal computing costs (+0.07x runtime of BE; Table 1). Additionally, we demonstrate that CMC provides high-quality candidates that enhance CE’s end-to-end prediction accuracy even with a reduced candidate set, while improving overall latency (Table 2). To examine the effectiveness of CMC as a reranker, we also evaluate CMC on entity, passage, and dialogue ranking tasks. We observe that CMC outperforms CE on both Wikipedia entity linking datasets (+0.7 accuracy points) and DSTC7 dialogue ranking datasets (+3.3 MRR points), requiring only 0.09x of CE’s reranking latency (Table 3).

The main contribution of the paper is as follows:

- We propose a novel CMC that is both effective and scalable reranker by utilizing single pre-computed candidate embeddings (§3).
- We show that CMC can function as a virtually enhanced retriever, which increases the recall of the initial retriever at a marginal cost and thus improves overall reranking performance. (§4.3)
- We provide experimental results which show CMC has robust performance on passage ranking, entity linking, and dialogue ranking tasks compared to various baselines (§4.4).
- Additionally, we show that CMC can benefit from domain transfer from sentence encoders while BE cannot (§4.5).

## 2 Background and Related Works

### 2.1 Retrieve and rerank

Information retrieval systems commonly comprise two stages: efficient retrieval and effective rerank-




Figure 2: Overview of the proposed CMC framework that compares multiple candidates at once. The configuration of Bi-encoder + CMC can be used as both a virtually enhanced retriever which finds top- $K'$  candidates or a reranker which outputs top-1 candidate. Candidate embeddings for bi-encoders and CMC are both precomputed while query embeddings for bi-encoders and CMC are computed in parallel on the fly. After bi-encoders retrieve top- $K$  candidates, CMC indexes the corresponding candidate embeddings and passes through a two-layer transformer encoder.

ing. A fast retriever will score the query  $q$  with each candidate  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ . Although the retriever is designed to be fast, its top-1 accuracy tends to be suboptimal. Practitioners therefore identify a candidate set.

$$C_q = \{c_{q,1}, c_{q,2}, \dots, c_{q,K}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}, \quad (1)$$

whose elements are  $K$  most relevant candidates in corpus  $\mathcal{C}$ , to be reranked.

A reranker  $s_\theta(q, c_{q,j})$  ( $1 \leq j \leq K$ ) is a model learned to assign more fine-grained matching scores between a query  $q$  and each candidate  $c_{q,j}$  from the relatively small set of candidates  $C_q$  predicted by the retriever. It is an expressive model that is generally slower but more accurate than the retriever. The candidate with the highest score,

$$\hat{c}_q = \arg \max_{c_{q,j} \in C_q} s_\theta(q, c_{q,j}), \quad (2)$$

is the final output where query  $q$  should be linked.

## 2.2 Related Work

**Bi-encoders and Cross-encoders** In the two-stage retrieval system, the compatibility score between the query and candidate can be computed by diverse functions. Nogueira et al. (2019a) first retrieves candidates for a query using the bag-of-words *BM25* retriever and then uses a *cross-encoders*, transformer encoders that input the query and candidate tokens jointly, to get a final score. Numerous works (Lee et al., 2019; Gillick et al., 2019; Karpukhin et al., 2020) use a pre-trained language model for *bi-encoders* architecture to encode

a query and a candidate separately and get the compatibility score between the them. The scalability of bi-encoders comes from the indexing of candidates and *maximum inner-product search (MIPS)*; however, they are less effective than cross-encoders as candidate representation does not reflect query information (Figure 1 (a-b)). To enhance the performance of bi-encoders, follow-up works propose a task-specific fine-tuned model (Gao and Callan, 2022), injecting graph information (Wu et al., 2023; Agarwal et al., 2022a), and multi-view text representation (Ma et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023).

**Late Interaction** Late interaction models, which typically function as either a retriever or a reranker, enhance bi-encoder architectures with an interaction component between the query and candidates.

Poly-encoder (Humeau et al., 2019) and Mix-Encoder (Yang et al., 2023) represent query information through cross-attention with individual candidates to calculate matching scores. However, these models have overlooked the opportunity to explore the interaction across candidates.

Sum-of-Max (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020; Zhang and Stratos, 2021; Santhanam et al., 2021) and DeFormer (Cao et al., 2020) rely on Maximum Similarity (MaxSim) operations or additional cross-encoder layers on top of bi-encoders. These approaches increase offline indexing costs as they require every token embedding for each candidate, complicating their application to tasks where the knowledge base is frequently updated and the index

must be continuously revised.

CMC diverges from these models by using a single vector embedding for each candidate, enabling interactions among multiple candidates with enhanced scalability. It helps to explore deeper relational dynamics among candidates while enhancing memory efficiency.

**Listwise Ranking** CMC is not the first approach to jointly compare a query and documents to enhance ranking performance. This listwise ranking method has been explored in previous works (Han et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2023). They process cross-encoder logits for the list (query, candidate<sub>1</sub>, . . . , candidate<sub>K</sub>) to rerank  $K$  candidates from cross-encoders. Although they focus on performance, these approaches lack scalability as depending on pairwise representations from cross-encoders.

Unlike previous listwise ranking models with pairwise representations from cross-encoders, we propose a method that employs single representations from sentence encoders. In particular, CMC can function as a virtually enhanced retriever, boosting scalability by using independent sentence encoders for query and candidate, while still maintaining accurate predictions.

### 3 Proposed Method

#### 3.1 Model Architecture

Comparing Multiple Candidates, CMC, employs self-attention layers to capture both query-candidate and candidate-candidate interactions. Contrary to other late interaction models (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020; Humeau et al., 2019; Yang et al., 2023), which compute the matching scores by only comparing a query and an individual candidate, CMC considers the query in conjunction with all candidates simultaneously. In other words, CMC enriches each candidate’s representation by contextualizing it with other candidates and the query. In addition, this architecture enables the processing of multiple candidates in a scalable manner by pre-computing individual candidate embeddings as discussed in §3.2. The overall architecture in Figure 1.(d) provides a high-level picture of the CMC, describing how it integrates and processes multiple candidate interactions given a single query. In detail, the self-attention layer is designed to process the aggregated encoder output (i.e.  $[CLS]$  token embedding) of the query and multiple candidates.

The outputs are derived from our query encoder  $\text{Enc}_{qry}$  and candidate encoder  $\text{Enc}_{can}$ .

