

# Graph Neural Re-Ranking via Corpus Graph

Andrea Giuseppe Di Francesco<sup>\*†‡</sup>  
difrancesco@diag.uniroma1.it

Christian Giannetti<sup>\*†</sup>  
giannetti.1904342@studenti.uniroma1.it

Nicola Tonellotto<sup>§‡</sup>  
nicola.tonellotto@unipi.it

Fabrizio Silvestri<sup>†‡</sup>  
fsilvestri@diag.uniroma1.it

## ABSTRACT

Re-ranking systems aim to reorder an initial list of documents to satisfy better the information needs associated with a user-provided query. Modern re-rankers predominantly rely on neural network models, which have proven highly effective in representing samples from various modalities. However, these models typically evaluate query-document pairs in isolation, neglecting the underlying document distribution that could enhance the quality of the re-ranked list. To address this limitation, we propose Graph Neural Re-Ranking (GNRR), a pipeline based on Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), that enables each query to consider documents distribution during inference. Our approach models document relationships through corpus subgraphs and encodes their representations using GNNs. Through extensive experiments, we demonstrate that GNNs effectively capture cross-document interactions, improving performance on popular ranking metrics. In TREC-DL19, we observe a relative improvement of 5.8% in Average Precision compared to our baseline. These findings suggest that integrating the GNN segment offers significant advantages, especially in scenarios where understanding the broader context of documents is crucial.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems.

## KEYWORDS

Graph Neural Networks, Neural Re-Ranking, Graph Neural Re-Ranking

### ACM Reference Format:

Andrea Giuseppe Di Francesco, Christian Giannetti, Nicola Tonellotto, and Fabrizio Silvestri. 2018. Graph Neural Re-Ranking via Corpus Graph. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

<sup>\*</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

<sup>†</sup>Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

<sup>‡</sup>ISTI-CNR, Pisa, Italy

<sup>§</sup>University of Pisa

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

*Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY*

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Learning to rank for Information Retrieval (IR) involves automatically creating a ranking model that sort new objects based on their relevance. Given that many IR challenges inherently revolve around ranking, applying learning-to-rank techniques can enhance various IR technologies [27]. This process typically encompasses two key stages. Firstly, during the training phase, a ranking model is developed to assign a ranking score to each query-document pair based on labeled data such as user interactions and relevance indicators. Subsequently, in the testing phase, the trained ranking model is applied to a collection of documents retrieved for a new query, ultimately delivering a ranked list of documents to the users. Considering the potentially large document collection size from which we generate our list, the ranking task is generally divided into several stages, employing different models at each stage. The rationale behind this multi-stage process is to utilize faster and less effective models in the initial stages, with numerous documents to analyze. As we filter out the more relevant ones, we use more effective models to re-rank them. This approach is also known as re-ranking. Currently, most re-ranking pipelines adopt a two-stage approach. The first stage involves document retrieval, typically employing fast retrievers such as BM25 [41]. The second stage is the re-ranking phase, usually conducted by dense and effective retrievers based on the transformer architecture [48].

When employing dense retrievers, scores are assigned to query-document pairs and sorted from highest to lowest. However, this approach has a drawback: each score is computed by considering only the individual query-document pair, neglecting the document distribution that could provide a more accurate understanding of the true relevances within a set of documents. This class of models falls under the family of uni-variate scoring functions [2]. To overcome this limitation, multi-variate scoring functions have been introduced [2, 24, 37–39], which aim to improve re-ranking performance by using relevance scores that are aware of the document distributions. These methods have demonstrated improved performance compared to the uni-variate case. In previous works, multi-variate schemes have been implemented through self-attention mechanisms [24, 37], as this operation is permutation invariant, and documents are interpreted as a set rather than a sequence with a specific ordering. However, this self-attention mechanism causes each document to attend to every other, leading to unnecessary computations between pairs of documents that do not affect each other.

In this paper, we leverage another deep learning architecture known for its permutation invariant property: Graph Neural Networks [16, 49]. GNNs are deep learning models that operate on graph data structures. Given the ubiquity of graphs in nature, these models

have found applications in several domains, including recommender systems [47, 52, 55], natural language processing [4, 31, 45], and computer vision [15, 46, 51], achieving state-of-the-art performance. Considering documents as the nodes of a graph allows for a natural representation of their relationships, reflecting their distributions in a non-Euclidean space. Our work aims to establish these relationships based on document semantic similarities. To achieve this, we employ a data structure known in the literature as the Corpus Graph [29], which is a graph of documents that encodes relationships derived from both lexical and semantic similarities. The contributions of this paper are the following:

- We explore new applications of GNNs in the context of re-ranking, where their contribution remains under-investigated.
- We define a data structure referred to as the query-induced corpus subgraph, which models document relationships within re-ranking.
- We propose a novel pipeline that combines any message-passing rule with a corpus graph for re-ranking.
- We demonstrate that our proposed approach improves ranking metrics compared to uni-variate baselines.
- Through an ablation study, we quantify the contribution of GNNs in the final re-ranking performance.

