

# *GenTREC*: The First Test Collection Generated by Large Language Models for Evaluating Information Retrieval Systems

Mehmet Deniz Türkmen<sup>1</sup>, Mucahid Kutlu<sup>2</sup>,  
Bahadır Altun<sup>3</sup>, Gokalp Cosgun<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>GESIS Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, <sup>2</sup>Qatar University

<sup>3</sup>University at Buffalo, <sup>4</sup>Wayne State University

deniz.tuerkmen@gesis.org, mucahidkutlu@qu.edu.qa,  
ialtun@buffalo.edu, gcosgun@wayne.edu

January 7, 2025

## Abstract

Building test collections for Information Retrieval evaluation has traditionally been a resource-intensive and time-consuming task, primarily due to the dependence on manual relevance judgments. While various cost-effective strategies have been explored, the development of such collections remains a significant challenge. In this paper, we present *GenTREC*, the first test collection constructed entirely from documents generated by a Large Language Model (LLM), eliminating the need for manual relevance judgments. Our approach is based on the assumption that documents generated by an LLM are inherently relevant to the prompts used for their generation. Based on this heuristic, we utilized existing TREC search topics to generate documents. We consider a document relevant only to the prompt that generated it, while other document-topic pairs are treated as non-relevant. To introduce realistic retrieval challenges, we also generated non-relevant documents, ensuring that IR systems are tested against a diverse and robust set of materials. The resulting *GenTREC* collection comprises 96,196 documents, 300 topics, and 18,964 relevance “judgments”. We conducted extensive experiments to evaluate *GenTREC* in terms of document quality, relevance judgment accuracy, and evaluation reliability. Notably, our findings indicate that the ranking of IR systems using *GenTREC* is compatible with the evaluations conducted using traditional TREC test collections, particularly for P@100, MAP, and RPrec metrics. Overall, our results show that our proposed approach

offers a promising, low-cost alternative for IR evaluation, significantly reducing the burden of building and maintaining future IR evaluation resources.

## 1 Introduction

The construction of test collections to evaluate IR systems has been a fundamental component of IR research, enabling systematic comparison of various retrieval techniques and algorithms. Typically, the process involves crawling a large document collection, developing a set of search topics, selecting documents for relevance judgment, and collecting relevance judgments for the document-topic pairs [67]. Over the years, researchers have developed several methodologies aimed at constructing high-quality and reusable test collections within reasonable budgets [57, 64, 37, 18, 41].

Several factors affect the quality of a test collection, including the number of topics, the accuracy and prevalence of relevance judgments, and the documents themselves. In particular, several studies explore the impact of the number of topics on the evaluation reliability and report that 50 topics, as used by several TREC test collections [30, 31], are not enough for a reliable evaluation [65, 72, 75, 37]. In addition, the document collection should contain a reasonable amount of relevant documents for each topic to assess and distinguish the performance of systems. Furthermore, as collecting relevance judgments is extremely costly, a sample of the documents should be selected and judged. Obviously, the accuracy of the judgments and the selected documents to be judged [1] affect the evaluation reliability. Considering all these factors affecting the quality of test collections, the conventional approach to test collection construction carries inherent risks because the quality of a collection can only be fully assessed after its completion. As a result, despite careful design, test collections might suffer from low quality [76], leading to substantial financial costs and considerable human effort being wasted.

In recent years, the remarkable success of large language models (LLMs) has also affected the IR research community in several directions. In particular, a growing portion of document collections on the Internet is likely to consist of AI-generated content<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, IR systems need to deal with this new AI-generated data. In addition, several researchers explored various ways to integrate these models into search operations [85]. While LLMs

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/12/20/1065667/how-ai-generated-text-is-poisoning-the-internet/>

can be used to retrieve answers to a particular question, their knowledge base is restricted by the training data, limiting their usage to get information for recent events. Consequently, prior work investigated hybrid systems where a response is generated from retrieved documents [8], making the standard retrieval systems still vital to satisfy our information needs. Therefore, building test collections and its risks continues to be an important area to explore.