**Query and Candidate Encoders** Prior to CMC, the initial retriever identifies the candidate set with  $K$  elements  $C_q = \{c_{q,1}, \dots, c_{q,K}\}$  for query  $q$ . Each query and candidate is represented by tokens  $x_q$  and  $x_{c_{q,j}}$ . Initially, CMC obtains the aggregated output of query sentence tokens ( $\mathbf{h}_q^{sent}$ ) and candidate sentence tokens ( $\mathbf{h}_{c_{q,j}}^{sent}$ ) from the query encoder  $\text{Enc}_{qry}$  and the candidate encoder  $\text{Enc}_{can}$ . These encoders play the same role as conventional bi-encoders in that condensing each query and candidate information into single vector embedding, but are trained separately from bi-encoders for the initial stage retriever.

$$\mathbf{h}_q^{sent} = \text{aggregator}(\text{Enc}_{qry}([\text{CLS}]x_q^0 \dots x_q^k)) \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{h}_{c_{q,j}}^{sent} = \text{aggregator}(\text{Enc}_{can}([\text{CLS}]x_{c_{q,j}}^0 \dots x_{c_{q,j}}^k)) \quad (4)$$

The aggregator function extracts  $[CLS]$  token embeddings from the last layer of each encoder<sup>2</sup>.

**Self-attention Layer** The self-attention layer jointly processes concatenated embeddings of a query and all candidate sentences. This lightweight module enables parallel computation (*efficient*) and generates contextualized embeddings that capture query-candidate and candidate-candidate interaction (*effective*). Representing candidates together with self-attention enables fine-grained comparison among candidates. The self-attention layer consists of two layers of vanilla transformer encoder (Vaswani et al., 2017) in Pytorch without positional encoding.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \mathbf{h}_q^{\text{CMC}}; \mathbf{h}_{c_{q,1}}^{\text{CMC}}; \dots; \mathbf{h}_{c_{q,K}}^{\text{CMC}} \right] \\ &= \text{SelfAttn} \left( \left[ \mathbf{h}_q^{sent}; \mathbf{h}_{c_{q,1}}^{sent}; \dots; \mathbf{h}_{c_{q,K}}^{sent} \right] \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Consequently, CMC computes the final prediction  $\hat{c}_q$  via dot products of query and candidate embeddings from the self-attention layer:

$$\hat{c}_q = \arg \max_{c_{q,j} \in C_q} \mathbf{h}_q^{\text{CMC}} \cdot \left( \mathbf{h}_{c_{q,j}}^{\text{CMC}} \right)^\top \quad (6)$$

<sup>2</sup>For entity linking tasks, both the query (mention) and candidate (entity) sentences include custom special tokens that denote the locations of mention and entity words. These include  $[\text{SEP}]$ ,  $[\text{query\_start}]$ ,  $[\text{query\_end}]$ , and  $[\text{DOC}]$  tokens following Wu et al. (2020).



### 3.2 Inference

**Offline Indexing** CMC is capable of pre-computing and storing candidate embeddings offline, unlike cross-encoders (Logeswaran et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2020) (Figure 1). CMC processes the candidates in the collection (e.g. knowledge base) and stores a single embedding for each. As demonstrated in Section 4.4, offline indexing significantly reduces the inference time compared to that of cross-encoders. Furthermore, it allows the runtime performance of CMC to be comparable to that of bi-encoders. While reducing time complexity, the space requirement for our model is less than 1% of that required by Sum-of-Max and Deformer, as these models necessitate every token embedding for scoring, whereas CMC requires only a single vector embedding per candidate.

**Parallel Computation** Given multiple GPUs, the end-to-end runtime for retrieving and reranking with CMC can be comparable to that of bi-encoders retrieval. This is achieved through parallel computation of query encoders at bi-encoders and CMC (Figure 2). Consequently, the additional latency for running CMC is limited to the execution of a few encoder stacks within the self-attention layer.

### 3.3 CMC as a Virtually Enhanced Retriever

The parallel computation of CMC (Section 3.2) offers an experience of *virtually enhanced retriever*, requiring only a slight increase in computing resources (*virtual*) while significantly improving recall at various K ( $\uparrow R@K$ ) (*enhanced*). This process begins with initial retrievers such as bi-encoders, which retrieve a broad set of candidates. CMC then narrows this set down to a more manageable number for cross-encoders (e.g., 64 or fewer). Since CMC can rerank candidates from the initial retriever with only a marginal increase in latency, the runtime for bi-encoders is comparable to that of a *virtually enhanced retriever* running bi-encoders and CMC in parallel. Consequently, the improved recall contributes to the performance increase of the final stage reranker (e.g., cross-encoders) at a marginal cost, optimizing overall performance with comparable efficiency (Section 4.3).

### 3.4 CMC as a Reranker

The obvious application of CMC is the final stage reranker whose goal is to increase  $R@1$  as well as  $R@K$ . Effective reranking is achieved by contextualizing the query and the candidates concerning

each other while maintaining efficiency by utilizing a single vector embedding for each. In the training stage, CMC is typically fed with 64 candidates per query. Surprisingly, this training setup remains effective for a varying number of candidates at the inference stage. For example, even though CMC was trained with 64 candidates on the MS MARCO passage ranking dataset, it shows effectiveness when handling up to 1,000 candidates (Section §4.4). This evidence not only emphasizes the scalability of CMC but also its robustness in processing a diverse distribution of candidates.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Dataset

To assess the empirical impact of CMC, we conduct our experiments on entity linking, passage ranking, and dialogue ranking tasks, where the retrieve-and-rerank approach is commonly employed. For entity linking, we utilize datasets linked to the Wikipedia knowledge base (AIDA-CoNLL (Hofbart et al., 2011), WNED-CWEB (Guo and Barbosa, 2018), and MSNBC (Cucerzan, 2007)), as well as a ZEROSHOT Entity Linking dataset (ZeSHEL; Logeswaran et al. (2019)) based on the Wikia<sup>3</sup> knowledge base. The candidates are retrieved from bi-encoders fine-tuned for each knowledge base (Wu et al., 2020; Yadav et al., 2022). For passage ranking, we conduct an experiment on MS MARCO with 1K candidates from BM25 as an initial retriever following Bajaj et al. (2016). For dialogue ranking tasks, we test our model on DSTC7 challenge (Track 1) (Yoshino et al., 2019), where conversations are extracted from technical support chat. For more details, see Appendix §C.