## 2 RELATED WORKS

**From Early Approaches to Neural Ranking.** Initially, IR relied on classical statistical approaches to elicit a global ranking among items based on pairwise comparison data, such as the Bradley-Terry-Luce (BTL) model [5, 28]. Building upon early research on network centrality, subsequent studies utilized the stationary distribution of a Markov chain to rank nodes in a network. Various measures have been developed to assess the importance of nodes within a graph or other network structures [32, 33, 35]. In addition to these classical, learning-free optimizers for ranking problems, contemporary approaches increasingly employ learning-based, predominantly neural models for similar tasks. An essential subset of these is represented by attention-based models, which have gained popularity following the success of the Transformer architecture in natural language processing [48], computer vision [13], and other essential fields. Notable examples in this context are based on BERT-related [12] models such as [21, 25, 34]. The natural modeling of document relationships through graphs has inspired recent research to employ graph-based approaches to enhance recall [29] and, most importantly, to utilize GNNs with their message-passing formalism [16] for ranking tasks. This growing interest in GNNs within the IR community underscores their potential in this context. **Graph Neural Networks for ranking.** Scarselli et al. [43] presented the first example graph-based machine learning framework designed for information retrieval, specifically focusing on computing page ranks for web pages. This approach builds upon conventional algorithms such as PageRank [36] by leveraging node-specific feature vectors to improve ranking accuracy. However, the model necessitates label supervision with ground truth ranks for effective training. Damke et al. [10] employs GNNs to convert graphs into feature embeddings. These are subsequently utilized in comparator networks to assess pairwise preferences, thus constructing global rankings. Similarly, He et al. [18] utilize a GNN framework where nodes represent items,

and edges indicate pairwise comparisons, enabling the recovery of global rankings through direct optimization of ranking objectives. Other approaches [26, 40], use the graph structure to model a node ranking problem. Thanks to GNNs, this task is approached incorporating both node features and the structural information of the network. Similarly, in [14] a heterogeneous graph is constructed using query-resource pairs, where edges represent query-resource or resource-resource relationships. Here, GNNs are employed to extract resources' features, in order to predict the most relevant resource for a query. In this setting, the task is modeled as a link prediction [56] pipeline rather than node ranking. Even though, we use a graph of documents rather than resources, and model the task as node ranking, their procedure to obtain resource and query representations is similar to ours. Generally, these methods have not been employed directly for ranking documents, leaving obscure their impact on more grounded applications.

We can find also a line of works that employs GNNs in the document retrieval scenario [9, 57]. Even though these methods use GNNs in the context of ranking query-document pairs, they use the graph structure to model the words in the documents rather than the documents relationships. In our case, we opted for modelling the interactions between documents. **Multi-variate Scoring Functions.** Conventional learning-to-rank models typically adhere to the probability ranking principle (PRP) [42], which posits that each document has a distinct likelihood of fulfilling a specific information requirement. Consequently, ranking scores for documents are assigned independently and are not interdependent. Despite their widespread use, PRP-based learning-to-rank approaches have demonstrated limitations [1, 2, 19]. This focus on query-document pairs results in neglecting the broader context provided by other documents in the corpus. Research on pseudo-relevance feedback [23] and query-dependent learning-to-rank [7] has shown that incorporating local context elements, such as document feature distributions at the query level, can significantly enhance ranking efficacy. While PRP operates on a document-by-document basis, Robertson et al. [42] argue that ranking outcomes should be evaluated request-by-request. Furthermore, analysis of user behavior on search engines reveals that users naturally compare multiple documents during their search process [20, 54], highlighting the importance of considering document interdependencies. Therefore, incorporating the broader document context into ranking models can overcome the limitations of traditional PRP-based approaches and improve the performance of learning-to-rank systems. Analysis of user behavior on search engines reveals distinct comparison patterns in interactions with information retrieval systems [20, 54]. Additionally, investigations on query-document relevance annotations suggest that input from other documents in the same ranked list may influence an annotator's judgment regarding the current document [44, 54], thus challenging the conventional assumption that relevance should be assessed independently for each document within a single information request. Recently, a novel category of learning-to-rank techniques has emerged, wherein scoring functions consider a query-document pair and multiple documents as input and collectively predict the ranking scores associated with each pair, garnering increasing attention. For instance, Ai et al. [1, 2] proposed a context-aware query-level ranking model that processes a sequence of documents as input. This family of methods

is referred to as multivariate scoring functions. Follow-up works, attempted to improve existing approaches using scoring function that are agnostic to the document ordering, relying more on the permutation-invariant property of the self-attention [37–39]. These methods have shown to be capable of extracting information from the document interactions, improving the overall performance. In our work, we focus on re-ranking, modeling the candidates found by the BM25 algorithm as a graph. We decided to employ GNNs to operate on the graph structure while exploiting their permutation invariant property within the neighborhood of each document. In the remaining Sections we provide detailed information on our methodology and the illustrate the respective performances against univariate-based baselines.

