

PromptDSI: Prompt-based Rehearsal-free Instance-wise Incremental Learning for Document Retrieval

Tuan-Luc Huynh¹ Thuy-Trang Vu¹ Weiqing Wang¹ Yinwei Wei¹
Trung Le¹ Dragan Gasevic² Yuan-Fang Li¹ Thanh-Toan Do¹

{tuanhuynh1, trang.vu1, teresa.wang, yinwei.wei,
trunglm, dragan.gasevic, yuanfang.li, toan.do}@monash.edu

¹ Department of Data Science & AI, Monash University, Australia

² Department of Human Centred Computing, Monash University, Australia

Abstract

Differentiable Search Index (DSI) utilizes Pre-trained Language Models (PLMs) for efficient document retrieval without relying on external indexes. However, DSIs need full re-training to handle updates in dynamic corpora, causing significant computational inefficiencies. We introduce PromptDSI, a rehearsal-free, prompt-based approach for instance-wise incremental learning in document retrieval. PromptDSI attaches prompts to the frozen PLM’s encoder of DSI, leveraging its powerful representation to efficiently index new corpora while maintaining a balance between stability and plasticity. We eliminate the initial forward pass of prompt-based continual learning methods that doubles training and inference time. Moreover, we propose a topic-aware prompt pool that employs neural topic embeddings as fixed keys. This strategy ensures diverse and effective prompt usage, addressing the challenge of parameter underutilization caused by the collapse of the query-key matching mechanism. Our empirical evaluations demonstrate that PromptDSI matches IncDSI in managing forgetting while significantly enhancing recall by over 4% on new corpora.

1 Introduction

Differentiable Search Index (DSI) (Tay et al., 2022) represents a new paradigm in end-to-end retrieval. Unlike traditional sparse (Robertson et al., 2009) and dense retrieval methods (Karpukhin et al., 2020), DSI leverages a Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017) to directly map user queries to document identifiers (docids) through end-to-end training. The integration of corpus information into model parameters in DSI poses significant challenges, especially in dynamic, real-world corpora where new documents are continually added (Mehta et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2024).

Re-training DSI from scratch for each update is computationally prohibitive, necessitating con-

tinual learning (CL) methods (McCloskey and Cohen, 1989; French, 1999). DSI++ (Mehta et al., 2023a) employs generative replay and Sharpness-Aware Minimization (Foret et al., 2020) to address this challenge, while IncDSI (Kishore et al., 2023) leverages constrained optimization under an instance-wise incremental learning setup. However, DSI++ with generative replay requires a query generation model trained on past documents, and IncDSI necessitates caching all previous documents’ queries, raising data privacy concerns (Shokri and Shmatikov, 2015; Custers et al., 2019).

Rehearsal-free prompt-based continual learning (PCL) methods (Wang et al., 2022d,c,a; Smith et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024a) offer a promising approach to alleviate the need for accessing previous documents or queries. These methods have shown competitive performance compared to rehearsal-based techniques in class-incremental learning (CIL) settings within the vision domain (Wang et al., 2024a). Despite their success, adapting PCL methods to the context of document retrieval remains challenging due to the significant difference in the number of classes. Moreover, PCL methods inherently require two forward passes through the Transformer model, which can be unsuitable for retrieval systems where low latency is critical.

In this work, we propose PromptDSI, a prompt-based DSI for rehearsal-free instance-wise incremental learning in document retrieval. PromptDSI uses prompts to index new documents while keeping the DSI’s encoder frozen, without accessing previous documents. This approach leverages the powerful representations of a frozen pre-trained language model (PLM), optimizing prompts during continual indexing to handle new documents efficiently. To overcome the inefficiencies of PCL methods and tailor them for retrieval tasks, we introduce several modifications. Firstly, we address the inefficiency of the initial forward pass used for query-key matching in PCL methods. Instead of

using the [CLS] token from the last layer of frozen PLMs as the query vector, we utilize intermediate layer representations. This adjustment bypasses the need for an additional forward pass, significantly reducing computational overhead with minimal performance trade-off. Secondly, while existing PCL methods follow multi-layer prompting (Wang et al., 2022c; Smith et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024a), it is unclear if this is optimal for document retrieval settings. To find the best stability-plasticity trade-off, we conduct a comprehensive layer-wise prompting study to identify the most effective layers for prompting in our context.

Due to the lack of distinct semantic meaning across new corpora, PromptDSI often collapses into using a limited set of prompts, leading to underutilized parameters and suboptimal performance. Inspired by neural topic modeling (Gupta et al., 2020; Gerald and Soulier, 2022), we propose an approach using neural topic embeddings mined from the initial corpus as fixed keys in the prompt pool of PCL methods. This strategy eliminates training instability and opens a promising new avenue for continual learning in document retrieval, centered around topic updating. Overall, our work makes the following contributions:

- We introduce PromptDSI, the first prompt-based continual learning (PCL) method for classification-based end-to-end document retrieval.
- We propose a novel single pass PCL approach that reduces computational costs and conduct a thorough analysis which verifies that single-layer prompting is sufficient for optimal performance.
- To address prompt underutilization in existing PCL methods, we propose a novel approach for adapting PCL methods to continual learning in document retrieval by using neural topic embeddings as fixed prompt keys.
- Experimental results on the NQ320k and MS MARCO datasets under the challenging rehearsal-free instance-wise incremental learning setup show that PromptDSI performs on par with IncDSI, a strong baseline.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Differentiable Search Index (DSI)

In the paradigm of DSI (Tay et al., 2022), a Transformer model (Vaswani et al., 2017) f_θ is trained to

learn a mapping function from a document $d_y \in \mathcal{X}$ to its document identifier (docid) $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ in the indexing stage: $f_\theta: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$. In the retrieval stage, given a query $q_y \in \mathcal{Q}$ about a document d_y , DSI returns a list of top- n relevant docids: $f_\theta: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{Y}}$, where $2^{\mathcal{Y}}$ denotes the powerset of \mathcal{Y} . Recent works have shown that using queries as document representation improves retrieval performance (Wang et al., 2022b; Zhuang et al., 2022). By using an off-the-shelf query generation model like DocT5Query (Nogueira et al., 2019) to generate synthetic queries, combining with natural queries from the dataset; these works directly use a set of queries $Q_y = \{q_{y,1}, \dots, q_{y,|Q|}\} \in \mathcal{Q}$ as document representation, where $q_{y,i}$ represents the i^{th} query of document d_y , simplifying the indexing and retrieval stage of DSI to a universal mapping function: $f_\theta: \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$.

2.2 Continual Learning in DSI

Unlike class-incremental learning (CIL) setup in the vision domain, where a limited number of classes with multiple samples per class are incrementally learned, *instance-wise* incremental learning in document retrieval treats each document as a unique class. While both setups have disjoint data label spaces and known task identities during training (Wang et al., 2024b), a key distinction lies in the several orders of magnitude larger number of classes in document retrieval for instance-wise incremental learning. Moreover, input data across corpora often overlaps significantly because queries could differ only by some keywords. Thus, instance-wise incremental learning, the problem we investigate, is much harder than CIL.

In this work, we follow the continual learning DSI setup of Kishore et al. (2023). Specifically, this setup introduces additional continual indexing stages for newly arrived documents $D' = \cup_{t=1}^T D_t$, where $D_t = \{d_1^t, \dots, d_{|D_t|}^t\}$ refers to a batch of $|D_t|$ new documents (i.e., a new corpus), and T is the number of new corpora. Each new document $d_y^t \in D_t$ has a set of associated queries $Q_y^t = \{q_{y,1}^t, \dots, q_{y,|Q_y^t|}^t\} \in \mathcal{Q}^t$, which are either natural or synthetic. We denote the DSI’s encoder as f_θ and the initial linear classifier as f_ϕ^0 , both of which are frozen after indexing on D_0 .