### 4.2 Training Details

All the training details for CMC and other baselines are the same, following prior studies (Wu et al., 2020; Zhang and Stratos, 2021; Gao and Callan, 2022; Yang et al., 2023). CMC and other baselines are trained using the AdamW optimizer with a 10% warmup step. Also, we investigate different sentence encoders for CMC and late interaction models: (1) vanilla BERT and (2) BERT-based sentence encoders fine-tuned on each dataset. After training, we select the best result among them.<sup>5</sup> For

<sup>3</sup>now Fandom: <https://www.fandom.com>

<sup>4</sup>recall@64 of Poly-encoder and Sum-of-max from Zhang and Stratos (2021) is reported as 84.34 and 89.62, respectively.

<sup>5</sup>If more favorable results are found from prior works over the same candidates, we source the results from these works.

Method	Test						Speed (ms)	Index Size (GB)
	R@1	R@4	R@8	R@16	R@32	R@64		
Single-View	BM25	25.92	44.86	52.05	58.21	63.76	69.13	-
	Bi-encoder (BE <sup>♣</sup> )	52.94	64.51	71.94	81.52	84.98	87.95	568.9
	Poly-encoder <sup>♡</sup>	40.04	60.16	67.23	72.16	76.49	80.18	581.0
	Arbo-EL	50.31	68.34	74.26	78.4	82.02	85.11	-
	GER	42.86	66.48	73.00	78.11	81.11	85.65	-
	Sum-of-max <sup>♡</sup>	27.11	64.11	73.21	79.59	84.14	87.95	6393.0
	BE <sup>♣</sup> + CMC(Ours)	<b>59.08</b>	<b>77.58</b>	<b>82.91</b>	<b>86.32</b>	<b>89.33</b>	<b>91.51</b>	607.2
Multi-View	MuVER	43.49	68.78	75.87	77.65	85.86	89.52	-
	MVD	<u>52.51</u>	<u>73.43</u>	<u>79.74</u>	<u>84.35</u>	<u>88.17</u>	<u>91.55</u>	-
	MVD + CMC(Ours)	<b>59.04</b>	<b>77.77</b>	<b>83.06</b>	<b>86.71</b>	<b>89.91</b>	<b>92.36</b>	-

Table 1: Retrieval performance over ZeSHEL dataset. The best result is denoted in bold and the second-best result is underlined for each method. BE<sup>♣</sup> is bi-encoders from Yadav et al. (2022) which is used for CMC. ♡ indicates our implementation as recall@k for all k are not provided in previous work<sup>4</sup>. Our result is conducted over top-512 candidates from the initial retriever and averaged over experiments with five random seeds.

ZeSHEL, training CMC and other low-latency baselines for one epoch on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU takes approximately 4 hours. Every training detail for each dataset is outlined in Appendix §D.

### 4.3 CMC as a Virtually Enhanced Retriever

We conduct experiments on the ZeSHEL dataset to verify the impact of CMC as a *virtually enhanced retriever*. We conduct experiments on how the parallel computation of CMC reranking can achieve a higher recall@k with only a marginal increase in computational cost compared to conventional bi-encoders. We also evaluate how improved recall@k can enhance the performance of cross-encoders’ reranking. To do so, we compare how well cross-encoders rerank candidates filtered only by the bi-encoders versus those further refined by CMC.

**Baselines** To assess CMC’s performance as a retriever, we compare CMC against baselines categorized into two types: single-view and multi-view retriever.<sup>6</sup> As an initial retriever that provides candidates for CMC, we use bi-encoders fine-tuned for ZeSHEL (Yadav et al., 2022) for the single-view retriever, and MVD (Liu et al., 2023) for multi-view retriever. As baselines, we select baselines such as the poly-encoder (Humeau et al., 2019), Sum-of-max (Zhang and Stratos, 2021), Arbo-EL (Agarwal et al., 2022b), and GER (Wu et al., 2023) for single-view retriever, and we include MuVER (Ma et al., 2021) and MVD (Liu et al., 2023), recognized as the SOTA retrievers for the ZeSHEL dataset.

<sup>6</sup>Single-view retrievers consider only a single global view derived from the entire sentence, whereas multi-view retrievers divide candidate information into multiple local views.

**Experimental Results** In Table 1, adopting CMC upon single-view retriever surpasses other baseline models across all k values, demonstrating its effectiveness in enhancing the end-to-end retrieval process. Also, CMC boosts recall@64 to 91.51% with candidates from the initial retriever whose recall@64 is 87.95%, with a marginal increase in latency (+0.07x). Similarly, operating CMC with MVD shows that *virtually enhanced retriever* consistently improves recall performance, regardless of the initial retriever used. It leads to an increase in performance, moving from 91.55 to 92.36 at recall@64. For the effect of the number of candidates from the initial retriever, see appendix §E.2.

To assess the effect of candidates retrieved from CMC on the overall performance, we analyze the subsequent cross-encoder’s reranking performance in Table 2. We explore various combinations where candidates are selected from either bi-encoders or CMC, in groups of (8, 16, 64). These candidates from CMC are initially selected from pools of (64, 256, 512) provided by bi-encoders which are the same or larger than 64 that typical cross-encoders consider.

A key finding presented in the table is that CMC’s scalability to search over a broad set enables it to provide better candidates for cross-encoders. By filtering candidates from bi-encoders to fewer, CMC effectively narrows down the most promising candidates for cross-encoders. In Table 2, the performances of cross-encoders with 16 candidates from CMC which filters out 256 or 512 candidates (row 8-9) are slightly better than their best results with 64 bi-encoder candidates (row 3), with a significant reduction in latency, making it 1.75 times faster

by presenting fewer candidates for cross-encoders. Furthermore, cross-encoders reach their best performance with candidates from CMC. When using 64 candidates from CMC (row 11), cross-encoders surpass their performance with an equal number of bi-encoder candidates (row 3) by 0.17 points in macro accuracy.

Row	Retrieved (k)		Recall@k	Unnormalized Accuracy				Macro Avg.	Comparative Latency (%)
	Bi-encoder	CMC		Forgotten Realms	Lego	Star Trek	Yugioh		
1	8	-	77.72	78.92	65.14	62.76	48.64	63.87	38.90%
2	16	-	81.52	80.17	66.14	63.69	49.64	64.91	48.85%
3	64	-	87.95	80.83	67.81	64.23	50.62	65.87	100%
4	64	8	82.45	80.67	66.56	<u>64.54</u>	50.71	65.62	43.04%
5	256	8	82.86	<u>80.92</u>	66.89	<u>64.42</u>	50.86	65.77	43.36%
6	512	8	82.91	80.75	67.14	<u>64.35</u>	51.01	65.81	43.55%
7	64	16	85.46	80.5	66.97	<u>64.47</u>	50.68	65.66	56.76%
8	256	16	86.22	80.75	67.31	<b>64.63</b>	51.1	<u>65.95</u>	57.08%
9	512	16	86.22	<u>80.83</u>	67.64	<u>64.49</u>	50.95	<u>65.98</u>	57.27%
10	256	64	<u>90.91</u>	<b>81.17</b>	67.64	<u>64.37</u>	50.92	<u>66.03</u>	104.46%
11	512	64	<b>91.51</b>	<u>81.00</u>	<b>67.89</b>	<u>64.42</u>	50.86	<b>66.04</b>	104.65%