### 3 PRELIMINARIES

We begin by formalizing our notation for Information Retrieval (IR) and Graph Neural Networks topics. In our notation, bold symbols are used for both matrices and vectors, with uppercase letters representing matrices and lowercase letters representing vectors (e.g.,  $\mathbf{M}$ ,  $\mathbf{v}$ ). Scalars are denoted by simple italic letters. **Notation.**

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  be an undirected graph, where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the set of nodes and  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$  is the set of edges. The number of nodes in  $\mathcal{G}$  is denoted by  $|\mathcal{V}| = N$ , and the number of edges by  $|\mathcal{E}|$ .  $\Gamma(u)$  represents the neighborhood of node  $u$ , and  $|\Gamma(u)|$  denotes its degree. The diagonal matrix  $\mathbf{D}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is such that  $d_{ii} = |\Gamma(u)|$ . The feature vector of node  $u$  is represented by  $\mathbf{x}_u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . These node representations can be ordered into a matrix referred to as the *instance matrix*  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times m}$ . The instance matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  is defined as  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N]^T$ . The set of edges  $\mathcal{E}$  can also be expressed as the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ , where  $A_{uv} = 1$  if nodes  $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}$  are connected, and  $A_{uv} = 0$  otherwise.

In an IR-related scenario, we typically have a user-provided query  $q$  and a collection of documents  $C$  that are candidates to satisfy the information need expressed by the query. We refer to the  $i$ -th document in the collection as  $d_i$ .

**Graph Neural Networks.** Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) are models designed to learn and extract valuable features from graph-structured data. Given a collection of graphs  $\mathcal{D}$ , such that  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathcal{G}^i\}_{i=1}^n$ , each graph  $\mathcal{G}^i = (\mathcal{V}^i, \mathcal{E}^i, \mathbf{X}^i, \mathbf{A}^i)$  consists of an instance matrix  $\mathbf{X}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times m}$  and an adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times N_i}$ . GNNs utilize the message-passing formalism to extract features from these graph-structured datasets [16].

In this formalism, each instance matrix  $\mathbf{X}^i$  for  $i \in 1, \dots, n$  is iteratively updated within the GNN through a series of layers during the forward pass, which involves computing intermediate representations at each layer  $l$ , denoted as  $\mathbf{H}_l^i$  for  $0 \leq l \leq L$ . This process continues up to the  $L$ -th layer, resulting in a new set of latent features  $\mathbf{H}_l^i \in \mathbb{R}^{N_i \times m'}$  for the graph  $\mathcal{G}^i$ . Specifically, we can express the initial instance matrix as  $\mathbf{X}^i \equiv \mathbf{H}_0^i$ .

Given a set of weights  $\mathbf{W}_l$  and  $\Omega_l$  for layer  $l$ , the message-passing update rule for graph  $i$  can be written as follows, in alignment with [16]:

$$\mathbf{H}_l^{i+1} = UP_{\Omega_l}(\mathbf{H}_l^i, AGGR_{\mathbf{W}_l}(\mathbf{H}_l^i, \mathbf{A}^i)) \quad 0 \leq l \leq L, l \in \mathbb{N},$$

where  $UP_{\Omega_l}$  and  $AGGR_{\mathbf{W}_l}$  represent the *update* and *aggregation* functions, respectively, within the message-passing framework. In

literature exist several message-passing schemes that vary based on the choice of  $UP_{\Omega_l}$  and  $AGGR_{\mathbf{W}_l}$  [17, 22, 50, 53]. The newly obtained node representations  $\mathbf{Z}^i$  are then utilized for downstream tasks, typically including node classification, graph classification, or link prediction.


**Retrieval and Re-Ranking.** The document retrieval task involves identifying the top- $K$  candidates in a collection of documents  $C$  that best satisfy the information need expressed by a query  $q$ . This task encompasses several critical aspects. Firstly, the model must effectively identify all potentially relevant documents among the top- $K$  while managing the size of  $C$ , which can be prohibitively large. Multi-stage approaches are typically employed to address this challenge. These approaches first retrieve a broad set of candidate documents and then prune iteratively, retaining the most relevant documents while filtering out the less relevant ones. This reduction in candidate set size allows for deploying more sophisticated models in later stages, optimizing precision at the expense of recall. One widely adopted approach is the two-stage pipeline, which comprises an initial retrieval phase and a re-ranking phase. During the retrieval stage, an efficient, albeit less effective, model is utilized to process the extensive collection of documents. In contrast, the re-ranking phase focuses on the top- $K$  documents identified in the first stage and employs a more effective, though computationally intensive, model, such as Transformer architectures. The retrieval phase is primarily recall-oriented, ensuring that the most relevant documents are included in the top- $K$  set. Conversely, the re-ranking phase is precision-oriented, refining the ranking to prioritize the most relevant documents. In this study, we concentrate on two-stage pipelines, particularly emphasizing the re-ranking phase. Our methodology is applied to the documents in the top- $K$  candidate set, denoted as top- $K_q$ . Typically, a text encoder  $ENC_{\theta}()$  is employed to encode both queries and documents, represented as  $z_q = ENC_{\theta_q}(q)$  and  $z_{d_i} = ENC_{\theta_{d_i}}(d_i)$ , where  $z_q \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $z_{d_i} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . The encoded representations are then compared using a similarity function  $s_{q,d_i} = \phi_{\theta}(z_q, z_{d_i})$ . The sequence of the most relevant documents for the query is subsequently defined as follows:

$$\pi_q = \text{SORT}(\{s_{q,d_i} \mid \forall i \in \text{top-}K_q\}).$$

The objective of neural re-ranking is to learn a set of weights that align the predicted list of documents  $\pi_q$  with the ground-truth list  $\pi_q^*$ .

