

---

# EFFICIENT FINE-TUNING METHODOLOGY OF TEXT EMBEDDING MODELS FOR INFORMATION RETRIEVAL: CONTRASTIVE LEARNING PENALTY (CLP)

---

**Jeongsu Yu**

Department of Convergence Security  
Kangwon National University  
yjshi25@kangwon.ac.kr

December 24, 2024

## ABSTRACT

Text embedding models play a crucial role in natural language processing, particularly in information retrieval, and their importance is further highlighted with the recent utilization of RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation). This study presents an efficient fine-tuning methodology encompassing data selection, loss function, and model architecture to enhance the information retrieval performance of pre-trained text embedding models. In particular, this study proposes a novel Contrastive Learning Penalty function that overcomes the limitations of existing Contrastive Learning. The proposed methodology achieves significant performance improvements over existing methods in document retrieval tasks. This study is expected to contribute to improving the performance of information retrieval systems through fine-tuning of text embedding models. The code for this study can be found at <https://github.com/CreaLabs/Enhanced-BGE-M3-with-CLP-and-MoE>, and the best-performing model can be found at <https://huggingface.co/CreaLabs>.

## 1 Introduction

Text embedding models play a crucial role in natural language processing, particularly in information retrieval, by mapping text data into a semantically rich vector space. The importance of information retrieval has been further highlighted with the recent utilization of RAG (Retrieval-Augmented Generation) (Lewis et al., 2020) to address the issues of hallucination and outdated information in large language models (LLMs). Pre-trained text embedding models on a massive corpus have significantly improved the quality of text representation. BGE M3-Embedding (Chen et al., 2024) is a representative model that shows outstanding performance in multilingual text embedding and information retrieval.

This study proposes an efficient fine-tuning methodology to enhance the information retrieval performance of pre-trained text embedding models by specializing them to a specific domain:

1. Efficient Training Data Selection Technique: Applies ANCE (Approximate Nearest Neighbor Negative Contrastive Estimation) (Xiong et al., 2020) for selecting negative samples in the training data.
2. Contrastive Learning Penalty (CLP): Analyzes the limitations of existing Contrastive Learning functions and proposes a novel loss function to overcome them.
3. Mixture of Experts (MoE) Technique (Gupta et al., 2022): Generates optimized embeddings based on the characteristics of the input text to effectively respond to various types of queries.

To validate the effectiveness of the proposed methodology, we evaluated its performance on document retrieval tasks in three languages using the nDCG metric. The experimental results demonstrate that the proposed methodology achieves significant performance improvements compared to existing methods.

## 2 Related Work

In the past, keyword-matching based retrieval methods like BM25 were mainly used for document retrieval. BM25 calculates a similarity score considering term frequency, inverse document frequency, and document length (Robertson et al., 1995; Crestani et al., 1998). Although BM25 is an efficient and widely used method, it has the following limitations:

1. Vocabulary mismatch: If different words with the same meaning are used in the query and the document, BM25 may not accurately capture the relevance. For example, BM25 recognizes "car" and "vehicle" as different words even though they have the same meaning.
2. Difficulty in understanding meaning: Since BM25 only considers the frequency and distribution of words, it does not capture the meaning or context of words. Therefore, it may have difficulty accurately matching the intent of the query with the content of the document.
3. Ignoring syntactic information: BM25 does not consider syntactic information such as word order or sentence structure. Therefore, "how to get from Seoul to Busan" and "how to get from Busan to Seoul" can be treated the same in BM25.

These limitations can be overcome with the advent of text encoders, i.e., text embedding models, from pre-trained language models (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019; Ni et al., 2021).

**Dense Retrieval.** Dense Retrieval (DR) using text embedding models enables search results that understand the meaning of text, not just word matching. DR maps text to a high-dimensional vector space using deep learning and performs search by measuring similarity based on distances in this vector space (Karpukhin et al., 2020).