The advancements in generative AI technologies led several researchers to focus on how LLMs can be utilized in the evaluation of IR systems [59]. Several studies have employed these models to automatically assess document relevance [24, 71, 69, 60] and generate search queries [58, 61] to construct test collections from crawled document sets. To the best of our knowledge, no prior research has attempted to use recent LLMs to generate test collections entirely, including both documents and relevance judgments.

In this study, we investigate whether LLMs can be utilized to generate test collections and introduce *GenTREC* as a proof-of-concept test collection that is generated by an LLM. Our approach significantly diverges from the conventional test collection construction approach by generating documents. Our proposed approach relies on the intuition that a generated document should be relevant to its prompt. Thus, if we use search topics as prompts and generate documents accordingly, we do not need to collect relevance judgments because we can decide the relevance of documents during the generation phase. Specifically, we first collect existing search topics from TREC tracks and generate subtopics for each of them using GPT 3.5, to increase topical diversity. For each subtopic, we generate a document, assuming that the generated document is relevant to the corresponding topic. Considering that generated documents may be too easily retrieved, we also generate non-relevant documents that are similar to the relevant ones. Additionally, to further enlarge the collection, we generate documents on random topics, assuming that these documents will not be relevant to any of the search topics, similar to the conventional pooling method where unjudged documents are treated as non-relevant. Eventually, *GenTREC* consists of 96,196 documents, 300 topics, and 18,964 relevant judgments, costing only \$ 126 based on the current charges.

We conduct a comprehensive set of experiments to analyze the quality of the generated documents, the accuracy of the relevance judgments, and the reliability of system evaluations done by *GenTREC*. Specifically, we compare (i) the generated documents with the Disks 4-5 document collection used in several TREC tracks [30, 23, 31], and (ii) the system ranking correlation between TREC collections and *GenTREC*. Our observations are as

follows. i) *GenTREC* contains shorter documents and sentences, with lower lexical diversity but require a higher education level (based on established readability metrics), compared to human-authored documents. ii) The generated documents assumed to be relevant are indeed relevant in 83% of the cases. However, the accuracy of the relevance “judgments” varies across topics such that almost all generated documents are relevant in several topics. On the other hand, the generated documents are related to the search topic but not addressing the actual information need in some search topics. iii) The ranking of IR systems based on *GenTREC* is highly similar to the ranking of systems based on the existing TREC tracks for P@100, reaching 1.0 and 0.95 Kendall’s  $\tau$  score for TREC6 and Robust2004, respectively. While the ranking correlation with MAP and RPrec metrics do not reach 0.9 threshold, which is a conventionally accepted threshold for high ranking correlation [73], we find that the ranking correlation across existing TREC collections usually do not reach this threshold and our results are compatible with them. However, our system rankings are highly different than TREC rankings based on P@10.

The main contributions of our work are as follows.

- We explore the potential of using LLMs to generate a test collection. Our proposed method enables researchers to design document collections and configure the number of relevant documents and their topics based on their specific needs.
- We introduce *GenTREC*, the first test collection, consisting of LLM-generated documents and corresponding relevance “judgments”.
- Through extensive experiments, we evaluate the effectiveness of *GenTREC* and demonstrate that it yields compatible rankings with TREC collections for P@100, MAP, and RPrec metrics.
- We share our code and data to enable reproducibility of our results and to support the research community in testing and training their IR systems.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review previous work related to our study. In Section 3, we define our methodology for generating a test collection using an LLM. We introduce *GenTREC* in Section 4 and provide a quantitative analysis of the generated documents in Section 5. We present our experimental results for system rankings with *GenTREC* in Section 6. We discuss the limitations of our work in Section 7 and conclude in Section 8.

## 2 Related Work

This section presents a detailed examination of research on IR evaluation methodologies. We begin by discussing studies that focus on the construction of test collections using human annotations (Section 2.1). Next we discuss the pseudo-test collections, which eliminate the need for relevance judgments (Section 2.2). We then explore simulated test collections that generate queries and/or documents (Section 2.3). Finally, we review recent research studies utilizing LLMs for IR evaluation (Section 2.4).