Table 2: Unnormalized accuracy of cross-encoders across various candidate configurations on the ZeSHEL dataset. We underlined when the cross-encoders show superior accuracy with candidates generated by CMC compared to those from bi-encoders. The top-performing scenarios in each category are highlighted in **bold**. We measure the comparative latency required for running cross-encoders over 64 bi-encoder candidates (260.84ms). For your reference, the CMC runtime is 2x when increasing the number of candidates by 16x (from 128 to 1048), while able to compare up to 16k candidates at once. (Appendix E.1)

#### 4.4 CMC as a Reranker

**Baselines** In Table 3, baseline models are categorized into high-latency, intermediate-latency, and low-latency models. We adopt cross-encoders as our primary baseline for the high-latency approach. For the intermediate-latency models, we include *Deformer* and *Sum-of-max*, which utilize all vector embeddings to represent candidate information. For the low-latency models, we include the *Bi-encoder*, *Poly-encoder*, and *Mixencoder*, all of which require a single vector embedding for representation and have a serving time similar to that of the *Bi-encoder*. In this context, CMC is classified as a low-latency method because it requires a single embedding for the candidate and takes 1.17x serving time of the *Bi-encoder*.

**Comparison with High-latency Models** Given the critical importance of computational resources and serving time in applications, CMC can be a highly practical alternative to cross-encoders. CMC shows 11.02x speedup and comparable prediction performance. CMC outperforms the cross-encoder in the Wikipedia entity linking (+0.7 accuracy points) and DSTC7 dataset (+3.3 MRR

points) and presents a competitive performance in MS MARCO and ZeSHEL dataset, achieving the second- or third-best prediction performance. This comparison in performance underscores the significant role of the self-attention layer in CMC, suggesting that it effectively replaces the token-by-token interaction in cross-encoders with a balance between accuracy and computational efficiency.

#### Comparison with Intermediate-latency Models

When compared with intermediate-latency models such as Deformer and Sum-of-max, CMC demonstrates its capability not just in memory efficiency but also in maintaining competitive performance. CMC mostly surpasses these models in entity linking and passage ranking tasks. Also, CMC offers significant improvements in computational speed over Deformer (1.17x vs. 4.39x) and Sum-of-max without caching (1.17x vs. 5.20x).

For Sum-of-max with caching, it poses a critical issue in memory efficiency, requiring an index size 125 times larger than that of CMC. This gap becomes critical in terms of memory efficiency and scalability when managing extensive document collections. For instance, Sum-of-max and deformer require 3.2 TB to store just 5M entity descriptions from Wikipedia with 128 tokens, while CMC requires 23GB to store the same entities. As the knowledge base and document collections continuously change and grow, the operational feasibility of these systems quickly becomes impractical. Furthermore, the need to frequently update the embeddings to integrate the latest advances from pre-trained language models adds another layer of complexity and resource demand.

This analysis suggests that CMC’s single-vector approach is not only significantly faster under practical resource constraints but also demonstrates a comparable ability to represent candidate information with less information, occasionally surpassing more complex methods.

**Comparison with Low-latency Models** In comparison with low-latency models, CMC matches or surpasses the performance of other baselines like Bi-encoder, Poly-encoder, and Mixencoder across different datasets. When compared with bi-encoders, the architectural distinctions contribute to CMC’s enhanced performance across every dataset. It shows the effectiveness of the CMC’s self-attention layer over the simple dot product. When evaluated against the Poly-encoder, CMC falls short on conversational datasets, as reported by

Tasks Datasets		Entity Linking		Passage Ranking		Dialogue Ranking		Computational Efficiency	
		Wikipedia	ZeSHEL	MS MARCO	Dev	DSTC7 Challenge		Total Speed	Extra Memory
		Accuracy	Accuracy	R@1	MRR@10	R@1	MRR@10		
High-latency	Cross-encoder	80.2±0.2	<b>65.9<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>36.8</b>	64.7	73.2	12.9x	-
Intermediate-Latency	Deformer	79.6±0.8	63.6±0.3	23.0 <sup>†</sup>	35.7 <sup>†</sup>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>76.4</b>	4.39x	125x
	Sum-of-max	80.7±0.2	58.8±1.0	22.8 <sup>†</sup>	35.4 <sup>†</sup>	66.9	75.5	5.20x	-
	- w/ offline indexing	80.7±0.2	58.8±1.0	22.8 <sup>†</sup>	35.4 <sup>†</sup>	66.9	75.5	1.05x	125x
Low-Latency	Bi-encoder	77.1 <sup>†</sup>	52.9 <sup>†</sup>	22.9	35.3	67.8	75.1	1x	1x
	Poly-encoder	80.2±0.1	57.6±0.6	23.5	35.8	<u>68.6</u>	<u>76.3</u>	1.01x	1.0x
	MixEncoder	75.4±1.4	57.6±0.3	20.7 <sup>†</sup>	32.5 <sup>†</sup>	68.2 <sup>†</sup>	75.8 <sup>†</sup>	1.12x	1.0x
	CMC (Ours)	<b>80.9±0.1</b>	59.2±0.3	<u>23.9</u>	<u>35.9</u>	68.0	75.7	1.17x	1.0x

Table 3: Reranking Performance on four datasets with three downstream tasks: Entity Linking (Wikipedia-KB based datasets (Hoffart et al., 2011; Guo and Barbosa, 2018; Cucerzan, 2007), ZeSHEL (Logeswaran et al., 2019), Passage Ranking (MS MARCO Passage Ranking (Bajaj et al., 2016), and Dialogue Ranking (Gunasekara et al., 2019)). The best result is denoted in **bold** and the second-best result is underlined. MRR stands for mean reciprocal rank and R@1 stands for recall at 1. In the entity linking datasets, the results are derived from averages across five random seeds. To show the computing resources required for the reranking process, we define reranking latency in terms of relative latency and additional memory usage compared to bi-encoders. <sup>†</sup> indicates that the results are sourced from Wu et al. (2020); Yang et al. (2023); Yadav et al. (2022), respectively.