2.3 Prompt Tuning

Prompt tuning (Lester et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2022a) is a family of Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning (PEFT) methods that introduce a small




Figure 1: Naive-PromptDSI (left) integrates PCL methods into the DSI model using two forward passes, resulting in increased training/inference time. PromptDSI (right) enhances efficiency by using intermediate layer representations (i.e. average of token embeddings [AVG]) for prompt selection, effectively removing the need for an additional forward pass. In this example, both models are performing prefix-tuning to layer 2 of the DSI’s encoder f_θ .

set of learnable soft prompts to instruct frozen PLMs on downstream tasks. In this work, we follow the deep prompt-tuning (Li and Liang, 2021; Liu et al., 2022b) method as popularized by the rehearsal-free PCL methods in the vision domain (Wang et al., 2022c; Smith et al., 2023). Given an input sequence $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ with length n and embedding dimension of d , prompt token $P \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ with length m is prepended to the self attention in Transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) as follows: $\text{Attn}([P, X]) = \text{softmax}(\frac{Q^T K_{new}}{\sqrt{d}}) V_{new}$ where $K_{new} = [P_k, X]$, $V_{new} = [P_v, X]$, and $\{P_k, P_v\} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m/2}$ are equally split from P .

In this paper, we study three popular PCL methods, including: L2P (Wang et al., 2022d) uses a shared prompt pool, selecting the top- k prompts during inference based on query-key similarity; S-Prompt++ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a) assigns a single prompt to each corpus, using a similar query-key matching mechanism as L2P, but keeps prompts fixed after training on a corpus; and CODA-Prompt (Smith et al., 2023) minimizes cross-corpus interference with prompt initialization and utilizes both learnable keys and attention vectors, combining prompts through a weighted summation based on query similarities (details about these PCL methods are provided in Appendix B).

3 PromptDSI: Prompt-based DSI for Continual Learning

Incorporating Prompt-based Continual Learning (PCL) methods (Wang et al., 2022d,c; Smith et al.,

2023) into DSI enables the use of learnable soft-prompts to guide the frozen encoder f_θ in indexing new documents. As depicted on the left side of Figure 1, Naive-PromptDSI directly integrates PCL methods into the DSI model, necessitating two forward passes per input: the first pass to extract the [CLS] token for prompt selection and the second pass to prepend prompts to a layer of f_θ . As a result, this approach significantly increases latency during both training and inference. To overcome this inefficiency, we introduce PromptDSI, a streamlined variant that is discussed in the following section.

3.1 Single Pass PCL Methods

Existing PCL methods (Wang et al., 2022d,c; Smith et al., 2023) involve two forward passes during training and inference. The first pass extracts deep semantic embedding (i.e., [CLS] token) of the input sequence from a frozen PLM as the query vector for the query-key matching mechanism, which is used to select the most relevant prompt in an instance-wise fashion. This first pass is the key for the task-agnostic inference capability of PCL methods. The second pass passes the input sequence to the PLM again, but this time prompts are prefix-tuning to the PLM, thus resulting in an enhanced [CLS] token that is instructed by the prompts. In general, given that a forward pass to Transformer models is already computationally expensive, this two-pass design is not designed for retrieval systems.

To mitigate the inefficiency of Naive-PromptDSI, we introduce PromptDSI, which removes the initial

forward pass required by PCL methods, thus accelerating both training and inference. As depicted on the right side of Figure 1, instead of using the [CLS] token from the initial pass, PromptDSI leverages the average token embeddings [AVG] from the intermediate layer just before the prompting layer for prompt selection. This adjustment approximates the semantic richness typically provided by the [CLS] token. PromptDSI is designed to be compatible with existing PCL methods, allowing seamless integration without altering their core mechanisms. As discussed in Section 5, our approach results in only a minor task performance degradation while nearly doubling both the training and inference speed.

3.2 Topic-aware Prompt Keys

The instance-wise incremental learning setup of DSI is challenging due to the lack of distinct semantic boundaries among tasks (i.e, new corpora both consist of documents of similar topics). Although PCL methods demonstrate to be robust in this challenging setup, some PCL methods like L2P (Wang et al., 2022d) and S-Prompt++ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a) do not enable PromptDSI to fully utilize the prompt pool. Because the learnable keys in the prompt pool are optimized to learn a new corpus centroid, the lack of distinction between corpora causes these keys to become highly similar across corpora. This leads to prompt selection collapsing to a small subset of prompts, diminishing the efficacy of the query-key matching mechanism. Consequently, some prompts are completely ignored during training, resulting in underutilization of parameters.

Instabilities in training prompt pools for PCL methods have been widely reported in the literature (Moon et al., 2023; Yadav et al., 2023). Our observations show that in PCL methods, the query vectors used for prompt selection is deterministic (Wang et al., 2022d), suggesting that optimizing keys might be unnecessary. Additionally, to achieve more diverse prompt selection, it is essential to assign prompts at a more granular level than methods like S-Prompt++, which allocates a single prompt per corpus. Inspired by neural topic modeling techniques (Gupta et al., 2020; Gerald and Soulier, 2022), we propose using neural topic embeddings derived from the initial corpus as fixed keys in the prompt pool, utilizing BERTopic (Groendorst, 2022). This approach addresses the issues of sub-optimal prompt selection and underutiliza-

tion of prompts by assuming each document semantically belongs to a topic. By employing topic-aware prompts, PromptDSI alleviates the prompt underutilization problem and facilitates knowledge transfer between documents within the same topic.

3.3 Optimization Objective

During continual indexing, PromptDSI’s encoder f_θ and linear classifier f_ϕ^0 , trained on the initial corpus D_0 , remains frozen. Let us denote the expanded portion of f_ϕ as $f_\phi^{>0}$, the prompt pool as P , and the learnable keys as K . The query vector extraction function is denoted by q . We refer to the encoder, parametrized by P , K , and θ , as $f_{P,K,\theta}$. The general optimization objective for PromptDSI with L2P or S-Prompt++ is:

$$K_X = \sum_{k_s \in K_t} (\cos(q(X), k_s)) \quad (1)$$

$$\min_{P,K,f_\phi^{>0}} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(f_\phi(f_{P,K,\theta}(X), y)) + K_X,$$

where \mathcal{L}_{CE} is the cross-entropy loss, K_t refers to prompts assigned to task t , and k_s are the top- k prompts selected from K_t . PromptDSI with CODA-Prompt directly optimizes end-to-end with the following objective:

$$\min_{P,K,A,f_\phi^{>0}} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(f_\phi(f_{P,K,A,\theta}(X), y)), \quad (2)$$

where A are learnable attention vectors. PromptDSI with topic-aware keys use the following objective:

$$\min_{P,f_\phi^{>0}} \mathcal{L}_{CE}(f_\phi(f_{P,\theta}(X), y)) \quad (3)$$

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

We adopt the benchmark provided by Kishore et al. (2023), including the Natural Questions 320K (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) (NQ320k) and the MS MARCO (Nguyen et al., 2016) datasets. The datasets are split into the initial corpus D_0 , new corpus D' and a tuning set with the ratio of 90%, 9% and 1% of total documents. We do not use the tuning set in our experiments. Each document has a set of corresponding natural queries. We further divide the official train split of the benchmark into 80%/20% to be used as train/validation data in our setting. The original official validation split is used as test data in our setting. Each

| Added corpus | Method | NQ320k: D_0 | | NQ320k: D' | | MS MARCO: D_0 | | MS MARCO: D' | |
|--------------|--|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Hits@1 | Hits@10 | Hits@1 | Hits@10 | Hits@1 | Hits@10 | Hits@1 | Hits@10 |
| D_0 | - | 67.9 | 88.1 | - | - | 49.5 | 81.5 | - | - |
| | Non CL methods | | | | | | | | |
| | Multi-corpora | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.1 | 91.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 78.2 | 92.2 |
| | Joint | 61.5 | 85.9 | 59.4 | 84.7 | 44.5 | 76.8 | 42.4 | 78.3 |
| | DPR [†] | 45.7 | 74.4 | 45.7 | 73.6 | 39.2 | 68.8 | 42.1 | 62.8 |
| | CL methods | | | | | | | | |
| D' | Sequential | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.9 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.2 | 31.0 |
| | Sparse ER | 2.4 | 2.6 | 19.9 | 29.8 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 19.3 | 27.2 |
| | IncDSI | 64.2 | 86.3 | 60.9 | 86.0 | 48.1 | 80.6 | <u>56.1</u> | 84.2 |
| | IncDSI (batch) | <u>64.1</u> | 86.3 | 60.9 | 86.3 | 48.1 | 80.6 | <u>56.1</u> | 84.7 |
| | PromptDSI _{L_{2p}} (Ours) | 63.3 | <u>86.2</u> | <u>62.8</u> | 90.4 | 47.8 | 80.5 | 54.1 | 85.1 |
| | PromptDSI _{S-Prompt++} (Ours) | 63.5 | 86.0 | <u>62.8</u> | <u>90.8</u> | 47.9 | 80.4 | 54.8 | 85.1 |
| | PromptDSI _{CODA-Prompt} (Ours) | 62.8 | 86.0 | 64.1 | 90.6 | <u>48.0</u> | 80.6 | 54.5 | 88.3 |
| | PromptDSI _{Topic} (Ours) | 63.1 | 86.0 | 62.7 | 91.2 | 47.8 | 80.4 | 57.0 | <u>86.1</u> |