**Contrastive Learning.** The learning of text embedding models for DR has been advanced by the advent of Contrastive Learning techniques (Hadsell et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2022). Contrastive Learning (CL) aims to learn effective representations by pulling together semantically close neighbors and pushing away irrelevant ones. This assumes a dataset  $D = (q_i, p_i^+, P_i^-)_{i=1}^m$  composed of semantically related pairs, where  $q_i$  denotes a query,  $p_i^+$  denotes a positive sample for  $q_i$  and  $P_i^-$  denotes a set of negative samples for  $q_i$ . Following the Contrastive Learning framework of Chen et al. (2020), we use a cross-entropy objective function with negative samples from within a mini-batch. Specifically, when  $h_i, h_i^-, P_i^-$  are the representations of  $q_i, p_i^+, P_i^-$  respectively, the training objective function on a mini-batch of  $N$  pairs is:

$$LITER_i = -\log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(h_i, h_i^+)/\tau)}{\sum_{H_i \in \{h_i^+, H_i^-\}} \exp(\text{sim}(h_i, H_i)/\tau)} \tag{1}$$

where  $r$  is a temperature hyperparameter and  $\text{sim}(h_1, h_2)$  is the cosine similarity  $\frac{h_1^T h_2}{\|h_1\| \cdot \|h_2\|}$ .

To perform CL, we need to construct pairs  $D = (q_i, p_i^+, P_i^-)_{i=1}^m$ . In this process, effective negative sampling has a significant impact on learning performance. The ANCE (Xiong et al., 2020) study revealed that using uninformative negative samples that are distant from the query leads to problems such as decreased gradient values, increased stochastic gradient variance, and slow learning convergence. Therefore, utilizing informative negative samples that are closer to the query is more effective.

## 3 Fine-tuning Methods

### 3.1 Contrastive Learning Penalty (CLP)

CL simply minimizes the distance between  $q_i$  and its semantically related counterpart  $p_i^+$ , while maximizing the distance to the unrelated  $p_i^-$ . However, this learning method does not consider the distance between  $H_i^-$  and its semantically related queries,  $Q_i^*$ , where  $Q_i^*$  is the set of positive queries for each document in  $H_i^-$ . For efficient learning, while minimizing the distance between  $q_i$  and  $p_i^+$  and maximizing the distance to  $H_i^-$ , we need to ensure that this does not negatively affect the distance between  $H_i^-$  and  $Q_i^*$ . In this study, we propose a novel CLP to address the negative impact on the distance between  $H_i^-$  and  $Q_i^*$  in existing CL.

CLP imposes a penalty that increases as the distance between  $H_i^-$  and  $Q_i^*$  grows in the existing Contrastive Learning Loss function. The specific formula is as follows:

$$\text{LITER}_i = (\lambda - 1) \log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(h_i, h_i^+)/\tau)}{\sum_{H_i \in \{h_i^+, H'\}} \exp(\text{sim}(h_i, H_i)/\tau)} + \lambda \left( 1 - \sum_{h^* \in H^*} \text{sim}(h', h^*) \right) \quad (2)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the weight of the penalty, and  $H^*$  represents the representations of  $Q_i^*$ .




Figure 1: The difference between CL and CLP

### 3.2 Negative Sampling

In this study, we utilize the top 10 most similar samples from the dense retrieval results of the training corpus of the model being trained, excluding the positive sample, as negative samples, referring to the ANCE methodology. This provides information-rich samples to induce effective learning and prevents problems caused by using uninformative negative samples (Xiong et al., 2020).

### 3.3 Mixture of Experts(MoE)

Existing methodologies utilized dense networks that use the same weights for all tasks, regardless of input characteristics. However, this caused a problem where inputs with different characteristics interfered with each other in model training. To address this issue, Mixture of Experts (MoE) was introduced. MoE shares only some weights and trains the remaining weights according to the input characteristics. By assigning tasks to suitable experts for the input through a task-aware gating function that analyzes input characteristics, it improves transfer learning to low-resource tasks, enables efficient generalization, and prevents capacity loss in existing models (Gupta et al., 2022).

This study leverages the advantages of MoE by applying the MoE structure to the intermediate layer of the existing text embedding model. We froze and trained the remaining parameters excluding the MoE layer.

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Evaluation Setup

#### 4.1.1 Metric

In this study, we fine-tuned the BGE M3-Embedding model for specific languages (Korean, Hindi, and Persian) using the multilingual document retrieval dataset MIRACL (Table 1) and evaluated its performance. Korean is an agglutinative language, Hindi is an inflectional language, and Persian belongs to the Indo-European language family. By selecting these languages, we aimed to comprehensively analyze various language types.

The dense retrieval results of the fine-tuned models are evaluated using the nDCG metric. nDCG is an evaluation metric that considers the ranking of search results, assigning higher scores when more relevant documents are ranked higher, and is widely used in the field of information retrieval. The BGE M3-Embedding model achieved higher nDCG scores than previous models on MIRACL (Table 2).