### 2.1 Test Collection Construction with Human Annotations

The construction of test collections has attracted considerable interest due to its critical role in evaluating IR systems and the inherent challenges it presents. In particular, the process is resource-intensive due to the substantial amount of judgments required. Therefore, optimizing evaluation budgets is a key concern in achieving reliable system evaluations. A significant amount of research has focused on selecting documents for judgment, given that it is infeasible to assess every document-topic pair within a collection. The pooling method [37], which focuses on evaluating the top-ranked documents from pre-selected IR systems, has been widely adopted by the IR community [52]. While pooling reduces costs and can produce high-quality test collections (e.g., TREC-8 [30]), several challenges remain, including incomplete judgments, the necessity for multiple IR systems, and the high cost of relevance judgments. Consequently, numerous studies have tried to refine pooling through various strategies, such as predictive evaluation metrics for incomplete judgments [11, 64], smart document selection methods [14, 51, 56], and relevance inference using classifiers [13, 5, 45]. Other approaches have included crowdsourcing [27, 49, 18] and reducing the number of topics [41, 63, 29, 36].

The IR community has also shown great interest in shared-tasks such as TREC<sup>2</sup>, NTCIR<sup>3</sup>, FIRE<sup>4</sup>, and CLEF<sup>5</sup>, which have facilitated the construction of several test collections for various IR tasks [23, 16, 38]. In addition to shared-task test collections, some studies have developed collections independently. For instance, Hasanain et al. [33] utilize interactive search [19] to identify documents for relevance judgments rather than relying on tra-

---

<sup>2</sup><https://trec.nist.gov/>

<sup>3</sup><https://research.nii.ac.jp/ntcir/index-en.html>

<sup>4</sup><http://fire.irsi.org.in/fire/2024/home>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.clef-initiative.eu>

ditional pooling methods [37]. Similarly, Rahman et al. [57] explore active learning techniques to build test collections without a shared-task setup.

All these approaches rely on human-authored documents; in contrast, our work generates documents using LLMs and eliminates the need for both organizing a shared task and collecting relevance judgments.

## 2.2 Pseudo Test Collections

Due to the high cost of human annotations, researchers have investigated alternative approaches to constructing test collections without manual annotations. One such approach involves predicting document relevance based on shared-task participants. For example, Nuray et al. [54] explore the combination of retrieval results from multiple IR systems to form pseudo-relevant documents for system evaluation. Similarly, Hauff and de Jong [34] report that evaluation without judgments correlates with evaluation using few judgments, although Roitero et al. [62] highlight the limitations of simple combination strategies based on data fusion techniques.

As another research direction, prior work investigated how particular data resources can be turned into a test collection automatically, including web pages [2], tweets [10], Wikipedia dumps [21], and digital libraries [9]. For instance, Asadi et al. [2] propose using anchor texts in web pages as queries and assume documents pointed by anchor texts are relevant to the corresponding query. This enables them to construct a test collection without any manual effort to create topics and collect judgments. While they do not use their method to evaluate systems, they show that it can be utilized to train learning-to-rank models.

Similarly, Dietz et al. [21] generate queries from the titles and sub-headings of Wikipedia pages, assuming that the text following each title or heading is relevant to the corresponding query, thereby eliminating the need for manual relevance judgments. Berendsen et al. [10] take a similar approach with tweets, assuming that tweets are relevant to the hashtags they contain. They generate queries from hashtags and build a test collection to train and fine-tune learning-to-rank systems for microblog retrieval. Furthermore, Dietz and Dalton [22] develop a test collection for passage retrieval, using queries derived from Wikipedia pages, textbook chapters, and product descriptions. In this approach, only passages from the documents in which the queries were generated are considered relevant.

Nevertheless, while all these studies rely on pre-existing document collections, our approach generates the documents, thereby eliminating the dependency on existing corpora.

### 2.3 Simulated Test Collections

Our test collection falls under the category of simulated test collections. Research on simulated test collections has a history spanning several decades [35]. Notably, the first simulated test collection was introduced by Cooper in 1973 [17]. In his work, Cooper created artificial text blocks by generating words based on their frequency distributions. He then created a thesaurus from the word associations in this generated text, using it to construct both documents and queries. For his experiments, Cooper generated a total of 150 documents.