Humeau et al. (2019). However, it outperforms Poly-encoder on other datasets not covered in the original baseline paper, which shows the robustness of CMC in handling more complex tasks than dialogue ranking. Similarly, CMC outperforms Mix-Encoder in entity linking and passage ranking.

#### 4.5 Ablation Study

In Table 4, we explore the impact of different initialization checkpoints for sentence encoder on ZeSHEL reranking performance. We considered three sources for initialization: pre-trained BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), ZeSHEL-fine-tuned bi-encoders (Yadav et al., 2022), and MS-MARCO-fine-tuned-Cocondenser (Guo and Barbosa, 2018). For CMC, we find that initializing with a fine-tuned model significantly enhances performance. In contrast, Cocondenser leads to a performance decline in bi-encoders, highlighting CMC’s ability to facilitate domain adaptation of the sentence encoder. In poly-encoder and mixencoder, a similar trend to CMC is found, which can be attributed to their use of a single vector embedding from the candidate. On the other hand, Sum-of-max and Deformer demonstrate fairly consistent performance across various sentence encoders, likely because they use entire token embeddings, making them less sensitive to initialization choices.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we present Comparing Multiple Candidates (CMC) which offers a novel approach to retrieve and rerank framework, addressing key issues in scalability and runtime efficiency. By utilizing

language models for independent encoding and leveraging the self-attention layer, CMC achieves a balance of speed and effectiveness. Its ability to pre-compute candidate representations offline significantly reduces latency, making it a practical solution for enhancing end-to-end performance. Extensive experimentation validates CMC’s effectiveness, marking it as a promising advancement in the field of neural retrieval and reranking.

Methods	Bi-Encoder Initialization			ZeSHEL	
	Vanilla BERT	Fine-tuned w/ ZeSHEL	Fine-tuned w/ MS MARCO	Valid	Test
Deformer	✓			<b>65.40</b>	<b>63.58</b>
		✓		64.42	62.43
			✓	57.01	57.46
Sum-of-max	✓			<b>59.57</b>	58.37
		✓		58.77	57.65
			✓	59.15	<b>58.79</b>
Bi-encoder	✓			<b>55.45</b>	<b>52.94</b>
			✓	49.32	44.01
Poly-encoder	✓			53.37	52.49
		✓		55.75	54.22
			✓	<b>57.41</b>	<b>58.22</b>
MixEncoder	✓			58.63	57.92
		✓		58.52	57.68
			✓	<b>58.52</b>	<b>57.70</b>
CMC(Ours)	✓			56.15	55.34
		✓		58.04	56.20
			✓	<b>60.05</b>	<b>59.23</b>

Table 4: Comparison of unnormalized accuracy (U.Acc.) on ZeSHEL dataset over different initialization checkpoints (BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), Bi-encoder (Yadav et al., 2022) fine-tuned for ZeSHEL, and Cocondenser (Guo et al., 2020)) fine-tuned for MS MARCO. We denote the best case for each method as bold.



## References

- Dhruv Agarwal, Rico Angell, Nicholas Monath, and Andrew McCallum. 2022a. Entity linking via explicit mention-mention coreference modeling. In Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, pages 4644–4658.
- Sumit Agarwal, Suraj Tripathi, Teruko Mitamura, and Carolyn Rose. 2022b. Zero-shot cross-lingual open domain question answering. In Proceedings of the Workshop on Multilingual Information Access (MIA), pages 91–99.
- Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, et al. 2016. Ms marco: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09268.
- Qingqing Cao, Harsh Trivedi, Aruna Balasubramanian, and Niranjan Balasubramanian. 2020. DeFormer: Decomposing pre-trained transformers for faster question answering. In Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 4487–4497, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Silviu Cucerzan. 2007. Large-scale named entity disambiguation based on wikipedia data. In Proceedings of the 2007 joint conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and computational natural language learning (EMNLP-CoNLL), pages 708–716.
- Nicola De Cao, Gautier Izacard, Sebastian Riedel, and Fabio Petroni. 2020. Autoregressive entity retrieval. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00904.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805.
- Luyu Gao and Jamie Callan. 2022. Unsupervised corpus aware language model pre-training for dense passage retrieval. In Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 2843–2853.
- Daniel Gillick, Sayali Kulkarni, Larry Lansing, Alessandro Presta, Jason Baldridge, Eugene Ie, and Diego Garcia-Olano. 2019. Learning dense representations for entity retrieval. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10506.
- Chulaka Gunasekara, Jonathan K Kummerfeld, Lazaros Polymenakos, and Walter Lasecki. 2019. Dstc7 task 1: Noetic end-to-end response selection. In Proceedings of the First Workshop on NLP for Conversational AI, pages 60–67.
- Ruiqi Guo, Philip Sun, Erik Lindgren, Quan Geng, David Simcha, Felix Chern, and Sanjiv Kumar. 2020. Accelerating large-scale inference with anisotropic vector quantization. In International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 3887–3896. PMLR.
- Zhaochen Guo and Denilson Barbosa. 2018. Robust named entity disambiguation with random walks. Semantic Web, 9(4):459–479.
- Shuguang Han, Xuanhui Wang, Mike Bendersky, and Marc Najork. 2020. Learning-to-rank with bert in tf-ranking. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08476.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 770–778.
- Johannes Hoffart, Mohamed Amir Yosef, Ilaria Bordino, Hagen Fürstenauf, Manfred Pinkal, Marc Spaniol, Bilyana Taneva, Stefan Thater, and Gerhard Weikum. 2011. Robust disambiguation of named entities in text. In Proceedings of the 2011 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing, pages 782–792.
- Samuel Humeau, Kurt Shuster, Marie-Anne Lachaux, and Jason Weston. 2019. Poly-encoders: Transformer architectures and pre-training strategies for fast and accurate multi-sentence scoring. arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.01969.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04906.
- Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over bert. In Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval, pages 39–48.
- Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. Latent retrieval for weakly supervised open domain question answering. arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.00300.
- Yi Liu, Yuan Tian, Jianxun Lian, Xinlong Wang, Yanan Cao, Fang Fang, Wen Zhang, Haizhen Huang, Denvy Deng, and Qi Zhang. 2023. Towards better entity linking with multi-view enhanced distillation. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17371.
- Lajanugen Logeswaran, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Jacob Devlin, and Honglak Lee. 2019. Zero-shot entity linking by reading entity descriptions. In Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, pages 3449–3460.