Table 1: Performance comparison on NQ320k and MS MARCO datasets across different methods. All methods start from the same BERT checkpoint trained on the initial corpus D_0 of each respective dataset, leading to identical initial performance on D_0 . [†] denotes results reported from Kishore et al. (2023). Prompts are added to layer 1 and layer 2 of BERT, for NQ320k and MS MARCO, respectively.

document in the training set is supplied with up to 15 additional synthetic queries generated using docT5query (Nogueira et al., 2019). Models are trained on both natural and synthetic queries from the train split and evaluated only on natural queries from the validation/test split. The new corpus D' contains up to 10K unique documents in total, which is evenly split to form 5 new corpora $D' = \cup_{i=1}^5 D_i$. Please refer to Table 3 and 4 in the Appendix for detailed statistics.

4.2 Evaluation Metrics

To evaluate our methods and the baselines, we adopt Hits@k, where $k = \{1, 10\}$ reflects precision and recall respectively, and Mean Reciprocal Rank@10 (MRR@10). Hits@k measures the proportion of correct documents ranked in the top-k predictions. MRR@10 measures the reciprocal of the rank of the correct document. Additionally, we report common continual learning metrics, including average performance (A_t), forgetting (F_t), and learning performance (LA_t), following previous works (Mehta et al., 2023b,a). For our experiments, we report the results of the initial corpus and new corpora separately. We report forgetting for the initial corpus D_0 since all models start from the same initial checkpoint. Regarding the performance of new corpora, following Smith et al. (2023), we emphasize on average performance A_t as they reflect both plasticity and forgetting. Please refer to Appendix A for details of continual learning metrics.

4.3 Baselines

We adopt two PLMs: BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019). All baseline models comprise an encoder f_θ and a linear classifier f_ϕ , all initialized from a checkpoint trained on the initial corpus D_0 . We evaluate our method against the following baselines¹:

- **Sequential Fine-tuning** which is sequentially optimized on each D_t in the current corpus D' without accessing to previous corpora. It is usually served as the performance lower bound in continual learning.
- **Multi-corpora Fine-tuning** is only fine-tuned on new corpora D' , which are merged as one single corpus. Therefore, it does not suffer from catastrophic forgetting on D' . This baseline is equivalent to the multi-task learning baseline in the continual learning literature, and we regard it as the performance upper-bound on D' .
- **Joint Supervised** is fine-tuned on both initial and all new corpora, similar to the conventional supervised learning setup. Since this model expands f_ϕ^0 to incorporate new documents then fine-tunes all parameters, it reflects how new documents affect the initial checkpoint’s performance on D_0 .
- **Sparse Experience Replay** involves sequential fine-tuning of the model on a new corpus, with a memory buffer that gradually expands by randomly sampling queries from previous corpora, similar to DSI++ (Mehta et al., 2023a).

¹We omit comparisons with regularization-based methods as they are underperformed experience-replay methods (Wu et al., 2021).

- **Dense Passage Retrieval (DPR, Karpukhin et al., 2020)** is a standard dual-encoder trained with a hard negative mined from BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009) and in-batch negatives. There is no continual learning in DPR. The trained model is used to generate representations for both queries and documents. Approximate Nearest Neighbor search is used for document retrieval.
- **IncDSI (Kishore et al., 2023)** keeps the encoder f_θ and initial linear classifier f_ϕ^0 frozen. New documents are indexed by expanding f_ϕ^0 and solving a constraint optimization problem. Since IncDSI is designed for online learning, we include a variant (denoted as IncDSI (batch)) that solves the optimization for several epochs, initializing embeddings from previously learned ones. We regard IncDSI as a strong baseline on D_0 .

4.4 Main Results

Table 1 highlights the distinct challenges faced by non-CL and some CL methods. Among the non-CL approaches, for both datasets, **Multi-corpora Fine-tuning** completely forgets D_0 because it fine-tunes solely on D' . The **Joint** baseline, which trains on all corpora, shows degraded performance on D_0 due to the expansion of the linear classifier f_ϕ . **DPR**, despite its retrieval strategy, performs poorly on Hits@1. Among CL methods, **Sequential Fine-tuning** suffers from severe catastrophic forgetting across all corpora. **Sparse ER**, even with a memory buffer, provides only slight improvements over Sequential Fine-tuning. In contrast, **IncDSI**, which incrementally solves a constraint optimization problem for each new document, maintains strong performance on both D_0 and D' . Training IncDSI for 10 epochs (referred to as IncDSI (batch)) yields modest improvements of 0.3% and 0.5% in Hits@10 on D' for NQ320k and MS MARCO, respectively. While IncDSI’s exhaustive constraint optimization effectively preserves D_0 performance and achieves higher Hits@1 on D' in the MS MARCO dataset, it shows reduced effectiveness in Hits@10 on D' on both datasets.

Conversely, without retraining on previous corpora or accessing them, all variants of **PromptDSI**, utilizing prefix-tuning (Li and Liang, 2021), achieve competitive or better results on D' . They surpass IncDSI in Hits@10 performance on D' while also maintaining strong Hits@10 on D_0 across both datasets, comparable to that of IncDSI. Although PromptDSI incurs a slight trade-off on

| PCL | Metric | Naive-PromptDSI | | PromptDSI | |
|------------|--------------------|-----------------|------|-----------|------|
| | | @1 | @10 | @1 | @10 |
| L2P | D_0 Forgetting ↓ | 4.8 | 2.0 | 4.4 | 2.1 |
| | D' Hits ↑ | 64.7 | 90.4 | 62.8 | 90.8 |
| S-Prompt++ | D_0 Forgetting ↓ | 4.9 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 1.9 |
| | D' Hits ↑ | 64.0 | 90.4 | 62.8 | 90.4 |
| CODA | D_0 Forgetting ↓ | 5.2 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 2.1 |
| | D' Hits ↑ | 64.0 | 90.6 | 64.1 | 90.6 |

Table 2: Performance comparison between Naive-PromptDSI and PromptDSI using different PCL methods. Prompts are added to layer 1 of BERT.

D_0 in terms of Hits@1 due to its rehearsal-free nature, it still manages to preserve comparable performance with IncDSI. Notably, PromptDSI_{topic} achieves the highest Hits@10 on NQ320k at 91.2% and also outperforms IncDSI in Hits@1 on the MS MARCO dataset, proving to be more robust than variants like PromptDSI_{L2P} and PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++}. Additional results and discussions on NQ320k and MS MARCO can be found in the Appendices D and E, respectively.

5 Discussions

In this section, we delve into some critical research questions regarding PromptDSI, offering insights on multiple aspects. Our discussion is primarily focused on the NQ320k dataset.

(i) Memory Complexity Analysis. IncDSI requires caching a matrix $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(|D_0|+|D'|) \times d}$, where each row represents the average query embeddings. Consequently, the memory usage and indexing time of IncDSI increase linearly with the number of documents. For our experiments, this caching requires approximately 330MB for the NQ320k dataset and 900MB for MS MARCO. Extending this to the full MS MARCO dataset, with 8.9 million documents, demands 26.7GB of GPU memory which might cause memory problems for conventional GPUs. In contrast, PromptDSI is designed for a rehearsal-free CL setting, eliminating the need for Z . Instead, it employs a prompt pool $P \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d \times (m+1)}$, which includes M prompts $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ and M prompt keys $K \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where m is the prompt length and d is the hidden dimension. This approach requires approximately 315KB, at least three orders of magnitude smaller than the memory requirement of IncDSI. Hence, PromptDSI is substantially more memory-efficient.