### 4 PROPOSED APPROACH

We present our GNRR pipeline in Figure 1. Our approach can be divided into three main phases, which are detailed hereafter. The dotted boxes contain the trainable parameters. **Data Retrieval.** The data retrieval phase takes as input a query  $q$  and a corpus  $C$ . First, we use the BM25 [41] algorithm to compute the top-1000 $_q$  documents from  $C$  that better satisfy the information need of  $q$  from a lexical point of view. Next, we construct the semantic corpus graph  $\mathcal{G}^C = (\mathcal{V}^C, \mathcal{E}^C)$  via TCT-ColBERT [25]. Essentially, each pair of documents  $(d_i, d_j)$  in  $\mathcal{G}^C$  shares a connection based on the cosine similarity between their document encodings. Moreover,  $\mathcal{G}^C$  is a regular graph, as each node's neighborhood has a fixed cardinality  $|\Gamma(d)| = c$  for  $d \in \mathcal{V}^C$ . We use  $c = 8$  for our experiments.



**Figure 1: Overview of our Graph Neural Re-Ranking pipeline with  $K = 3$ . We distinguish three phases: *Data Retrieval*, *Subgraph Construction*, and *Features and Scores Computation*. These phases encompass both retrieval and re-ranking, with the final output shown on the right. Initially,  $d_3$  is more relevant than  $d_4$ , but after the re-ranking phase,  $d_4$  records a higher score and should be ranked second.**

This procedure is typically done offline due to the computational effort required. More details on the corpus graph construction are available in [29]. TCT-ColBERT is also adopted to encode  $q$ . By the end of this phase, we have the top-1000 $_q$ , the query and document encodings  $\mathbf{z}_q, \{\mathbf{z}_d\}_{d \in C}$ , and the semantic corpus graph  $\mathcal{G}^C$ . **Subgraph Construction.** The subgraph construction phase aims to represent the documents identified as relevant by the BM25 algorithm in a graph structure. Given the top-1000 $_q$  set of documents and  $\mathcal{G}^C$ , we define the respective query-induced subgraph.

**DEFINITION 1.** Let top-1000 $_q$  be a set of documents associated with a query, and  $\mathcal{G}^C = (\mathcal{V}^C, \mathcal{E}^C)$  be a corpus graph.  $\mathcal{G}_q^C$  is the associated query-induced corpus subgraph, such that  $\mathcal{G}_q^C = (\mathcal{V}^q, \mathcal{E}^q)$ , where  $\mathcal{V}^q \equiv \text{top-1000}_q$ , and  $\mathcal{E}^q = \{(d_i, d_j) \in \mathcal{E}^C \mid i \in \text{top-1000}_q \wedge j \in \text{top-1000}_q\}$ .

According to Definition 1,  $\mathcal{G}_q^C$  is a data structure that retains both the nodes obtained from the lexical-based algorithm and the connections derived from the semantic similarity of these documents. Since the connections are borrowed from  $\mathcal{G}^C$ , which is a regular graph, we know that the maximum number of connections will be limited as well. Specifically,  $|\mathcal{E}^q| \leq 8 \cdot 1000$ , since the total number of documents is 1000, and 8 is the maximum cardinality used for the corpus graph. Once the graph structure for each query is defined, we need to specify the features used to represent the nodes. In this phase, we employ a non-trainable operation  $f_1$ , simply the element-wise product between the query and each document. Specifically, the node feature of document  $i$  would be  $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{z}_q \odot \mathbf{z}_{d_i}$ . Applying this to each element in  $\mathcal{V}_q$ , we can group all the representations into a matrix  $\mathbf{X}^q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}^q| \times m}$ . **Features and Scores Computation.** The final phase is the re-ranking. In this phase, we employ trainable functions to re-rank the initial list of candidates, top-1000 $_q$ . To achieve this, we utilize both the interactions among the documents and the individual relevance between each

document and the query. To integrate these aspects into the architecture, we use a GNN to encode the local interactions between the documents and a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) for the individual aspects, as it is agnostic to the underlying graph structure. In our specific implementation, the GNN encoder takes as input the instance matrix  $\mathbf{X}^q$  and the nodes' adjacencies  $\mathbf{A}^q$ , producing a new set of document representations. In our experiments, we augment the initial feature representation  $\mathbf{X}^q$  with an additional feature representing the initial ranking of each document from the BM25 scores, leading to the instance matrix  $\mathbf{X}'_q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}^q| \times (m+1)}$ . This augmentation is only applied for the local feature extraction module to provide the model with a ranking inductive bias.