- Xinyin Ma, Yong Jiang, Nguyen Bach, Tao Wang, Zhongqiang Huang, Fei Huang, and Weiming Lu. 2021. Muver: improving first-stage entity retrieval with multi-view entity representations. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05716](#).
- Ida Mele, Cristina Ioana Muntean, Franco Maria Nardini, Raffaele Perego, Nicola Tonellotto, and Ophir Frieder. 2020. Topic propagation in conversational search. In [Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval](#), pages 2057–2060.
- Rodrigo Nogueira and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Passage re-ranking with bert. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.04085](#).
- Rodrigo Nogueira, Wei Yang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Jimmy Lin. 2019a. Multi-stage document ranking with bert. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.14424](#).
- Rodrigo Nogueira, Wei Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019b. Document expansion by query prediction. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08375](#).
- Chen Qu, Liu Yang, Cen Chen, Minghui Qiu, W Bruce Croft, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. Open-retrieval conversational question answering. In [Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval](#), pages 539–548.
- Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2021. Colbertv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01488](#).
- Xiaoyu Shen, Svitlana Vakulenko, Marco Del Tredici, Gianni Barlacchi, Bill Byrne, and Adrià de Gispert. 2022. Low-resource dense retrieval for open-domain question answering: A comprehensive survey. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03197](#).
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. [Advances in neural information processing systems](#), 30.
- Ledell Wu, Fabio Petroni, Martin Josifoski, Sebastian Riedel, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2020. Scalable zero-shot entity linking with dense entity retrieval. In [Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing \(EMNLP\)](#), pages 6397–6407.
- Taiqiang Wu, Xingyu Bai, Weigang Guo, Weijie Liu, Siheng Li, and Yujiu Yang. 2023. Modeling fine-grained information via knowledge-aware hierarchical graph for zero-shot entity retrieval. In [Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining](#), pages 1021–1029.
- Zhenran Xu, Yulin Chen, Baotian Hu, and Min Zhang. 2023. A read-and-select framework for zero-shot entity linking. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12450](#).
- Nishant Yadav, Nicholas Monath, Rico Angell, Manzil Zaheer, and Andrew McCallum. 2022. Efficient nearest neighbor search for cross-encoder models using matrix factorization. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.12579](#).
- Yuanhang Yang, Shiyi Qi, Chuanyi Liu, Qifan Wang, Cuiyun Gao, and Zenglin Xu. 2023. Once is enough: A light-weight cross-attention for fast sentence pair modeling. In [Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 2800–2806, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Koichiro Yoshino, Chiori Hori, Julien Perez, Luis Fernando D’Haro, Lazaros Polymenakos, Chulaka Gunasekara, Walter S Lasecki, Jonathan K Kummerfeld, Michel Galley, Chris Brockett, et al. 2019. Dialog system technology challenge 7. [arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.03461](#).
- Wenzheng Zhang and Karl Stratos. 2021. Understanding hard negatives in noise contrastive estimation. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.06245](#).
- Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Guangwei Xu, and Pengjun Xie. 2022. Hlatr: enhance multi-stage text retrieval with hybrid list aware transformer reranking. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10569](#).

## A Limitations

In the future, we plan to test the CMC’s performance with over 1000 candidates using batch processing. This is because it has not yet been extensively researched whether CMC can effectively retrieve from a large collection, e.g. a collection comprising more than 1 million candidates. Furthermore, we plan to tackle the issue that arises from the concurrent operation of both a bi-encoder and CMC index, which currently requires double the index size. This is a consequence of running two separate encoder models in parallel. To address this, we will investigate various data compression techniques aimed at reducing the space footprint, thereby enhancing the practicality and efficiency of running both the Bi-encoder and CMC simultaneously.

## B Potential Risks

This research examines methods to accelerate the two-stage retrieval and reranking process using efficient and effective CMC. While the proposed CMC might exhibit specific biases and error patterns, we do not address these biases in this study. It remains uncertain how these biases might affect our predictions, an issue we plan to explore in future research.

## C Detailed Information of Datasets

**Wikipedia Entity Linking** For standard entity linking, we use AIDA-CoNLL dataset (Hoffart et al., 2011) for in-domain evaluation, and WNED-CWEB (Guo and Barbosa, 2018) and MSNBC (Cucerzan, 2007) datasets for out-of-domain evaluation. These datasets share the same Wikipedia entity linking set. For comparison with the baseline results from (Wu et al., 2020), we employ the 2019 English Wikipedia dump, containing 5.9M entities. We employed a bi-encoder as an initial retriever that yields an average unnormalized accuracy of 77.09 and a recall@10 of 89.21. Unnormalized accuracy is measured for each dataset and macro-averaged for test sets.

Regarding the license for each dataset, AIDA-CoNLL dataset is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. We are not able to find any license information about WNED-CWEB and MSNBC datasets.

**Zero-shot Entity Linking (ZeSHEL)** ZeSHEL (Logeswaran et al., 2019) contains mutually exclusive entity sets between training and test data.

The dataset comprises context sentences (queries) each containing a mention linked to a corresponding gold entity description within Wikia knowledge base. The entity domain, also called “world”, varying from 10K to 100K entities, is unique to each domain, testing the model’s ability to generalize to new entities. We employed a bi-encoder from (Yadav et al., 2022) whose recall@64 is 87.95. On top of these candidate sets, we report macro-averaged unnormalized accuracy, which is calculated for those mention sets that are successfully retrieved by the retriever and macro-averaged across a set of entity domains. For statistics of entity linking datasets, see Table 5. ZeSHEL is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA).

The predominant approach for reranking in ZeSHEL dataset is based on top-64 candidate sets from official BM25 (Logeswaran et al., 2019) or bi-encoder (Wu et al., 2020; Yadav et al., 2022). On top of these candidate sets, we report macro-averaged normalized accuracy, which is calculated for those mention sets that are successfully retrieved by the retriever and macro-averaged across a set of entity domains.

Dataset		# of Mentions	# of Entities
AIDA	Train	18848	
	Valid (A)	4791	
	Valid (B)	4485	5903530
MSNBC		656	
WNED-WIKI		6821	
ZeSHEL	Train	49275	332632
	Valid	10000	89549
	Test	10000	70140

Table 5: Statistics of Entity Linking datasets.

**MS MARCO** We use a popular passage ranking dataset MS MARCO which consists of 8.8 million web page passages. MS MARCO originates from Bing’s question-answering dataset with pairs of queries and passages, the latter marked as relevant if it includes the answer. Each query is associated with one or more relevant documents, but the dataset does not explicitly denote irrelevant ones, leading to the potential risk of false negatives. For evaluation, models are fine-tuned with approximately 500K training queries, and MRR@10, Recall@1 are used as a metric. To compare our model with other baselines, we employed Anserini’s BM25 (Nogueira et al., 2019b). The dataset is licensed under Creative Commons

Attribution 4.0 International.