(ii) Does removing the first forward pass of PCL methods severely affect performance? Table 2 demonstrates the performance comparison between




Figure 2: Single-layer prompting analysis of SBERT-based PromptDSI equipped with different PCL methods on NQ320k dataset.




Figure 3: Multi-layer prompting analysis of SBERT-based PromptDSLs-Prompt++ on NQ320k dataset. Figures illustrate the performance differences when applying multi-layer prompting compared to single-layer prompting at layer 1 (represented by the red line).

PromptDSI and Naive-PromptDSI. The results indicate that all PromptDSI variants, utilizing intermediate layer representations as query vectors in PCL methods (i.e., removing the first forward pass), achieve consistent Hits@10 performance for forgetting on D_0 , while demonstrating similar average performance in terms of Hits@10 on D' . The primary trade-off is a slight drop in Hits@1 for D' , with a maximum decrease of 1.9% for L2P. However, PromptDSI achieves this with a 1.9x speedup, making it much more efficient for document retrieval. This significant reduction in latency outweighs the minor decrease in D_0 performance.

(iii) Which layers to attach prompts to achieve good stability-plasticity trade-off? To identify the optimal layers for prompting, we follow the protocol introduced by Wang et al. (2022c). We assume prompting layers are contiguous and limit our analysis to 3-layer prompting to reduce the search space. We first attach prompts to each layer of f_θ to determine potential layers for multi-layered prompting. Because of the instability of BERT-based PromptDSLsCODA-Prompt (see Figure 5 in the Appendix), we focus our analysis on SBERT-based PromptDSI. We refer to the PCL method used in PromptDSI as the model name. Our findings in Figure 2 reveals that CODA-Prompt exhibits lower performance but suffers less forgetting than L2P and S-Prompt++. Generally, PromptDSI outperforms IncDSI in learning capacity across layers. Regarding L2P (Wang et al., 2022d) and S-Prompt++ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a), we observe that top layers (i.e., layers 10-12) suffer significant forgetting on D_0 despite having great performance on D' ; therefore, we do not consider them for further analysis. Notably, layer 2 achieves equivalent or even less forgetting than IncDSI on D_0 while having great average performance on D' in terms of Hits@1 (first column of Figure 2), emerging as an optimal choice. Subsequently, we select S-Prompt++ for multi-layer prompting analysis due to its high forgetting on D_0 . Compared to single-layer prompting at layer 1, prompting at layers 1-2 offers negligible average performance gains on D' , while prompting at layers 1-3 leads to a deterioration of over 3% in Hits@1. This suggests that single-layer prompting, especially in the bottom layers (i.e., layers 1-5),

strikes the best balance with fewer parameters.

(iv) How prompts are selected during inference?

We investigate prompt selection of PromptDSI_{L2P} and PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++}, as shown in Figure 4. For BERT-based PromptDSI, PromptDSI_{L2P} often selects a single prompt across all new corpora, and PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++} shows similar but less pronounced behavior. This is because BERT embeddings are not great for similarity comparison (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019), leading to the query-key matching mechanism collapsing to several prompts during the first epoch. In contrast, SBERT-based PromptDSI exhibits more diverse prompt selection due to its embeddings being better suited for similarity comparisons. Although some prompts are ignored by PromptDSI_{L2P}, PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++}’s task-specific prompts are chosen more accurately across different corpora. Overall, despite underutilization and inaccuracy in prompt selection, PromptDSI_{L2P} matches PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++}’s performance without fully using its prompt pool (Figure 2). This underutilization leads us to explore using neural topic embeddings as fixed keys in the prompt pool.

(v) Do topic-aware keys improve PromptDSI?

The query-key matching mechanism in L2P and S-Prompt++ relies on comparing the similarity between query vectors and learnable keys to select appropriate prompts. However, BERT often produces query vectors that are highly similar to each other, as its features are poorly suited for effective similarity measurements. This high cosine similarity across different queries causes a problem: when a learnable key is updated to be closer to these query vectors, it can result in different queries frequently selecting the same key, leading to a collapse in the matching mechanism. Using fixed neural topic embeddings as keys, PromptDSI_{Topic} prevents this issue by ensuring diverse and robust prompt selection across queries. During inference, PromptDSI_{Topic} matches majority of queries to corresponding topic-aware keys, ensuring that the appropriate prompts are selected for prefix-tuning (see Table 10 in the Appendix). PromptDSI_{Topic} achieves a Hits@10 performance of 91.2%, close to the upper bound set by the “Multi-corpora” baseline at 91.4% on NQ320k (Table 1). However, there is a slight performance drop on D_0 . We hypothesize that this decline is due to the fine-grained prompts tailored to specific topics in D_0 not being adequately trained when these topics are infrequent in D' .




Figure 4: Prompt selection percentage of PromptDSI using L2P and S-Prompt++ across BERT and SBERT, with prompts attached to layer 1. Results are reported from checkpoints completed training on D' .

(vi) Why prompting does not degrade PromptDSI’s performance on D_0 ?

Although PromptDSI’s prompts are not explicitly trained on D_0 , the prompts are still prefix-tuning to the PLM’s backbone even if queries are from D_0 . Surprisingly, this only results in marginal forgetting compared to IncDSI. According to Petrov et al. (2024), prefix-tuning adds bias to the attention block output without altering the attention pattern of the PLM. Since the initial checkpoint is trained for document classification on D_0 , the prefix-tuning prompts also serve this purpose, making the initial checkpoint’s skills transferable to downstream tasks. Additionally, D' may contain documents semantically similar (i.e., belonging to the same topic) to those in the initial corpus, allowing prompts to learn backward-transferrable knowledge that preserves recall performance, though not precision, due to the unique docids of each document.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we present PromptDSI, a novel approach to rehearsal-free instance-wise incremental learning for DSI. PromptDSI uses learnable prompts to guide the PLM backbone, enabling effective indexing of new corpora without accessing previous documents or queries. Our topic-aware prompt pool challenges associated with parameter underutilization, ensuring the diverse and efficient utilization of prompts. Empirical results demonstrate that PromptDSI performs on par with IncDSI in managing forgetting while significantly enhancing recall on new corpora. PromptDSI presents a promising avenue for efficient information retrieval in dynamic corpora of the DSI paradigm.

Limitations

PromptDSI shows promise for rehearsal-free continual learning in Differentiable Search Index (DSI), but it has some limitations. Firstly, its success relies on the strength of the initial pre-trained language model (PLM); weaker initial embeddings may hinder the effective use of prompts for new document indexing. Secondly, our reliance on neural topic embeddings may falter in scenarios with highly dynamic or emergent topics. Although leveraging large language models (LLMs) could provide more robust topic embeddings, adapting to rapidly changing topic landscapes and controlling the number of representative topics remain open challenges. Lastly, while PromptDSI is effective at indexing new documents, it does not currently support editing or removing previously indexed documents, an area needing further exploration.