Language	ISO	Train		Dev		Test-A		Test-B		# Passages	# Articles	In Mr. TyDi?
		# Q	# J	# Q	# J	# Q	# J	# Q	# J			
Arabic	ar	3,495	25,382	2,896	29,197	936	9,325	1,405	14,036	2,061,414	656,982	✓
Bengali	bn	1,631	16,754	411	4,206	102	1,037	1,130	11,286	297,265	63,762	✓
English	en	2,863	29,416	799	8,350	734	5,617	1,790	18,241	32,893,221	5,758,285	✓
Spanish	es	2,162	21,531	648	6,443	-	-	1,515	15,074	10,373,953	1,669,181	×
Persian	fa	2,107	21,844	632	6,571	-	-	1,476	15,313	2,207,172	857,827	×
Finnish	fi	2,897	20,350	1,271	12,008	1,060	10,586	711	7,100	1,883,509	447,815	✓
French	fr	1,143	11,426	343	3,429	-	-	801	8,008	14,636,953	2,325,608	×
Hindi	hi	1,169	11,668	350	3,494	-	-	819	8,169	506,264	148,107	×
Indonesian	id	4,071	41,358	960	9,668	731	7,430	611	6,098	1,446,315	446,330	✓
Japanese	ja	3,477	34,387	860	8,354	650	6,922	1,141	11,410	6,953,614	1,133,444	✓
Korean	ko	868	12,767	213	3,057	263	3,855	1,417	14,161	1,486,752	437,373	✓
Russian	ru	4,683	33,921	1,252	13,100	911	8,777	718	7,174	9,543,918	1,476,045	✓
Swahili	sw	1,901	9,359	482	5,092	638	6,615	465	4,620	131,924	47,793	✓
Telugu	te	3,452	18,608	828	1,606	594	5,948	793	7,920	518,079	66,353	✓
Thai	th	2,972	21,293	733	7,573	992	10,432	650	6,493	542,166	128,179	✓
Chinese	zh	1,312	13,113	393	3,928	-	-	920	9,196	4,934,368	1,246,389	×
Total		40,203	343,177	13,071	126,076	7,611	76,544	16,362	164,299	90,416,887	16,909,473	
Surprise Language 1		?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	×
Surprise Language 2		?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	×

Table 1: MIRACL dataset (Zhang et al., 2022)

Model	Avg	ar	bn	en	es	fa	fi	fr	hi	id	ja	ko	ru	sw	te	th	zh	de	yo
Baselines ( <i>Prior Work</i> )																			
BM25	31.9	39.5	48.2	26.7	7.7	28.7	45.8	11.5	35.0	29.7	31.2	37.1	25.6	35.1	38.3	49.1	17.5	12.0	56.1
mDPR	41.8	49.9	44.3	39.4	47.8	48.0	47.2	43.5	38.3	27.2	43.9	41.9	40.7	29.9	35.6	35.8	51.2	49.0	39.6
mContriever	43.1	52.5	50.1	36.4	41.8	21.5	60.2	31.4	28.6	39.2	42.4	48.3	39.1	56.0	52.8	51.7	41.0	40.8	41.5
mE5 <sub>large</sub>	66.6	76.0	75.9	52.9	52.9	59.0	77.8	54.5	62.0	52.9	70.6	66.5	67.4	74.9	84.6	80.2	56.0	56.4	78.3
E5 <sub>mistral-7b</sub>	63.4	73.3	70.3	57.3	52.2	52.1	74.7	55.2	52.1	52.7	66.8	61.8	67.7	68.4	73.9	74.0	54.0	54.1	79.7
OpenAI-3	54.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M3-Embedding ( <i>Our Work</i> )																			
Dense	69.2	78.4	80.0	56.9	56.1	60.9	78.6	58.3	59.5	56.1	72.8	69.9	70.1	78.7	86.2	82.6	62.7	56.7	81.8
Sparse	53.9	67.1	68.9	43.8	38.6	45.1	65.4	35.3	48.2	48.9	56.1	61.5	44.5	57.9	79.1	70.9	36.1	32.5	70.0
Multi-vec	70.5	79.6	81.0	59.3	57.8	62.0	80.1	59.4	61.5	58.3	74.5	71.2	71.2	79.1	87.9	83.0	63.7	58.0	82.4
Dense+Sparse	70.4	79.6	80.7	58.8	58.1	62.3	79.7	58.0	62.9	58.3	73.9	71.2	69.8	78.5	87.2	83.1	63.5	57.7	83.3
All	<b>71.5</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>59.6</b>	<b>59.7</b>	<b>63.4</b>	<b>80.4</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>59.0</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>72.1</b>	<b>71.7</b>	<b>79.6</b>	<b>88.1</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>59.8</b>	<b>83.5</b>