The new set of features computed by the local encoder is given by:

$$\mathbf{H}_{q,loc} = \text{GNN}(\mathbf{X}'_q, \mathbf{A}^q). \quad (1)$$

The individual features are computed as follows:

$$\mathbf{H}_{q,ind} = \text{MLP}(\mathbf{X}_q). \quad (2)$$

Once we have  $\mathbf{H}_{q,ind} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}^q| \times m_{ind}}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_{q,loc} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}^q| \times m_{loc}}$ , we apply a non-trainable operation  $f_2$ , which is the vector concatenation. Specifically:

$$\mathbf{H}_q = \text{CONCAT}(\mathbf{H}_{q,ind}, \mathbf{H}_{q,loc}), \quad (3)$$

resulting in  $\mathbf{H}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}^q| \times (m_{ind} + m_{loc})}$ . The final stage of the re-ranking process involves using a scorer model  $\phi_\theta$  that takes  $\mathbf{H}_q$  as input and returns  $s_q \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}^q|}$ , which contains the estimated relevance scores of each document. From these scores, we compute  $\pi_q$  as follows:

$$\pi_q = \text{SORT}(s_q). \quad (4)$$

This re-ranking scheme remains consistent for both inference and training. If the number of training queries is massive, we recommend the practitioners to pre-compute the first two phases offline. However, this procedure is sustainable during inference and can be computed fully online, except for the corpus graph construction.

## 5 EXPERIMENTAL SET-UP

In this section, we describe the structure of our experimental set-up, including datasets, baselines, and the hyperparameters used. Through our experiments, we aim to address the following research questions:

- RQ1.** Can a re-ranking pipeline be improved through cross-document interactions when these are encoded through a GNN?
- RQ2.** How much the performance are sensitive to the presence of GNNs?

### 5.1 Datasets

In our experiments, we use the MS MARCO passage ranking dataset [3], which consists of 8.8M documents and a vast collection of queries. The corpus graph  $\mathcal{G}^C = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  was built from MS MARCO, with  $|\mathcal{V}| = 8.8\text{M}$  and  $|\mathcal{E}| = 8 \cdot |\mathcal{V}|$ , due to the regularity of the corpus graph. In our experiments, we trained a GNN model to extract new features based on the provided document representations. For this purpose, we used 1000 queries for training and 200 for validation from the MS MARCO training queries. Regarding the test sets used for comparing all baselines, we utilized TREC-DL19, TREC-DL20 [8], and TREC-DLHard [30].

- **DL19:** This dataset consists of 43 queries with an average of 215 relevance assessments per query.
- **DL20:** It contains 54 queries with 211 relevance assessments per query.
- **DLHard:** This set includes 50 queries from the official DL 2019/2020 evaluation benchmark [8], half of which are newly and independently assessed. The topics within this collection are generally more complex, posing greater challenges for neural ranking models.

### 5.2 Baselines

Our experiments aim to assess how effectively GNNs for encoding cross-document interactions improve performance compared to a univariate approach. Our baselines are as follows:

- **BM25** [41]: This is one of the most widely used lexical-based retrieval approaches. We use it to rank all the documents in the corpus, and the top-1000 candidates are evaluated directly using its scores.
- **TCT-CoBERT** (TCT) [25]: TCT is a lightweight transformer-based dense retrieval approach. We use its pre-trained version on MS MARCO. After retrieving the top-1000<sub>q</sub> documents through BM25, we use this model to re-rank them. Specifically, we encode each document and query, and use the cosine similarity between them to compute the final relevance score.
- **TCT+GCN:** This is one of our Graph Neural Re-Ranking approaches, based on the GCN model [22], which exemplifies convolutional message-passing [49].
- **TCT+GraphSAGE:** This is another Graph Neural Re-Ranking approach of the convolutional type, based on the GraphSAGE message-passing model [17].
- **TCT+GAT:** This Graph Neural Re-Ranker follows the attentional message-passing paradigm [49] and is based on the GAT architecture [50].

- **TCT+GIN:** GIN is the most expressive architecture according to the message-passing formalism [53]. We include this architecture in our experiments.
- **TCT+SignedConv:** SignedConv [11] not only applies message-passing through existing edges (positives) but also leverages non-existing ones, encoding a negative message-passing. We included it in our set of experiments; however, we did not select any specific policy for the negatives and limited the use to random negative sampling.

For these models, we instantiate Equation (1) with each baseline, while for the individual feature extraction branch, we do not train an MLP since TCT is already fine-tuned on MS MARCO. Thus, Equation (2) simplifies to:

$$\mathbf{H}_{q,ind} = \mathbf{X}_q. \quad (5)$$

In the following section, we present the performance of our baselines on the test sets. We consider popular metrics used for evaluating re-ranking systems, such as Average Precision (AP), Reciprocal Rank (RR), Precision (P), and Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (nDCG). Queries with a relevance score greater than or equal to 2 are considered relevant.

### 5.3 Further Details on Experiments and Hyperparameters

In our experiments, we aim to determine whether the re-ranking phase performed by the GNN-augmented re-ranker leads to improved performance compared to a vanilla TCT. To this end, we train each of our GNN models and select the best configuration based on the validation set before evaluating performance on the test sets. Specifically, we train the components within the dotted boxes, as shown in Figure 1. We employ early stopping, measuring the nDCG@10 on the validation set, a standard metric in information retrieval. Subsequently, we test our hypotheses on the test sets. During training, we use a pairwise loss function, specifically LambdaRank [6]. Our primary hyperparameters for the GNNs include the number of layers  $L$  and the hidden dimension  $m'$ . We also tuned specific hyperparameters for each baseline, but no consistent patterns emerged in relation to the results.