References

- Rahaf Aljundi, Francesca Babiloni, Mohamed Elhoseiny, Marcus Rohrbach, and Tinne Tuytelaars. 2018. Memory aware synapses: Learning what (not) to forget. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 139–154.
- Adam Berger, Rich Caruana, David Cohn, Dayne Freitag, and Vibhu Mittal. 2000. Bridging the lexical chasm: statistical approaches to answer-finding. In *Proceedings of the 23rd annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 192–199.
- Roi Blanco and Christina Lioma. 2012. Graph-based term weighting for information retrieval. *Information retrieval*, 15:54–92.
- Pietro Buzzega, Matteo Boschini, Angelo Porrello, Davide Abati, and Simone Calderara. 2020. Dark experience for general continual learning: a strong, simple baseline. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:15920–15930.
- Yinqiong Cai, Keping Bi, Yixing Fan, Jiafeng Guo, Wei Chen, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. L2r: Lifelong learning for first-stage retrieval with backward-compatible representations. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 183–192.
- Arslan Chaudhry, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Marcus Rohrbach, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2019. Efficient lifelong learning with a-gem. In *ICLR*.
- Jiangui Chen, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten de Rijke, Wei Chen, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. Continual learning for generative retrieval over dynamic corpora. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 306–315.
- Bart Custers, Alan M Sears, Francien Dechesne, Ilina Georgieva, Tommaso Tani, and Simone Van der Hof. 2019. *EU personal data protection in policy and practice*, volume 29. Springer.
- 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. 2019. **BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pierre Foret, Ariel Kleiner, Hossein Mobahi, and Behnam Neyshabur. 2020. Sharpness-aware minimization for efficiently improving generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.01412*.
- Robert M French. 1999. Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 3(4):128–135.
- Luyu Gao, Zhuyun Dai, Tongfei Chen, Zhen Fan, Benjamin Van Durme, and Jamie Callan. 2021. Complement lexical retrieval model with semantic residual embeddings. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 43rd European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2021, Virtual Event, March 28–April 1, 2021, Proceedings, Part I 43*, pages 146–160. Springer.
- Thomas Gerald and Laure Soulier. 2022. Continual learning of long topic sequences in neural information retrieval. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*, pages 244–259. Springer.
- Maarten Grootendorst. 2022. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794*.
- Jiafeng Guo, Changjiang Zhou, Ruqing Zhang, Jiangui Chen, Maarten de Rijke, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2024. Corpusbrain++: A continual generative pre-training framework for knowledge-intensive language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16767*.
- Pankaj Gupta, Yatin Chaudhary, Thomas Runkler, and Hinrich Schuetze. 2020. **Neural topic modeling with continual lifelong learning**. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3907–3917. PMLR.
- Wei-Cheng Huang, Chun-Fu Chen, and Hsiang Hsu. 2024. **OVOR: Oneprompt with virtual outlier regularization for rehearsal-free class-incremental learning**. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2019. Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3):535–547.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. [Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 6769–6781, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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.
- James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. 2017. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526.
- Varsha Kishore, Chao Wan, Justin Lovelace, Yoav Artzi, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. 2023. Incdsi: Incrementally updatable document retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’23*. JMLR.org.
- Tom Kwiattkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. [Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691*.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. [Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*.
- Xiaoxi Li, Jiajie Jin, Yujia Zhou, Yuyao Zhang, Peitian Zhang, Yutao Zhu, and Zhicheng Dou. 2024. From matching to generation: A survey on generative information retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14851*.
- Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. 2017. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947.
- Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022a. [P-tuning: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning across scales and tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 61–68, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2022b. [P-tuning: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning across scales and tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 61–68, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Lopez-Paz and Marc’Aurelio Ranzato. 2017. Gradient episodic memory for continual learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2017. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*.
- Yi Luan, Jacob Eisenstein, Kristina Toutanova, and Michael Collins. 2021. Sparse, dense, and attentional representations for text retrieval. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:329–345.
- Michael McCloskey and Neal J Cohen. 1989. Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 24, pages 109–165. Elsevier.
- Sanket Mehta, Jai Gupta, Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Vinh Tran, Jinfeng Rao, Marc Najork, Emma Strubell, and Donald Metzler. 2023a. [DSI++: Updating transformer memory with new documents](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8198–8213, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sanket Vaibhav Mehta, Darshan Patil, Sarath Chandar, and Emma Strubell. 2023b. [An empirical investigation of the role of pre-training in lifelong learning](#). *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(214):1–50.
- Jun-Yeong Moon, Keon-Hee Park, Jung Uk Kim, and Gyeong-Moon Park. 2023. Online class incremental learning on stochastic blurry task boundary via mask and visual prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. Ms marco: A human-generated machine reading comprehension dataset.
- Rodrigo Nogueira, Jimmy Lin, and AI Epistemic. 2019. From doc2query to docttttquery. *Online preprint*, 6(2).
- Aleksandar Petrov, Philip Torr, and Adel Bibi. 2024. [When do prompting and prefix-tuning work? a theory of capabilities and limitations](#). In *The Twelfth*

- International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. **Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks**. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- Minjoon Seo, Jinhyuk Lee, Tom Kwiatkowski, Ankur Parikh, Ali Farhadi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2019. **Real-time open-domain question answering with dense-sparse phrase index**. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4430–4441, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Reza Shokri and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2015. Privacy-preserving deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSAC conference on computer and communications security*, pages 1310–1321.
- James Seale Smith, Leonid Karlinsky, Vyshnavi Gutta, Paola Cascante-Bonilla, Donghyun Kim, Assaf Arbel, Rameswar Panda, Rogerio Feris, and Zsolt Kira. 2023. Coda-prompt: Continual decomposed attention-based prompting for rehearsal-free continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11909–11919.
- Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Zheng Chen, Shuaiqiang Wang, Haichao Zhu, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, Maarten Rijke, and Zhaochun Ren. 2023. Learning to tokenize for generative retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Yi Tay, Vinh Tran, Mostafa Dehghani, Jianmo Ni, Dara Bahri, Harsh Mehta, Zhen Qin, Kai Hui, Zhe Zhao, Jai Gupta, et al. 2022. Transformer memory as a differentiable search index. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:21831–21843.
- Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Beir: A heterogenous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08663*.
- 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.
- Han Wang, Nirmalendu Prakash, Nguyen Khoi Hoang, Ming Shan Hee, Usman Naseem, and Roy Ka-Wei Lee. 2023. Prompting large language models for topic modeling. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (BigData)*, pages 1236–1241. IEEE.
- Liyuan Wang, Jingyi Xie, Xingxing Zhang, Mingyi Huang, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. 2024a. Hierarchical decomposition of prompt-based continual learning: Rethinking obscured sub-optimality. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Liyuan Wang, Xingxing Zhang, Hang Su, and Jun Zhu. 2024b. **A comprehensive survey of continual learning: Theory, method and application**. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–20.
- Yabin Wang, Zhiwu Huang, and Xiaopeng Hong. 2022a. S-prompts learning with pre-trained transformers: An occam’s razor for domain incremental learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:5682–5695.
- Yujing Wang, Yingyan Hou, Haonan Wang, Ziming Miao, Shibin Wu, Qi Chen, Yuqing Xia, Chengmin Chi, Guoshuai Zhao, Zheng Liu, et al. 2022b. A neural corpus indexer for document retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25600–25614.
- Zifeng Wang, Zizhao Zhang, Sayna Ebrahimi, Ruoxi Sun, Han Zhang, Chen-Yu Lee, Xiaoqi Ren, Guolong Su, Vincent Perot, Jennifer Dy, et al. 2022c. Dual-prompt: Complementary prompting for rehearsal-free continual learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 631–648. Springer.
- Zifeng Wang, Zizhao Zhang, Chen-Yu Lee, Han Zhang, Ruoxi Sun, Xiaoqi Ren, Guolong Su, Vincent Perot, Jennifer Dy, and Tomas Pfister. 2022d. Learning to prompt for continual learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 139–149.
- Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Remi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, Joe Davison, Sam Shleifer, Patrick von Platen, Clara Ma, Yacine Jernite, Julien Plu, Canwen Xu, Teven Le Scao, Sylvain Gugger, Mariama Drame, Quentin Lhoest, and Alexander Rush. 2020. **Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing**. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 38–45, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tongtong Wu, Massimo Caccia, Zhuang Li, Yuan-Fang Li, Guilin Qi, and Gholamreza Haffari. 2021. Pre-trained language model in continual learning: A comparative study. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold

Overwijk. 2020. Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00808*.

Prateek Yadav, Qing Sun, Hantian Ding, Xiaopeng Li, Dejiao Zhang, Ming Tan, Parminder Bhatia, Xiaofei Ma, Ramesh Nallapati, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, et al. 2023. Exploring continual learning for code generation models. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 782–792.

Friedemann Zenke, Ben Poole, and Surya Ganguli. 2017. Continual learning through synaptic intelligence. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3987–3995. PMLR.

Tiancheng Zhao, Xiaopeng Lu, and Kyusong Lee. 2021. SPARTA: Efficient open-domain question answering via sparse transformer matching retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 565–575, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Guoqing Zheng and Jamie Callan. 2015. Learning to reweight terms with distributed representations. In *Proceedings of the 38th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval*, pages 575–584.

Shengyao Zhuang, Houxing Ren, Linjun Shou, Jian Pei, Ming Gong, Guido Zuccon, and Daxin Jiang. 2022. Bridging the gap between indexing and retrieval for differentiable search index with query generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10128*.