As a noteworthy work, Zobel and Moffat [87] developed a simulated test collection using a language model to generate documents with statistical properties resembling real text. In addition, they generated queries based on the vocabulary of the corpus. However, their focus was not on ranking information retrieval systems, but rather on comparing document signatures and inverted file structures.

Our method shares conceptual similarities with studies on known-item search [7, 6], where relevance judgments are not required as queries are generated for specific documents. For instance, Kim and Croft [39] create a simulated collection for desktop research, where queries are generated for a specific document (i.e., known-item), thereby eliminating the need to collect relevance judgments. However, in contrast to these methods, we generate documents for a given topic rather than queries for a known-item. Furthermore, our focus is on ad hoc search tasks, not known-item search.

To our knowledge, the most comprehensive work on simulated test collections in the literature is done by Hawking et al. [35]. In their study, they develop several tools to extract features from a given corpus and generate synthetic corpora based on specific parameters and models. They explore various techniques, including unigram models, Markov models, and fine-tuned GPT-2 models. They implement three systems and evaluate their performance using the simulated test collection. While they find that the text generated by GPT-2 appears superficially plausible, it lacks meaningful content, making it unsuitable for queries that require understanding complex linguistic structures. In contrast, our work utilizes ChatGPT to generate documents and evaluates the resulting collection with a broader range of IR systems, including more recent retrieval technologies.

## 2.4 LLMs for Evaluation

With the remarkable success of LLMs across various tasks, researchers in the IR community have investigated whether LLMs can be employed to evaluate IR systems. Most of these studies have concentrated on using LLMs to collect relevance judgments [24, 71, 69, 60], exploring different prompts and strategies to enhance their accuracy. LLMs have also been employed for relevance judging in specific tasks such as product search [50] and in less commonly studied languages like Tetun [20] and Brazilian Portuguese [12]. To improve the reliability of evaluations involving LLM-judged document-topic pairs, some researchers [55] have developed methods to create confidence intervals around ranking metrics derived from LLM-based relevance judgments. However, none of these studies utilize LLMs to both generate documents and derive relevance judgments, as we do in our study.

As generative IR becomes an emerging research direction with the advancements in LLMs, other researchers have focused on methodologies for evaluating generative IR systems [66, 25]. However, our work centers on evaluating retrieval performance rather than generation capabilities.

Several researchers have also employed LLMs to generate synthetic test collections. For instance, Rahmani et al. [58] generated synthetic queries and relevance judgments using LLMs, using the MS MARCO v2 corpus as the document collection. Their findings indicate that synthetic test collections can produce evaluation results comparable to those derived from traditional test collections. Zhang et al. [86] introduced USimAgent, a simulator that uses LLMs to mimic user search behaviors such as querying, clicking, and stopping. They report that USimAgent outperforms other methods in query generation and is as effective as traditional approaches in predicting user clicks and session termination. Similarly, Rajapakse and de Rijke [61] generated queries using sequence-to-sequence models, demonstrating that dense retrievers can benefit from automatically generated training datasets. In contrast, our work does not focus on query generation but rather on generating document collections and relevance judgments.

Studies focused on document generation share similarities with our approach. Several researchers have explored the use of LLMs to generate training data, particularly for text classification [83, 82, 84]. However, we focus on search tasks. In the context of generating documents for IR systems, Askari et al. [3, 4] generate documents for specific queries to augment training datasets. In contrast, our work investigates whether generated documents can also be employed to evaluate systems, not just to enhance training processes.



### 3 Automatic Test Collection Generation

Cranfield-style test collections are created by compiling a large number of already existing documents, creating/obtaining search topics, and labeling the relevance of document-topic pairs [67]. In this study, we abandon this approach and prefer to generate documents from scratch using LLMs rather than crawling existing ones. This approach enables us to identify the topic of a document at the generation stage, eliminating the burden of labeling. Furthermore, we can control the prevalence of relevant documents for each topic and the difficulty of the retrieval task by this approach. However, there are several challenges that need to be addressed to achieve a reliable evaluation of systems.