### 5.4 Results




In this Section, we discuss the experimental results within the framework of the research questions outlined in the previous sections, namely **RQ1** and **RQ2**. Focusing on **RQ1**, which questions the effectiveness of incorporating cross-document interactions into learning-to-rank models, we refer to the data presented in Table 1. These results effectively address the research question, demonstrating that integrating GNN architectures consistently enhances ranking performance, as evidenced by the results. The experimental data demonstrates that this performance improvement is consistent across three distinct datasets, namely DL19, DL20, and DLHard. Specifically, the analysis of the DL19 and DL20 datasets demonstrates the ability of GNN-enhanced models to improve ranking metrics in standard retrieval scenarios significantly. Meanwhile, the results on the DLHard dataset, which is a more challenging dataset, further showcases the robustness of these models.

**Table 1: Benchmarking Results**

Pipeline	DL19				DL20				DLHard			
	AP	RR	P@3	nDCG@10	AP	RR	P@3	nDCG@10	AP	RR	P@3	nDCG@10
BM25	0.286	0.642	0.473	0.480	0.293	0.619	0.463	0.494	0.147	0.422	0.240	0.274
+TCTColBert	0.430	0.843	0.667	0.685	0.453	0.817	<b>0.691</b>	0.680	0.230	0.538	0.353	0.373
+GCN	<b>0.455</b>	<b>0.858</b>	0.713	<b>0.702</b>	<b>0.470</b>	<b>0.840</b>	0.673	<b>0.695</b>	<b>0.242</b>	<b>0.559</b>	<b>0.367</b>	<b>0.386</b>
+GraphSAGE	0.434	0.850	0.728	0.689	0.454	0.837	0.667	0.685	0.223	0.531	0.366	0.379
+GAT	0.442	0.852	0.698	0.690	0.453	0.826	0.685	0.682	0.219	0.542	0.364	0.376
+GIN	0.449	0.853	<b>0.729</b>	0.691	0.455	0.793	0.642	0.675	0.215	0.490	0.333	0.357
+SignedConv	0.426	0.828	0.698	0.675	0.445	0.813	0.685	0.676	0.218	0.509	0.353	0.366

Among the tested GNNs, the GCN model exhibits the most noticeable improvements over the baselines, reaching up to 5.81 % relative improvement with respect to (w.r.t.) TCT. In the case of DL19 and DLHard for example it always outperforms TCT in all the evaluation metrics. Conversely from what expected, more expressive message-passing strategy such as GAT, GIN, and SignedConv should surpass GCN models due to their advanced capacity for modeling complex relationships, but the experimental results suggest otherwise. We conjecture that the superior performance of the GCN model over more complex variants can be attributed to the limited number of training queries, which likely prevents more expressive models to fully capture the patterns within the datasets. However, also these can outperform baseline models. Considering these findings, we affirm the research hypothesis underlying **RQ1** as validated, thus confirming the pivotal role of GNNs in capturing and leveraging cross-document interactions to improve ranking performance.

However, due to the limited performance improvements and the small number of queries in the test sets, we do not record statistical significance in any of our proposed methods. To still quantitatively assess the specific contribution of the GNN component to the overall model performance, we conducted an ablation study measuring the performance drop upon the removal of the GNN branch. More specifically, we take the trained branches in Figure 1, and corrupt the output coming from the GNN branch at inference time, to see how much the results are affected. Bar charts in Figures 2, 3, 4 visually depict the impact of removing the GNN branch, where each blue bar represents performance with it, and the overlapping red section indicates the performance drop without it. The charts for the DL19, DL20, and DL-HARD datasets consistently show a noticeable decrease in the nDCG@10 score upon removal. The consistent performance decline across all datasets underscores its significant contribution to the final performance. Thus, we can affirmatively answer **RQ2**, confirming that the GNNs play a limited but pivotal role in the re-ranking phase.