Table 2: BGE M3-Embedding on MIRACL dev set (nDCG@10) (Chen et al., 2024)

### 4.1.2 Training details

This model was trained on a single 3090 GPU with the following hyperparameters:

- Learning rate: 1e-5
- Mixed precision training (fp16)
- Number of training epochs: Table 3
- Per-device training batch size: 1
- Gradient accumulation steps: 4

For CLP, the penalty weight was set to 0.1. For the MoE layers, the number of experts was set to 2 and the number of experts per token was set to 1.

In this study, we applied four methods based on the BGE M3-Embedding model to improve its performance. Detailed explanations of each method are provided in the following paragraphs. To find the model with the optimal performance, we fixed the hyperparameters for each method and trained the model while only changing the epoch value. The epoch that showed the best performance for each method is as follows:

method/Number of training epochs	ko	fa	hi
random dataset	1	1	1
ANCE dataset	2	1	1
ANCE-CLP	2	1	1
ANCE-CLP-intermediate	2	1	1
ANCE-CLP-moe-intermediate	3	3	3

Table 3: Optimal epoch value for each method

## 4.2 Performance Comparison

method/language	ko	fa	hi	average
baseline(BGE M3-Embedding)	64.36	51.13	52.35	55.95
random dataset	59.61	47.38	51.78	52.92
ANCE dataset	66.89	50.88	54.53	57.43
ANCE-CLP	67.05	52.39	54.75	58.06
ANCE-CLP-intermediate	66.92	55.1	56.34	59.45
ANCE-CLP-moe-intermediate	<b>67.74</b>	<b>55.56</b>	<b>56.36</b>	<b>59.89</b>

Table 4: MIRACL dev set (measured by nDCG@5)

### 4.2.1 Train Dataset

This study compared and analyzed negative sampling techniques in CL. Comparing the conventional method of random negative sampling with the ANCE methodology, the following performance differences were observed:

- random dataset: This method employed random negative sampling. This approach resulted in lower performance (52.92) compared to the baseline model (55.95). This is likely because random sampling has a higher chance of selecting negative samples with low information content, making it less effective for model training.
- ANCE dataset: This method utilized the ANCE methodology for negative sampling. This approach achieved higher performance (57.43) than the baseline model (55.95). It is analyzed that ANCE contributed to the performance improvement by effectively selecting hard negative samples, which provide useful information for model learning.

These experimental results show that the negative sampling technique in CL can significantly influence model performance. In particular, it was confirmed that a technique that effectively selects hard negative samples, such as ANCE, is effective in improving the performance of the model.

### 4.2.2 Loss Funtion

This study compared and analyzed the performance of the proposed CLP and existing CL. Applying CLP requires positive queries corresponding to negative samples, but the MIRACL dataset used in the experiment does not include this information.

Therefore, we utilized Gemini 1.5 Pro to generate synthetic data for positive queries. Specifically, we generated negative sample’s positive query through the Gemini 1.5 Pro model using the prompt in Table 5.

As shown in Table 4, the experimental results demonstrate a performance improvement when applying CLP (ANCE-CLP) with a score of 58.06, compared to the existing CL (ANCE dataset) which scored 57.43. Notably, in the case of Persian, applying the existing CL resulted in a performance decrease (50.88) compared to the baseline model (51.13). However, applying CLP showed a significant performance improvement (52.39), demonstrating the superiority of CLP.

lang	prompt
ko	아래 글과 관련된 질문을 하나만 해주세요.
fa	لطفا یک سوال در مورد مقاله زیر بپرسید.
hi	कृपया नीचे दिए गए लेख से संबंधित केवल एक प्रश्न पूछें।

Table 5: MIRACL dev set (measured by nDCG@5)

However, CLP took 3 minutes and 16 seconds to train one epoch on the MIRACL Korean learning dataset (854 instances), while the existing CL took 4 minutes and 18 seconds. The longer training time for CLP is attributed to the additional computational step of calculating the similarity between the negative sample and the negative sample’s query.