A Continual Learning Metrics

We follow previous studies (Mehta et al., 2023b,a) and report continual learning metrics for our experiments, including average performance (A_t), forgetting (F_t), and learning performance (LA_t). F_t (aka backward transfer) measures the influence of the current corpus t on the performance of all previous corpora. As knowledge accumulates during continual learning, LA_t (aka forward transfer) measures the learning capability of the model on a new corpus. Denoting $P_{t,i}$ as the performance of the model on corpus D_i after training on corpus D_t , where $i \leq t$, the continual learning metrics are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{i=0}^t P_{t,i}; LA_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=0}^t P_{t,i} \\ F_t &= \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \max_{i' \in \{0, \dots, t-1\}} (P_{i',i} - P_{t,i}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

B Prompt-based Continual Learning Methods

In this section, we further explain three mainstream rehearsal-free Prompt-based Continual Learning (PCL) methods that are used throughout our study. **L2P (Wang et al., 2022d)** introduces a shared prompt pool $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_M\}$ with M prompts, each $P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$ associated with a learnable key $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Prompt keys are optimized using cosine distance to align them with the [CLS] token $f_\theta(X)[0]$ of the input sequence X : $\cos(f_\theta(X)[0], K_i)$. During inference, the [CLS] token of input queries is compared with all prompt keys, and the top- k prompts are selected from the prompt pool based on this query-key matching mechanism, in an instance-wise manner without requiring task identity.

S-Prompt++ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a) employs task-specific prompts, akin to a single-prompt version of L2P, for individual tasks. While its optimization and prompt selection procedures during inference resemble those of L2P, prompts and prompt keys assigned for a task remain fixed after training on that task.

CODA-Prompt (Smith et al., 2023) differs from S-Prompt++ in three main ways: (1) Prompts and learnable keys are initialized with the Gram-Schmidt process to reduce knowledge interference between corpora; (2) Along with a prompt key, CODA-Prompt introduces another learnable vector, the attention vector $A \in \mathbb{R}^d$, associated with each prompt; (3) Instead of using the query-key matching mechanism, CODA-Prompt uses weighted summation of prompts from the prompt pool, defined as: $P = \sum_{i=1}^M (\alpha_i P_i)$, where $\alpha_i = \cos(f_\theta(X)[0] \odot A_i, K_i)$ is the weighting factor and \odot stands for the Hadamard product.

C Implementation Details

We use a single NVIDIA V100 16GB GPU on all experiments, except for training the the initial checkpoint on MS MARCO’s initial corpus D_0 , where we use a single NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU to fit the large batch size of 1024. Pre-trained model weights are initialized from Huggingface library (Wolf et al., 2020). We use “bert-base-uncased” pre-trained weight for BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) and “all-mpnet-v2” pre-trained weight for SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019).

Regarding training settings of the initial corpus D_0 , we follow (Kishore et al., 2023) to set our hy-

| NQ320k | | | | | |
|--------|----------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Corpus | Document | Train Queries | Validation Queries | Test Queries | Generated Queries |
| D_0 | 98743 | 221194 | 55295 | 6998 | 1480538 |
| D_1 | 2000 | 4484 | 1091 | 152 | 29997 |
| D_2 | 2000 | 4417 | 1085 | 153 | 29992 |
| D_3 | 2000 | 4800 | 1298 | 177 | 29991 |
| D_4 | 2000 | 4346 | 1107 | 116 | 29992 |
| D_5 | 1874 | 4131 | 964 | 140 | 28105 |

Table 3: The NQ320k dataset statistics used in our study.

| MS MARCO | | | | | |
|----------|----------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Corpus | Document | Train Queries | Validation Queries | Test Queries | Generated Queries |
| D_0 | 289424 | 262008 | 65502 | 4678 | 4312150 |
| D_1 | 2000 | 1768 | 480 | 40 | 29787 |
| D_2 | 2000 | 1799 | 457 | 35 | 29805 |
| D_3 | 2000 | 1800 | 450 | 30 | 29774 |
| D_4 | 2000 | 1772 | 475 | 29 | 29821 |
| D_5 | 2000 | 1851 | 430 | 30 | 29779 |

Table 4: The MS MARCO dataset statistics used in our study.

perparameters for the initial model f_θ^0 . We train on the initial corpus for 20 epochs using cross-entropy loss before the continual indexing phase. We use a batch size of 128 and 1024; a learning rate of $1e^{-4}$ and $5e^{-5}$ for training on NQ320k (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019) and MS MARCO (Nguyen et al., 2016), respectively.

We reproduce IncDSI (Kishore et al., 2023) in our setup using the official implementation². Other baselines model are trained using the settings in Table 5. Note that for the Sparse Experience Replay baseline, we randomly sample queries from previous corpora with a ratio of $\frac{1}{32}$ to construct the memory buffer, consistent with the mixing ratio used in DSI++ (Mehta et al., 2023a). Regarding PromptDSI, we adopt the public re-implementations of L2P³ (Wang et al., 2022d), S-Prompt++⁴ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a), and the official implementation of CODA-Prompt⁵ (Smith et al., 2023). Please refer to Table 6 for details configuration.

²<https://github.com/varshakishore/IncDSI>

³<https://github.com/JH-LEE-KR/l2p-pytorch>

⁴<https://github.com/JH-LEE-KR/dualprompt-pytorch>

⁵<https://github.com/GT-RIPL/CODA-Prompt>

D Additional Results on NQ320k

Due to the paper length restriction, we discuss additional results on NQ320k in this section and MS MARCO in the following section.

D.1 BERT-based PromptDSI

In Section 5, we demonstrate that SBERT-based PromptDSI with CODA-Prompt (Smith et al., 2023) slightly falls behind L2P (Wang et al., 2022d) and S-Prompt++ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a) in terms of average performance on D' but exhibits less catastrophic forgetting and avoids sudden surges in forgetting, particularly in the top layers of D_0 . However, this conclusion does not extend to BERT-based PromptDSI, as illustrated in Figure 5.

For BERT-based PromptDSI, the performance of PromptDSI_{CODA-Prompt} significantly declines when prompts are attached to deeper layers of PromptDSI’s encoder f_θ . This deterioration suggests that CODA-Prompt’s reliance on attention and weighted prompt summation is highly sensitive to the PLM’s query features, especially since we avoid using the [CLS] token from the top layer. In contrast, both L2P and S-Prompt++ maintain consistent performance across layers, and the observed trends of high forgetting and learning capacity in the top layers remain applicable. This resilience

| Sequential, Multi-corpora, Joint, Sparse | |
|--|--|
| Learning rate | $1e^{-4}$ |
| Epochs | 10 |
| Batch size | 128 |
| Optimizer | AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017), weight decay: $1e^{-2}$ |
| Scheduler | None |
| Loss | Cross-entropy |

Table 5: Detailed configuration for implementation of: Sequential Fine-tuning, Multi-corpora Fine-tuning, Joint Supervised, and Sparse Experience Replay.

| PromptDSI | |
|--|--|
| Learning rate | NQ320k: $1e^{-4}$ (BERT), $1.5e^{-4}$ (SBERT) MS MARCO: $5e^{-4}$ (BERT), $1e^{-3}$ (SBERT) |
| Epochs | 10 |
| Batch size | 128 |
| Optimizer | AdamW, weight decay: $1e^{-2}$ |
| Scheduler | None |
| Loss | Cross-entropy |
| L2P (Wang et al., 2022d) | Prompt length 20; Prompt pool size: 5; Top-k: 1 |
| S-Prompt++ (Wang et al., 2022a, 2024a) | Prompt length 20; Prompts per task: 1 |
| CODA-Prompt (Smith et al., 2023) | Prompt length 10; Prompts per task: 2 |

Table 6: Detailed configuration for implementation of PromptDSI

highlights the robustness of PCL methods, where even a single prompt can be competitive against more complex strategies. (Huang et al., 2024).

As depicted in the left column of Figure 6, prompting at deeper layers generally increases forgetting on D_0 , with multi-layer prompting exacerbating this effect compared to single-layer prompting at layer 1, which is undesirable. In the right column of Figure 6, we observe that single-layer prompting from layer 4 to layer 9 improves Hits@10, albeit at the expense of lower Hits@1 and MRR10. While there is no discernible trend in two-layer prompting, three-layer prompting starting from layer 3 shows a notable average performance increase. However, this approach requires three times the number of trainable parameters compared to single-layer prompting at layer 1.