**Figure 2: Ablation study on DL19.****Figure 3: Ablation study on DL20.****Figure 4: Ablation on DLHard.**

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper presented a novel approach to augment the re-ranking pipeline with GNNs, called Graph Neural Re-Ranking. Drawing inspiration from a data structure known in literature as a corpus graph, we include semantic corpus subgraphs in our pipeline, helping the query focus on the document distribution during the re-ranking process. Our approach showcases consistent improvements w.r.t. uni-variate baselines. Moreover, through a simple ablation study, where we corrupt the GNNs output, we record a drop in the performance, demonstrating that the GNN module effectively contributes to the final performance. Our work still needs to include statistically significant results and be extensively tested in a more comprehensive setting. In future works, we intend to explore heterogeneous graph structures and additional encoders for documents and queries. Finally, we may also consider applying interactions between documents for tasks other than re-ranking.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Qingyao Ai, Keping Bi, Jiafeng Guo, and W Bruce Croft. 2018. Learning a deep listwise context model for ranking refinement. In *The 41st international ACM SIGIR conference on research development in information retrieval*. 135–144.
- [2] Qingyao Ai, Xuanhui Wang, Sebastian Bruch, Nadav Golbandi, Michael Bendersky, and Marc Najork. 2019. Learning groupwise multivariate scoring functions using deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 ACM SIGIR international conference on theory of information retrieval*. 85–92.
- [3] Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Alina Stoica, Saurabh Tiwary, and Tong Wang. 2018. MS MARCO: A Human Generated MACHine Reading COmprehension Dataset. arXiv:1611.09268 [cs.CL]
- [4] Jasmijn Bastings, Ivan Titov, Wilker Aziz, Diego Marcheggiani, and Khalil Sima'an. 2020. Graph Convolutional Encoders for Syntax-aware Neural Machine Translation. arXiv:1704.04675 [cs.CL]
- [5] Ralph Allan Bradley and Milton E Terry. 1952. Rank analysis of incomplete block designs: I. The method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika* 39, 3/4 (1952), 324–345.
- [6] Christopher Burges, Robert Ragno, and Quoc Le. 2006. Learning to Rank with Nonsmooth Cost Functions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, B. Schölkopf, J. Platt, and T. Hoffman (Eds.), Vol. 19. MIT Press. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2006/file/af44c4c56f385c43f2529f9b1b018f6a-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2006/file/af44c4c56f385c43f2529f9b1b018f6a-Paper.pdf)
- [7] Ethem F Can, W Bruce Croft, and R Mamatha. 2014. Incorporating query-specific feedback into learning-to-rank models. In *Proceedings of the 37th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research & development in information retrieval*. 1035–1038.
- [8] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, Ellen M. Voorhees, and Ian Soboroff. 2021. TREC Deep Learning Track: Reusable Test Collections in the Large Data Regime. arXiv:2104.09399 [cs.IR]
- [9] Hejie Cui, Jiaying Lu, Yao Ge, and Carl Yang. 2022. How Can Graph Neural Networks Help Document Retrieval: A Case Study on CORD19 with Concept Map Generation. arXiv:2201.04672 [id='cs.IR']
- [10] Clemens Damke and Eyke Hüllermeier. 2021. Ranking structured objects with graph neural networks. In *Discovery Science: 24th International Conference, DS 2021, Halifax, NS, Canada, October 11–13, 2021, Proceedings 24*. Springer, 166–180.
- [11] Tyler Derr, Yao Ma, and Jiliang Tang. 2018. Signed Graph Convolutional Network. arXiv:1808.06354 [cs.SI]
- [12] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. arXiv:1810.04805 [id='cs.CL']
- [13] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiuhua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020).
- [14] Ulugbek Ergashev, Eduard Dragut, and Weiyi Meng. 2023. Learning To Rank Resources with GNN. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 3247–3256.
- [15] Victor Garcia and Joan Bruna. 2018. Few-Shot Learning with Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:1711.04043 [stat.ML]
- [16] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S. Schoenholz, Patrick F. Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E. Dahl. 2017. Neural Message Passing for Quantum Chemistry. arXiv:1704.01212 [cs.LG]
- [17] William L. Hamilton, Rex Ying, and Jure Leskovec. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Long Beach, California, USA) (NIPS'17). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 1025–1035.
- [18] Yixuan He, Quan Gan, David Wipf, Gesine D Reinert, Junchi Yan, and Mihai Cucuringu. 2022. Gnnrank: Learning global rankings from pairwise comparisons via directed graph neural networks. In *international conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8581–8612.
- [19] Ray Jiang, Sven Gowal, Yuqiu Qian, Timothy Mann, and Danilo J Rezende. 2018. Beyond Greedy Ranking: Slate Optimization via List-CVAE. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [20] Thorsten Joachims, Laura Granka, Bing Pan, Helene Hembrooke, and Geri Gay. 2017. Accurately interpreting clickthrough data as implicit feedback. In *Acm Sigir Forum*, Vol. 51. ACM New York, NY, USA, 4–11.
- [21] Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. ColBERT: Efficient and Effective Passage Search via Contextualized Late Interaction over BERT. arXiv:2004.12832 [id='cs.IR']
- [22] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. 2017. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. arXiv:1609.02907 [cs.LG]
- [23] Victor Lavrenko and W Bruce Croft. 2017. Relevance-based language models. In *ACM SIGIR Forum*, Vol. 51. ACM New York, NY, USA, 260–267.
- [24] Juho Lee, Yoonho Lee, Jungtaek Kim, Adam Kosiorek, Seungjin Choi, and Yee Whye Teh. 2019. Set transformer: A framework for attention-based permutation-invariant neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 3744–3753.
- [25] Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Distilling Dense Representations for Ranking using Tightly-Coupled Teachers. arXiv:2010.11386 [cs.IR]
- [26] Chen Liu, Tingting Cao, and Lixin Zhou. 2022. Learning to rank complex network node based on the self-supervised graph convolution model. *Knowledge-Based Systems* 251 (2022), 109220.
- [27] Tie-Yan Liu et al. 2009. Learning to rank for information retrieval. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 3, 3 (2009), 225–331.
- [28] R Duncan Luce. 1959. Response latencies and probabilities. *Mathematical methods in the social sciences* (1959), 298–3.
- [29] Sean MacAvaney, Nicola Tonello, and Craig Macdonald. 2022. Adaptive Re-Ranking with a Corpus Graph. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM '22)*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3511808.3557231>
- [30] Iain Mackie, Jeffery Dalton, and Andrew Yates. 2021. How Deep is your Learning: the DL-HARD Annotated Deep Learning Dataset. arXiv:2105.07975 [cs.IR]
- [31] Diego Marcheggiani, Jasmijn Bastings, and Ivan Titov. 2020. Exploiting Semantics in Neural Machine Translation with Graph Convolutional Networks. arXiv:1804.08313 [cs.CL]
- [32] S Negahban, S Oh, and D Shah. [n. d.]. Rank centrality: Ranking from pair-wise comparisons. 2012. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1209.1688> ([n. d.]).
- [33] Mark Newman. 2018. *Networks*. Oxford university press.
- [34] Rodrigo Nogueira, Wei Yang, Kyunghyun Cho, and Jimmy Lin. 2019. Multi-Stage Document Ranking with BERT. arXiv:1910.14424 [id='cs.IR']
- [35] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd. 1999. The PageRank Citation Ranking: Bringing Order to the Web. In *The Web Conference*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:15085037D>
- [36] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, Terry Winograd, et al. 1999. The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. (1999).
- [37] Liang Pang, Jun Xu, Qingyao Ai, Yanyan Lan, Xueqi Cheng, and Jirong Wen. 2020. Setrank: Learning a permutation-invariant ranking model for information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*. 499–508.
- [38] Rama Kumar Pasumarthi, Honglei Zhuang, Xuanhui Wang, Michael Bendersky, and Marc Najork. 2020. Permutation equivariant document interaction network for neural learning to rank. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGIR on international conference on theory of information retrieval*. 145–148.
- [39] Przemysław Pobrotyn, Tomasz Bartczak, Mikołaj Synowiec, Radosław Białobrzęski, and Jarosław Bojar. 2020. Context-aware learning to rank with self-attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.10084* (2020).
- [40] Hongbo Qu, Yu-Rong Song, Ruqi Li, and Min Li. 2023. GNR: A universal and efficient node ranking model for various tasks based on graph neural networks. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 632 (2023), 129339.
- [41] Stephen Robertson, Steve Walker, Susan Jones, Micheline Hancock-Beaulieu, and Mike Gatford. 1994. Okapi at TREC-3. 0–.
- [42] Stephen E Robertson. 1977. The probability ranking principle in IR. *Journal of documentation* 33, 4 (1977), 294–304.
- [43] Franco Scarselli, Sweah Liang Yong, Marco Gori, Markus Hagenbuchner, Ah Chung Tsoi, and Marco Maggini. 2005. Graph neural networks for ranking web pages. In *The 2005 IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI'05)*. IEEE, 666–672.
- [44] Falk Scholer, Andrew Turpin, and Mark Sanderson. 2011. Quantifying test collection quality based on the consistency of relevance judgements. In *Proceedings of the 34th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval*. 1063–1072.