**DSTC 7 Challenge (Track 1)** For conversation ranking datasets, we involve The DSTC7 challenge (Track 1) (Yoshino et al., 2019). DSTC 7 involves dialogues taken from Ubuntu chat records, in which one participant seeks technical assistance for diverse Ubuntu-related issues. For these datasets, an official candidate set which includes gold is provided. For details for MS MARCO and DSTC 7 Challenge, see Table 6

Datasets	Train	Valid	Test	# of Candidates per Query
MS MARCO	498970	6898	6837	1000
DSTC 7	100000	10000	5000	100

Table 6: Statistics of MS MARCO & Conversation Ranking Datasets.

## D Training Details

**Negative Sampling** Most of previous studies that train reranker (Wu et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2023) employ a fixed set of top- $k$  candidates from the retriever. In contrast, our approach adopts hard negative sampling, a technique derived from studies focused on training retrievers (Zhang and Stratos, 2021). Some negative candidates are sampled based on the retriever’s scoring for query-candidate pair  $(q, c_{q,j})$ :

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, K\} \setminus \{\text{gold index}\},$$

$$\tilde{c}_{q,j} \sim \frac{\exp(s_{\text{retriever}}(q, \tilde{c}_{q,j}))}{\sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \neq \text{gold index}}}^K \exp(s_{\text{retriever}}(q, \tilde{c}_{q,k}))} \quad (7)$$

To provide competitive and diverse negatives for the reranker,  $p\%$  of the negatives are fixed as the top- $k$  negatives, while the others are sampled following the score distribution.

As detailed in Table 7, we implement a hard negative mining strategy for training CMC and comparable baseline methods. Specifically, for the MS MARCO dataset, hard negatives are defined as the top 63 negatives derived from the CoCondenser model, as outlined in (Gao and Callan, 2022). In the case of entity linking datasets, we adhere to the approach established by (Zhang and Stratos, 2021), where hard negatives are selected from the top 1024 candidates generated by a bi-encoder. Meanwhile, for dialogue ranking datasets, we do not employ hard negative mining, owing to the absence of candidate pool within these datasets.

**Sentence Encoder Initialization** The initial starting point for both the query and candidate encoders can significantly impact performance. The sentence encoders for late interaction models including CMC are initialized using either vanilla huggingface BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) or other BERT-based, fine-tuned models. These models include those fine-tuned on the Wikipedia dataset (BLINK-biencoder; Wu et al. (2020)) or MS MARCO (Cocondenser; Gao and Callan (2022)). As cross-encoder is the only model without sentence encoder, we initialize cross-encoder only using vanilla BERT.

We initialize the sentence encoder for CMC and other baselines using (1) vanilla BERT and (2) the BLINK bi-encoder for Wikipedia entity linking datasets, and the MS-MARCO fine-tuned Cocondenser for other datasets. After conducting experiments with both starting points, we selected the best result among them. If more favorable results are found from prior works that conduct reranking over the same candidates, we sourced the numbers from these works.

**Optimization** Our model employs multi-class cross-entropy as the loss function, regularized by Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the reranker’s scores and the retriever’s scores. The loss function is formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(q, \tilde{C}_q) = -\lambda_1 \sum_{i=1}^K y_i \log(p_i) + \lambda_2 \sum_{i=1}^K p_i \log\left(\frac{p_i}{r_i}\right) \quad (8)$$

For the query  $q$ ,  $y_i$  represents the ground truth label for each candidate  $\tilde{c}_{q,i}$ ,  $p_i$  is the predicted probability for candidate  $\tilde{c}_{q,i}$  derived from the score function  $s_\theta$ ,  $r_i$  is the probability of the same candidate from the retriever’s distribution, and  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are coefficients forming a convex combination of the two losses.

**Extra Skip Connection** CMC is trained end-to-end, where the self-attention layer is trained concurrently with the query and candidate encoders. In addition to the inherent skip connections present in the transformer encoder, we have introduced an extra skip connection following (He et al., 2016) to address the vanishing gradient problem commonly encountered in deeper network layers. Specifically, for an encoder layer consisting of self-attention layer  $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})$ , the output is now formulated as  $\mathbf{x} + \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})$ , with  $\mathbf{x}$  being the input embedding.



	Entity Linking		Passage Ranking	Dialogue Ranking
	AIDA-train	ZeSHEL	MS MARCO	DSTC7
Sentence Encoder Initialization	BERT-large	BERT-base	BERT-base	BERT-base
max. query length	32	128	32	512
max. document length	128	128	128	512
learning rate	<b>{1e-5,5e-6,2e-6}</b>	<b>{1e-5,2e-5,5e-5}</b>	<b>{1e-5,5e-6,2e-6}</b>	<b>{1e-5,2e-5,5e-5}</b>
batch size	4	4	8	8
hard negatives ratio	0.5	0.5	1	-
# of negatives	63	63	63	7
training epochs	4	5	3	10

Table 7: Hyperparameters for each dataset. We perform a grid search on learning rate and the best-performing learning rate is indicated as bold.




Figure 3: The relationship between the number of candidates and the corresponding time measurements in milliseconds for two different models: Cross-encoder (CE) and Comparing Multiple Candidates (CMC).

This training strategy ensures a more effective gradient flow during backpropagation, thereby improving the training stability and performance of our model.

## E Additional Results and Analysis

### E.1 Reranking Latency of cross-encoders and CMC

In Figure 3, we present the plot of runtime against the number of candidates. For CMC, the model can handle up to 16,384 candidates per query, which is comparable to the speed of cross-encoders for running 64 candidates. Running more than 128 and 16,384 candidates cause memory error on GPU for cross-encoders and CMC, respectively.

### E.2 Effect of Number of Candidates on Retrieval Performance

In Table 8, we present detailed results of retrieval performance on varying numbers of candidates from the initial bi-encoder. Recall@k increased with a higher number of candidates. It indicates

that CMC enables the retrieval of gold instances that could not be retrieved by a bi-encoder, which prevents error propagation from the retriever. It is also noteworthy that CMC, which was trained using 64 candidates, demonstrates the capacity to effectively process and infer from a larger candidate pool (256 and 512) while giving an increase in recall@64 from 82.45 to 82.91.

### E.3 Detailed Information of Entity Linking Performance

In Table 9, we present detailed results from Wikipedia entity linking datasets. Also, in table 10, we present detailed results for each world in ZeSHEL test set.