**Figure 1** shows the overall process to generate a test collection. **Table A1** in Appendix provides the prompts and example outputs. Firstly, we gather a large set of search topics and generate a document using its topic description (i.e., initialization step). Next, in order to increase the diversity of documents, we generate several *subtopics* for each topic using an LLM. Subsequently, we generate a document for each subtopic, assuming that the generated documents will be relevant to the corresponding topic. Furthermore, in order to make the retrieval task more challenging, we generate *tricky non-relevant documents* which share similarities with relevant documents, but are eventually non-relevant. Lastly, to increase the collection size, we generate topics on any random topic, assuming that they will be non-relevant to any topic in our collection. Eventually, our test collection consists of search topics we gather and all generated documents. We do not collect any relevance judgments, but we consider that documents generated for a specific topic are relevant to the corresponding topic but non-relevant to the others.

Now, we explain the details of generating subtopics (Section 3.1), documents relevant to a specific topic (Section 3.2), and non-relevant documents (Section 3.3).

#### 3.1 Generating Subtopics

Using LLMs, we can generate several relevant documents for each topic at a minimal cost. However, having highly similar relevant documents would reduce the reliability of system evaluation, as retrieving one document may make it easier for the system to retrieve others that are closely related. Therefore, we need a diverse set of relevant documents for each topic to construct a realistic and reliable test collection.




Figure 1: Automatic Test Collection Generation Process and Prompts.

As a naive approach to creating different documents, we can ask the LLM to regenerate its response for a given prompt (i.e., topic) several times. However, using the same prompt usually yields highly similar documents. As another approach, we can change the prompt slightly for each generated document. For instance, in our not-reported experiments with ChatGPT, we explored using follow-up prompts such as "Talk about it more" and "What else can you say?" to create different documents. However, this method also failed and created documents with high overlap compared to the other generated documents we generated.

In order to address this issue, we take the following steps. Many topics are broad and can be addressed in different ways. For instance, if a topic asks about technological developments in 20<sup>th</sup> century, this information need can be addressed from various perspectives, such as technological developments in medicine, transportation, and other domains. Thus, instead of using only the original topic description to generate documents, we first use an LLM to produce subtopics related to the given topic, and then generate documents for each subtopic. Because we use distinct prompts for each document, the resulting documents likely exhibit less word overlap compared to those generated based on only the original topic description. To generate subtopics for a given topic, we provide the LLM with the topic description, followed by the prompt: "Can you write 100 subtopics related to this? Please be as specific as possible.". **Table 1** lists the first 10 subtopics generated for topic

260 of TREC-5.

	Generated Subtopics
1	The significance of the Neolithic era in human history
2	How scientists determine the age of ancient artifacts and fossils
3	The origins of agriculture and domestication of animals
4	The impact of climate change on the development of human civilization
5	The spread of human populations across the globe
6	The role of women in ancient societies
7	The evolution of human technology during the Neolithic era
8	The development of writing systems and communication
9	The use of fire and its importance to human survival
10	The emergence of social hierarchy and class systems

Table 1: The first 10 subtopics generated by ChatGPT for the topic 260 of TREC-5, of which the topic description is “Evidence of the existence of human life 10,000 years ago.”

### 3.2 Generating Relevant Documents

We generate relevant documents using the original topic description and subtopics derived from it. However, in order to identify the most effective method, we conducted a pilot study and examined the impact of prompt memorization and the specification of document type on the generated documents.

**Memorization of Previous Prompts.** Instruct-tuned LLMs, e.g., ChatGPT, keep the previous prompts and generate texts considering all prompts to achieve coherent conversation. This might negatively impact the textual diversity as the model tends to shape its all responses around the very first request. As expected, in our pilot study, we observed that the minimum, maximum, and median textual similarity<sup>6</sup> between generated document pairs is 0.006, 0.977, and 0.125, respectively. However, if we start a new chat session for each generated document (i.e., no memorization), the minimum, maximum, and median textual overlap between generated document pairs reduce to 0.004, 0.202, and 0.055, respectively. Therefore, we do not use any memorization in our document generation processes.

---

<sup>6</sup>We used “SequenceMatcher” module from Python “difflib” library to calculate the similarity between two texts.