In summary, our findings indicate that for BERT-based PromptDSI, single-layer prompting at layer 1 strikes a good balance between stability and plasticity while minimizing the number of trainable parameters. Additionally, we recommend adopting SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) as the preferred pre-trained model for future studies. This recommendation is twofold: first, SBERT-

based PromptDSI generally outperforms BERT-based PromptDSI; second, its embeddings are better suited for PCL methods that rely on similarity comparisons for prompt selection or construction, as demonstrated by approaches like CODA-Prompt.

D.2 SBERT-based PromptDSI

Figure 7 illustrates the performance of various SBERT-based PromptDSI variants when prompts are attached to the second layer of SBERT. Evaluating on metrics such as average performance (A_n) and learning performance (LA_n), all PromptDSI variants exhibit a similar trend and outperform IncDSI. While these PromptDSI variants tend to have higher forgetting rates in terms of Hits@1, owing to being rehearsal-free, they are more robust in terms of maintaining Hits@10. PromptDSI_{Topic}, which utilizes topic-aware fixed keys, demonstrates strong performance in Hits@1, reflecting its ability to identify topic-specific documents effectively. However, PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++}, which assigns a single prompt to each corpus, excels in Hits@10. This suggests that shared prompts across a task can enhance the ability to general-




Figure 5: Single-layer prompting analysis of BERT-based PromptDSI equipped with different PCL methods on NQ320k dataset. PromptDSI_{CODA-Prompt} shows deteriorating performance when prompting at deeper layers of BERT, which implies that CODA-Prompt is highly sensitive to the query vectors.




Figure 6: Multi-layer prompting analysis of BERT-based PromptDSL_{S-Prompt++} on NQ320k dataset. Figures illustrate the performance differences when applying multi-layer prompting compared to single-layer prompting at layer 1 (represented by the red line).

ize and retrieve a broader set of relevant documents. Despite PromptDSL_{S-Prompt++}'s advantage in Hits@10 during the continual indexing phase, it suffers from significant forgetting over time. Conversely, PromptDSL_{Topic} shows superior retention in Hits@10, achieving the lowest forgetting rate among all methods tested. This indicates that while shared prompts boost learning, they may not be as effective in long-term retention as topic-aware prompts, which help maintain a broader and more

consistent recall performance.

Table 7 presents the results for various methods using the SBERT backbone on the NQ320k dataset. All PromptDSI variants show comparable results on D_0 in terms of Hits@10, while PromptDSL_{L2P} and PromptDSL_{CODA-Prompt} even outperform IncDSI in terms of Hits@1. This suggests that solving the exhaustive constraint optimization problem, as in IncDSI, may not be necessary, particularly when access to previous documents or queries is restricted. With the right pre-training, PromptDSI demonstrate effective learning capacity and resilience against forgetting, matching the robustness of IncDSI. Regarding D' , PromptDSI approaches the upper-bound Hits@10 of the baseline “Multi-corpora” where the gap is only 0.5% for PromptDSL_{S-Prompt++}.

E Results on MS MARCO

Building on insights garnered from experiments on the NQ320k dataset, we extended our analysis to the challenging MS MARCO dataset, characterized by a larger initial corpus D_0 and a notably smaller test set, as outlined in Table 4.

From Figure 8, PromptDSL_{CODA-Prompt} is the only variant of PromptDSI that lags behind IncDSI in both average performance and learning capacity on D_0 , as indicated by Hits@1. Nevertheless, all PromptDSI variants, including PromptDSL_{CODA-Prompt}, surpass IncDSI in Hits@10 on the new corpus D' . Among these, PromptDSL_{Topic} demonstrates superior learning per-




Figure 7: Continual indexing performance of PromptDSI equipped with different PCL methods on NQ320k dataset compared to IncDSI. Prompts are added to layer 2 of SBERT.

| Added corpus | Method | Eval corpus: D_0 | | Eval corpus: D' | |
|---|--|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
| | | Hits@1 | Hits@10 | Hits@1 | Hits@10 |
| D_0 | - | 67.9 | 88.1 | - | - |
| D' | Non CL methods | | | | |
| | Multi-corpora | 0.0 | 0.0 | 78.7 | 92.0 |
| | Joint | 63.1 | 86.8 | 61.0 | 86.4 |
| | CL methods | | | | |
| | Sequential | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 27.5 |
| | Sparse ER | 2.4 | 2.7 | 21.7 | 33.6 |
| | IncDSI | 64.7 | 87.1 | 65.1 | 87.2 |
| | IncDSI (batch) | 64.7 | <u>87.0</u> | 65.1 | 87.2 |
| | PromptDSI _{L2P} (Ours) | <u>64.8</u> | 87.0 | 67.4 | 91.1 |
| | PromptDSI _{S-Prompt++} (Ours) | 64.7 | <u>86.7</u> | 66.9 | 91.5 |
| PromptDSI _{CODA-Prompt} (Ours) | 65.1 | <u>87.0</u> | 66.0 | 90.8 | |
| PromptDSI _{Topic} (Ours) | 64.6 | 86.8 | <u>67.3</u> | <u>91.2</u> | |

Table 7: Detail performance on NQ320k dataset across different methods. All methods start from the same SBERT checkpoints trained on the initial corpus D_0 , resulting in the same performance in D_0 . Prompts are added to layer 2 of SBERT.

formance, excelling in both Hits@1 and Hits@10 compared to other PromptDSI variants and IncDSI. In contrast, IncDSI shows its strength in maintaining D_0 performance, evidenced by the lowest levels of forgetting in Hits@1 and Hits@10.

Tables 8 present the performance comparison of various methods on the MS MARCO dataset using SBERT-based PromptDSI. IncDSI’s exhaustive constraint optimization demonstrates its effectiveness in maintaining performance on D_0 . However, consistent with previous findings, all PromptDSI variants achieve impressive Hits@10 on D_0 with at most 0.7% gap compared to IncDSI without rehearsal. On D' , PromptDSI variants exhibit better learning capabilities, particularly in Hits@10.

Remarkably, PromptDSI_{Topic} achieves the highest Hits@1 and Hits@10 on D' , at 62.3% and 90.2%, respectively.

F Ablation in hyperparameter for model selection

Due to the imbalance in the number of documents between the initial corpus D_0 and the new corpora D' , it is crucial to balance the performance trade-off between D_0 and D' during training. To achieve this, we use the F-beta score of validation MRR@10, as proposed by Kishore et al. (2023), for model selection. The F-beta score is defined as

| Added corpus | Method | Eval corpus: D_0 | | Eval corpus: D' | |
|---|--|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | Hits@1 | Hits@10 | Hits@1 | Hits@10 |
| D_0 | - | 50.3 | 82.7 | - | - |
| D' | Non CL methods | | | | |
| | Multi-corpora | 0.0 | 0.0 | 82.9 | 94.7 |
| | Joint | 45.2 | 76.3 | 49.5 | 84.1 |
| | CL methods | | | | |
| | Sequential | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 29.0 |
| | Sparse ER | 2.4 | 2.9 | 21.9 | 26.5 |
| | IncDSI | 49.0 | 82.0 | 58.8 | 84.6 |
| | IncDSI (batch) | 49.0 | 82.0 | 58.8 | 84.0 |
| | PromptDSI _{L2P} (Ours) | 47.6 | <u>81.7</u> | 59.3 | 87.2 |
| | PromptDSI _{S-Prompt++} (Ours) | 47.5 | 81.5 | <u>61.5</u> | 86.6 |
| PromptDSI _{CODA-Prompt} (Ours) | 47.5 | 81.5 | <u>57.5</u> | <u>87.3</u> | |
| PromptDSI _{Topic} (Ours) | <u>47.7</u> | 81.3 | 62.3 | 90.2 | |

Table 8: Detail performance on MS MARCO dataset across different methods. All methods start from the same SBERT checkpoint trained on the initial corpus D_0 , resulting in the same performance in D_0 . Prompts are added to layer 2 of SBERT.