### E.4 Ranking Performance on ZeSHEL BM25 candidate sets

In many previous works (Wu et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2023), the performance of models over BM25 candidates (Logeswaran et al., 2019) has been reported. In Table 11, we present the performance of CMC to illustrate its positioning within this research landscape.

### E.5 Ablation Study on Training Strategies

In Table 12, we evaluated the impact of different training strategies on the CMC’s reranking performance on the ZeSHEL test set. The removal of extra skip connections results in only a slight decrease ranging from 0.03 to 0.39 points in normalized accuracy. Also, to examine the effects of a bi-encoder retriever, we remove regularization from the loss. It leads to a performance drop but still shows higher performance than ColBERT, the most powerful baseline in the low latency method. Lastly, we tried to find the influence of negative sampling by using fixed negatives instead of mixed negatives. The result shows a marginal decline

Method	Test						Valid	
	R@1	R@4	R@8	R@16	R@32	R@64	R@1	R@64
Bi-encoder	52.94	64.51	71.94	81.52	84.98	87.95	55.45	92.04
Bi + CMC(64)	<b>59.22</b>	<b>77.69</b>	82.45	85.46	87.28	87.95	<b>60.27</b>	92.04
Bi + CMC(128)	59.13	<u>77.65</u>	82.72	85.84	88.29	89.83	<u>60.24</u>	93.22
Bi + CMC(256)	<u>59.13</u>	77.6	<u>82.86</u>	<u>86.21</u>	<u>88.96</u>	<u>90.93</u>	60.13	<u>93.63</u>
Bi + CMC(512)	59.08	77.58	<b>82.91</b>	<b>86.32</b>	<b>89.33</b>	<b>91.51</b>	60.1	<b>93.89</b>

Table 8: Retrieval performance by the number of candidates from the initial retriever. The numbers in parentheses (e.g., 128 for cmc(128)) indicate the number of candidates which CMC compares, initially retrieved by the bi-encoder. The best result is denoted in bold and the second-best result is underlined.

Method	Valid (A)	Test (B)	MSNBC*	WNED-CWEB*	Average
High-Latency Cross-encoder	82.12	80.27	85.09	68.25	77.87
High-Latency Cross-encoder <sup>†</sup>	87.15	83.96	86.69	69.11	80.22
Intermediate-Latency Sum-of-max <sup>†</sup>	<u>90.84</u>	<b>85.30</b>	86.07	<b>70.65</b>	<u>80.67</u>
Intermediate-Latency Deformer <sup>†</sup>	90.64	84.57	82.92	66.97	78.16
Low-Latency Bi-encoder	81.45	79.51	84.28	67.47	77.09
Low-Latency Poly-encoder <sup>†</sup>	90.64	84.79	<u>86.30</u>	69.39	80.16
Low-Latency MixEncoder <sup>†</sup>	89.92	82.69	78.24	64.00	76.27
Low-Latency CMC <sup>†</sup>	<b>91.16</b>	<u>85.03</u>	<b>87.35</b>	<u>70.34</u>	<b>80.91</b>

Table 9: Unnormalized accuracy on Wikipedia entity linking dataset (AIDA (Hoffart et al., 2011), MSNBC (Cucerzan, 2007), and WNED-CWEB (Guo and Barbosa, 2018)). Average means macro-averaged accuracy for three test sets. The best result is denoted in bold and the second best result is denoted as underlined. \* is out of domain dataset. <sup>†</sup> is our implementation.

Method	Valid	Test (By Worlds)					Avg.
		Forgotten Realms	Lego	Star Trek	Yugioh	Avg.	
High-Latency Cross-encoder	67.41	80.83	67.81	64.23	50.62	65.87	
High-Latency Cross-encoder (w/ CMC)	70.22	81.00	67.89	64.42	50.86	66.04	
Intermediate-Latency Sum-of-max	59.15	73.45	58.83	57.63	45.29	58.80	
Intermediate-Latency Deformer	56.95	73.08	56.98	56.24	43.55	57.46	
Low-Latency Bi-encoder	55.45	68.42	51.29	52.66	39.42	52.95	
Low-Latency Poly-encoder	57.19	71.95	58.11	56.19	43.60	57.46	
Low-Latency MixEncoder	58.64	73.17	56.29	56.99	43.01	57.36	
Low-Latency CMC(Ours)	60.05	73.92	58.96	58.08	45.69	59.16	

Table 10: Detailed Reranking Performance on Zero-shot Entity Linking (ZeSHEL) valid and test set (Logeswaran et al., 2019). Macro-averaged unnormalized accuracy is measured for candidates from Bi-encoder (Yadav et al., 2022). The best result is denoted in **bold**.

Methods	Forgotten Realms	Lego	Star Trek	Yugioh	Macro Acc.	Micro Acc.
Cross-encoder (Wu et al., 2020)	87.20	75.26	79.61	69.56	77.90	77.07
ReS (Xu et al., 2023)	<b>88.10</b>	78.44	81.69	75.84	81.02	80.40
ExtEnd (De Cao et al., 2020)	79.62	65.20	73.21	60.01	69.51	68.57
GENRE (De Cao et al., 2020)	55.20	42.71	55.76	34.68	47.09	47.06
Poly-encoder <sup>†</sup>	78.90	64.47	71.05	56.25	67.67	66.81
Sum-of-max <sup>†</sup>	83.20	68.17	73.14	64.00	72.12	71.15
Comparing Multiple Candidates (Ours)	83.20	70.63	75.75	64.83	73.35	72.41

Table 11: Test Normalized accuracy of CMC model over retrieved candidates from BM25. \* is reported from Xu et al. (2023). <sup>†</sup> is our implementation.

Methods	w/ bi-encoder retriever		w/ BM25 retriever
	Valid	Test	Test
CMC	65.29	66.83	73.1
w/o extra skip connection	64.78	66.44	73.07
w/o regularization	64.45	66.31	72.94
fixed negative	65.32	66.46	72.97

Table 12: Normalized Accuracy on ZeSHEL test set for various training strategies

# of candidates	Recall@1 (Unnormalized Accuracy)
16	65.02
64	65.87
512	65.85

Table 13: Normalized Accuracy on ZeSHEL test set for various training strategies

in the test set, which might be due to the limited impact of random negatives in training CMC.

## E.6 Reranking Performance of Cross-encoders for Various Number of Candidates

In Table 13, we evaluated the impact of the different number of candidates on the cross-encoder’s reranking performance on the ZeSHEL test set with a candidate set from the bi-encoder retriever. Even with a larger number of candidates, the unnormalized accuracy of the cross-encoder does not increase. Although the number of candidates from the bi-encoder increases from 64 to 512, recall@1 decreases by 0.01 points.