**Document Type.** In our pilot study, we generated news articles as mentioned above. However, specifying a particular writing style might reduce the textual diversity of the collection. Therefore, we also asked GPT3.5 to generate just long texts without mentioning the document type and calculated their textual overlap. We observed that the minimum, maximum, and median textual overlap between *long texts* is 0.001, 0.113 and 0.018, respectively. As the diversity of words is higher in long texts than news articles, we opt for creating our dataset with long texts rather than news articles.

### 3.3 Generating Non-Relevant Documents

For a robust and reliable evaluation, the quantity and quality of non-relevant documents are equally as critical as those of relevant documents. For instance, if all non-relevant documents are entirely different than the relevant ones, retrieval systems may identify all relevant documents, limiting the ability to differentiate between systems based on their retrieval performance. In addition, as the proportion of relevant documents within the collection decreases, the retrieval task becomes more challenging for the systems. However, an excessively challenging evaluation setup may also limit our ability to accurately distinguish the performance of different retrieval systems. Thus, balancing these factors is essential to ensure a reliable evaluation.

In standard test collections, unjudged documents are typically assumed to be non-relevant. Inspired by this assumption, documents generated for a specific topic can be regarded as relevant to that topic, while those generated for other topics are treated as non-relevant. While this is a reasonable starting point, these relevant and non-relevant documents may be about entirely different topics, potentially making the retrieval task too easy. Therefore, in addition to these non-relevant assumed documents, we also create two additional types of non-relevant documents: *tricky* non-relevant documents and documents on random topics.

**Tricky non-relevant documents.** In this step, our objective is to generate documents that are challenging to distinguish from relevant ones. These documents should exhibit similarities to relevant documents in terms of language and concepts but ultimately fail to satisfy the specified information need. To create such documents, we first mask various words in a given topic’s description. In this masking process, we employ a named entity recognition model to identify keywords in the topic description and replace them with the “[MASK]” token. Next, we prompt GPT-3.5 to create 10 variants of the topic description by filling “[MASK]” tokens<sup>7</sup>. Subsequently,

---

<sup>7</sup>The prompt is as follows. ”Can you generate 10 variants of the next sentence by filling

we apply the same procedure used to generate relevant documents. In particular, for each of the altered topic descriptions, we create five relevant documents, yielding a total of 50 non-relevant documents for the original topic description.

**Documents on random topics.** As test collections should contain a large set of documents, we also generate documents without specifying any particular topic and assume they are non-relevant to all topics. There are two potential concerns regarding these documents. First, they might not be necessary if we utilize a larger number of search topics. However, identifying and curating such an extensive set of topics may not always be feasible. Second, the assumption that these documents are non-relevant to any topic might not always hold true. This concern, however, parallels the practice in standard test collections, where unjudged documents are typically treated as non-relevant. Nevertheless, we evaluate the impact of these documents on system performance in our experiments (Section 6.2) to address these issues.

## 4 *GenTREC*: The first LLM-generated test collection

Using our proposed approach, we created the very first collection using ChatGPT, namely, *GenTREC*. We used ad hoc search topics of TREC-5 [32], TREC-6 [77], TREC-7 [80], TREC-8 [79], and Robust2004 [74], yielding 300 topics in total, as our basis to create relevant documents. In particular, for each topic, we first generated a relevant document, 50 tricky non-relevant documents, and subtopics using the topic description. Subsequently, for each subtopic, we generated a *relevant* document. We observed that ChatGPT occasionally fails to generate 100 subtopics for certain topics, resulting in a reduced number of relevant documents for those cases. Lastly, in order to increase the size of the collection, we created 59,804 documents on random topics. Overall, we generated 96,196 documents (consisting of approximately 41.3M words). Among these documents, 18,964 of them are considered relevant to the respective topic.

To evaluate the feasibility and sustainability of using LLMs in test collection generation, we analyzed the costs associated with generating *GenTREC* using GPT-3.5, focusing on both financial and energy consumption aspects.

- **Financial Cost.** The ChatGPT API charges \$1.50 per million input

---

[MASK]: <masked topic description> – Example: <topic description>”

tokens and \$2.00 per million output tokens. To create *GenTREC*, we used approximately 1.924M tokens for prompts. The generated texts including both documents and intermediate outputs (e.g., subtopic generation), are 61.7 million tokens in total. Given these values, the total price of using the API is approximately \$126.