- [45] Linfeng Song, Zhiguo Wang, Mo Yu, Yue Zhang, Radu Florian, and Daniel Gildea. 2018. Exploring Graph-structured Passage Representation for Multi-hop Reading Comprehension with Graph Neural Networks. arXiv:1809.02040 [cs.CL]
- [46] Damien Teney, Lingqiao Liu, and Anton van den Hengel. 2017. Graph-Structured Representations for Visual Question Answering. arXiv:1609.05600 [cs.CV]
- [47] Rianne van den Berg, Thomas N. Kipf, and Max Welling. 2017. Graph Convolutional Matrix Completion. arXiv:1706.02263 [stat.ML]
- [48] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [49] Petar Veličković. 2023. Everything is connected: Graph neural networks. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology* 79 (April 2023), 102538. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbi.2023.102538>
- [50] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. 2018. Graph Attention Networks. arXiv:1710.10903 [stat.ML]
- [51] Xiaolong Wang, Yufei Ye, and Abhinav Gupta. 2018. Zero-shot Recognition via Semantic Embeddings and Knowledge Graphs. arXiv:1803.08035 [cs.CV]
- [52] Qitian Wu, Hengrui Zhang, Xiaofeng Gao, Peng He, Paul Weng, Han Gao, and Guihai Chen. 2019. Dual Graph Attention Networks for Deep Latent Representation of Multifaceted Social Effects in Recommender Systems. In *The World Wide Web Conference*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3308558.3313442>
- [53] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. 2019. How Powerful are Graph Neural Networks? arXiv:1810.00826 [cs.LG]
- [54] Emine Yilmaz, Manisha Verma, Nick Craswell, Filip Radlinski, and Peter Bailey. 2014. Relevance and effort: An analysis of document utility. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM international conference on conference on information and knowledge management*. 91–100.
- [55] Rex Ying, Ruining He, Kaifeng Chen, Pong Eksombatchai, William L. Hamilton, and Jure Leskovec. 2018. Graph Convolutional Neural Networks for Web-Scale Recommender Systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3219890>
- [56] Muhan Zhang. 2022. Graph Neural Networks: Link Prediction. In *Graph Neural Networks: Foundations, Frontiers, and Applications*, Lingfei Wu, Peng Cui, Jian Pei, and Liang Zhao (Eds.). Springer Singapore, Singapore, 195–223.
- [57] Yufeng Zhang, Jinghao Zhang, Zeyu Cui, Shu Wu, and Liang Wang. 2021. A Graph-based Relevance Matching Model for Ad-hoc Retrieval. arXiv:2101.11873 [id='cs.IR']