### 4.2.3 Model Architecture

To determine the optimal location for applying Mixture of Experts(MoE), we conducted an experiment where only the intermediate layer of the model was trained, while keeping other layers frozen. Interestingly, training only the intermediate layer (ANCE-CLP-intermediate) resulted in higher performance (59.45 -> 59.89) than training all parameters of the model (ANCE-CLP). In this experiment, the intermediate layer serves to expand the dimension from 1024 to 4096.

Based on these experimental results, we applied MoE to the intermediate layer (ANCE-CLP-moe-intermediate) while freezing other parameters. This ultimately yielded the best performance of 59.89.

However, applying MoE has the drawback of increased inference time. Embedding the MIRACL Korean corpus dataset (371,688 instances) took 3 hours and 7 minutes for the baseline model, while the MoE model required 5 hours and 1 minute.




Figure 2: Model Architecture

## 5 Conclusion

This study proposes an efficient fine-tuning methodology for specializing pre-trained text embedding models to a specific domain, thereby enhancing information retrieval performance. We aimed to maximize model performance throughout the entire fine-tuning process, from training data construction to loss function and model structure.

Our key improvements include:

1. Efficient Training Data Selection: We utilized ANCE to select informative negative samples, leading to more effective model learning.

2. Contrastive Learning Penalty (CLP): We introduced a novel loss function, CLP, which addresses limitations of existing contrastive learning by considering the relationship between negative samples and their corresponding positive queries.

3. Mixture of Experts (MoE) Application: We applied MoE to the intermediate layer of the text embedding model to generate optimized embeddings tailored to diverse input text characteristics.

Experiments conducted on a multilingual document retrieval dataset (MIRACL) across Korean, Hindi, and Persian demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed methodology. By applying all proposed methods, we achieved a final performance improvement of approximately 5 points compared to the baseline.

The main contributions of this study are as follows:

- We demonstrate the effectiveness of combining ANCE, CLP, and MoE for fine-tuning pre-trained text embedding models in information retrieval tasks.
- The newly proposed CLP significantly improved performance, especially for Persian, where conventional CL exhibited performance degradation.

This study presents a novel approach to fine-tuning text embedding models and is expected to contribute to improving the performance of information retrieval systems. Future research will focus on validating the applicability of our method to various languages and domains and further enhancing the efficiency of CLP.

The code for this study is available at <https://github.com/CreaLabs/Enhanced-BGE-M3-with-CLP-and-MoE>, and the final model can be found at <https://huggingface.co/CreaLabs>.

## References

- Jianlv Chen, Shitao Xiao, Peitian Zhang, Kun Luo, Defu Lian, and Zheng Liu. Bge m3-embedding: Multi-lingual, multi-functionality, multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.03216>.
- Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.05709>.
- Fabio Crestani, Mounia Lalmas, Cornelis J Van Rijsbergen, and Iain Campbell. Is this document relevant? ... probably: a survey of probabilistic models in information retrieval. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 30(4):528–552, 1998.
- Tianyu Gao, Xingcheng Yao, and Danqi Chen. Simcse: Simple contrastive learning of sentence embeddings, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.08821>.
- Shashank Gupta, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Krishan Subudhi, Eduardo Gonzalez, Damien Jose, Ahmed H. Awadallah, and Jianfeng Gao. Sparsely activated mixture-of-experts are robust multi-task learners, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07689>.
- Raia Hadsell, Sumit Chopra, and Yann LeCun. Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. In *2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'06)*, volume 2, pages 1735–1742. IEEE, 2006.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen tau Yih. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.04906>.
- Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. *CoRR*, abs/2005.11401, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.11401>.
- Jianmo Ni, Gustavo Hernández Ábrego, Noah Constant, Ji Ma, Keith B. Hall, Daniel Cer, and Yinfei Yang. Sentence-t5: Scalable sentence encoders from pre-trained text-to-text models, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.08877>.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.10084>.
- Stephen E Robertson, Steve Walker, Susan Jones, Micheline M Hancock-Beaulieu, Mike Gatford, et al. Okapi at trec-3. In *Nist Special Publication Sp*, volume 109, page 109, 1995.

Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.00808>.

Xinyu Zhang, Nandan Thakur, Odunayo Ogundepo, Ehsan Kamaloo, David Alfonso-Hermelo, Xiaoguang Li, Qun Liu, Mehdi Rezagholizadeh, and Jimmy Lin. Making a mirac: Multilingual information retrieval across a continuum of languages, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.09984>.