Figure 8: Continual indexing performance of PromptDSI equipped with different PCL methods on MS MARCO dataset compared to IncDSI. Prompts are added to layer 2 of SBERT.

follows:

$$y_{target} = (1 + \beta^2) \cdot \frac{y_{new} \cdot y_{initial}}{(\beta^2 \cdot y_{new}) + y_{initial}}, \quad (5)$$

where β represents the importance weight of D_0 relative to the new corpus D' , and $y_{initial}$ and y_{new} denote the performance on D_0 and D' , respectively. Based on the results in Table 9, we choose $\beta = 3$ as it provides a balanced trade-off between the performances on D_0 and D' .

G Neural topics mined from BERTopic

We employ BERTopic (Grootendorst, 2022) to mine neural topics from the initial corpus D_0 , adhering closely to the author’s best practices

guide⁶. However, it is worth noting that this approach might not be universally optimal for all datasets. Given that we utilize BERT and SBERT as pre-trained weights for our PromptDSI, we adopt two distinct BERTopic models, each tailored to these respective pre-trained weights, for both the NQ320k and MS MARCO datasets. This choice results in slightly different topics being identified for the same dataset, as visually depicted in Figures 9 and 10. Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that topic modeling techniques may benefit from the use of larger language models (LLMs) compared to traditional models like BERT

⁶https://maartengr.github.io/BERTopic/getting-started/best_practices/best_practices.html

| PLM | Metric | $\beta = 2$ | $\beta = 3$ | $\beta = 5$ |
|-------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| BERT | Hits@1 | 63.4/62.4 | 63.5/62.8 | 65.0/55.2 |
| | Hits@10 | 86.0/90.9 | 86.0/90.8 | 86.5/89.4 |
| SBERT | Hits@1 | 63.4/66.7 | 63.7/65.8 | 65.5/56.8 |
| | Hits@10 | 86.3/91.1 | 86.4/90.6 | 86.8/89.6 |

Table 9: Ablation on the choice of β in F-beta score (Equation 5) using PromptDSI_{S-Prompt++}. Prompts are added to layer 1 of BERT/SBERT. Results are displayed as {Performance of D_0 }/{ A_5 - Average performance of D' }.

or SBERT, due to the increased representational capacity and contextual understanding offered by these larger models (Wang et al., 2023).

Table 10 shows the queries corresponding to the top-8 topics mined using SBERT-based BERTopic on the NQ320k validation set as selected during inference by PromptDSI_{topic}. The mined neural topics cover various popular topics frequently queried by users. We observe that these queries often contain the most frequent or highly semantically similar terms related to the corresponding topics. With prompts segmented by topics, they can transfer knowledge between corpora, enhancing the indexing and retrieval performance of new documents compared to prompts with learnable keys. Future work could explore better designs for a topic-aware prompt pool to retain initial corpus performance, particularly for rare topics that do not appear in new corpora.

H Related Work

H.1 Continual Learning

Addressing catastrophic forgetting in continual learning (CL) has been an active field of research. Two popular CL methods are regularization-based approaches (Kirkpatrick et al., 2017; Zenke et al., 2017; Li and Hoiem, 2017; Aljundi et al., 2018), which add regularization terms into the training objective to constraint the model weights from falling too far away from the original model or through knowledge distillation; and replay-based or rehearsal approaches (Lopez-Paz and Ranzato, 2017; Chaudhry et al., 2019; Buzzega et al., 2020) which utilize memory buffer to store past examples or generative model to generate pseudo examples for rehearsal. These two CL methods are employed in most lifelong information retrieval studies (Cai et al., 2023; Mehta et al., 2023a; Chen et al., 2023; Guo et al., 2024).

H.2 Prompt-based Continual Learning

Prompt-based continual learning (PCL) methods have emerged as a solution to address practical CL scenarios, particularly in situations where accessing historical data is prohibitively restricted due to data privacy regulations (Custers et al., 2019). A series of studies (Wang et al., 2022d,c; Smith et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2022a) have explored the use of prompts to guide frozen pre-trained language models (PLMs) in acquiring new tasks without necessitating additional storage for a memory buffer, hence the name rehearsal-free CL. Thanks to powerful representations of PLMs and the instance-wise prompt selection which enables task-agnostic inference capability, PCL methods can achieve competitive performance against rehearsal approaches under the challenging rehearsal-free class-incremental learning (Wang et al., 2024a).

H.3 Sparse, Dense, and Hybrid Retrieval

Traditional sparse retrieval methods (Blanco and Lioma, 2012; Zheng and Callan, 2015; Zhao et al., 2021) relies on ranking functions like TF-IDF or BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009) for keyword-based retrieval. Since these methods treat queries and documents as bag-of-word (Thakur et al., 2021), they suffer from lexical gap (Berger et al., 2000). Dense retrieval methods (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Xiong et al., 2020; Khattab and Zaharia, 2020) leverage neural networks, particularly PLMs, to capture semantic of both queries and documents, overcoming the lexical gap of sparse retrieval methods. These methods map both queries and documents to high dimensional vector; in the retrieval stage, efficient Approximated Nearest Neighbor search implementation like FAISS (Johnson et al., 2019) is used to compare similarity between a query and relevance documents. Hybrid retrieval methods (Seo et al., 2019; Gao et al., 2021; Luan et al., 2021) combine the best of both sparse and dense retrieval methods to achieves even better performance.

| Topic | Queries |
|-------------------|--|
| 0 (Music) | who sang the song no other love have i who sings the song it feels like rain who sings whenever you want me i'll be there who sang the song she blinded me with science |
| 1 (Football) | who played in the 2013 ncaa basketball championship when was the last time cleveland browns were in the playoffs has any nfl team gone 16-0 and won the superbowl what nfl team never went to the super bowl |
| 2 (Movies) | who is the actor that plays spencer reid who died in vampire diaries season 1 episode 17 who played the mother on father knows best how many season of the waltons are there |
| 3 (Human biology) | where does the amino acid attach to trna when a person is at rest approximately how much blood is being held within the veins where are lipids synthesized outside of the endomembrane system |
| 4 (Origin) | where does the last name broome come from where does spring water found in mountains come from where does the last name de leon come from |
| 5 (Soccer) | who has scored the most goals for brazil who is going to the 2018 world cup when did ifa first begun and which country was it played who came second in the world cup 2018 |
| 6 (War) | who fought on the western front during ww1 when did the allies start to win ww2 when did the united states declare war on germany what were the most effective weapons in ww1 |
| 7 (Geography) | how wide is the mississippi river at davenport iowa bob dylan musical girl from the north country what are the four deserts in north america |

Table 10: Natural queries from the NQ320k validation set that are matched correctly to the corresponding topic-aware prompts during inference. Topic embeddings are mined using BERTopic with SBERT. Topic-specific terms are highlighted.

H.4 End-to-end Retrieval

End-to-end retrieval replaces the conventional "retrieve-then-rank" framework with a single Transformer model, allowing direct query-to-docid mapping and simplifying training and inference processes (De Cao et al., 2020; Tay et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b). This approach integrates corpus information into the model parameters and eliminates specialized search procedures, where the most representative work is Differentiable Search Index (DSI) (Tay et al., 2022). DSI can be divided into two subcategories: classification-based (Kishore et al., 2023) and generative retrieval (Zhuang et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b; Mehta et al., 2023a; Sun et al., 2023). We mainly focus on classification-based approach in this paper. Enhanced versions of the DSI address gaps in indexing and retrieval, and improve docid representations (Zhuang et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022b; Sun et al., 2023). Recent advances explore CL issues in DSI, using rehearsal combines with various strategies such as using Sharpness-Aware Minimization loss (Mehta et al., 2023a), Incremental Product Quantization (Chen et al., 2023), continual pre-training adapters (Guo

et al., 2024), and solving a constraint optimization (Kishore et al., 2023). PromptDSI builds upon IncDSI (Kishore et al., 2023) and pushes DSI towards rehearsal-free CL.




Figure 9: Top 8 NQ320k topics mined using BERTopic with BERT/SBERT and their corresponding most frequent terms. A total of 79 topics were identified with BERT and 90 with SBERT from the initial corpus D_0 .





Figure 10: Top 8 MS MARCO topics mined using BERTopic with BERT/SBERT and their corresponding most frequent terms. A total of 181 topics were identified with BERT and 192 with SBERT from the initial corpus D_0 .