- **Energy Cost.** While our method for generating collections eliminates the need for human labor, it is essential to consider the energy consumption associated with using LLMs. We estimated the energy required to generate *GenTREC*. Each query for a typical prompt of around 20 tokens consumes approximately 0.3 watt-hours (Wh), equating to 0.015 Wh per token<sup>8</sup>. Given that we have approximately 63.6M tokens (i.e., input and output tokens) in total, the corresponding energy consumption is estimated to be around 954 kWh.

## 5 Quantitative Analysis

In this section, we quantitatively analyze our collection *GenTREC* from several perspectives. In particular, we first compare *GenTREC* against the documents of Disks 4-5 which have been used in previous TREC tasks [31, 79] in terms of document structure (Section 5.1), lexical diversity (Section 5.2), readability (Section 5.3), and topical diversity (Section 5.4). Next, we explore the accuracy of our assumption on the relevancy of documents (Section 5.5).

### 5.1 Document Structure

**Table 2** presents brief statistics about *GenTREC*, and compares it against the documents in Disks 4-5. Firstly, Disks 4-5 contains around five times more documents than *GenTREC*. This also results in differences in the total number of words (e.g. 41M vs 270M). In addition, the documents and sentences in Disks 4-5 have longer average lengths and higher standard deviations compared to those in *GenTREC*. Therefore, while a document in Disks 4-5 may be extremely long (e.g., document ‘FR941202-2-00139’ has 1,027,658 words), it may also contain only two words (e.g., document ‘LA011089-0070’). Overall, *GenTREC* consists of shorter documents and sentences, but the document sizes are more stable compared to human-authored documents.

---

<sup>8</sup><https://www.baeldung.com/cs/chatgpt-large-language-models-power-consumption>

	<i>GenTREC</i>	Disks 4-5
The total number of documents	96,196	528,155
The total number of words	44,718,147	280,033,874
The average number of words per document	464.86	534.54
Standard deviation in the number of words per document	121.95	1,866.75
The average number of sentences per document	23.98	21.5
Standard deviation in the number of sentences per document	7.43	39.6
The average number of words per sentence	19.39	24.84
The median of the number of words per sentence	20.0	21.0
Standard deviation in the number of words in sentences	8.34	105.12
Maximum word count in a document	700	1,027,658
Minimum word count in a document	6	2

Table 2: Statistics about the documents in *GenTREC* and Disks 4-5.

## 5.2 Lexical Diversity

Using a diverse set of words enriches a document’s content and usually reflects the author’s writing capability and creativity. Furthermore, lexical diversity influences retrieval tasks by reducing textual overlap across documents. Therefore, we compare the documents we generated with those in Disks 4–5 in terms of lexical diversity. In particular, we employ the following lexical diversity measures from the literature:

- **Type-Token Ratio (TTR)**: The ratio of the number of unique words (types) to the total number of words (tokens) in a text. A higher TTR indicates greater lexical diversity.
- **Maas TTR** [46]: The logarithmic transformation of TTR designed to reduce the sensitivity to text length. A lower Maas value indicates higher lexical diversity.
- **Hypergeometric Distribution-based D (HDD)** [48]. HDD calculates the probability that a word chosen at random is unique in a sample, using the hypergeometric distribution to estimate this probability across multiple random samples of different sizes. It’s often considered more robust for comparing texts of different lengths.

- **Measure of Lexical Textual Diversity (MTLD)** [47]. MTLD measures the point in a text at which the TTR falls below a specified threshold, resetting the count and continuing until the entire text is analyzed. The final value is the mean length of segments where TTR drops below the threshold. MTLD is also designed to be independent of text length, making it a robust measure for comparing texts of different lengths. A higher MTLD score indicates greater lexical diversity.

**Table 3** presents the results. We observe that human-authored documents demonstrate greater lexical diversity across all evaluated metrics. This difference is likely attributable to the fact that the Disks 4-5 collection contains documents authored by different writers and sourced from diverse news outlets. In contrast, our proof-of-concept study relies on a single LLM to generate all documents. Lexical diversity in our collection could potentially be enhanced by incorporating multiple LLMs during document generation. Moreover, employing advanced prompt engineering techniques [15] offers another avenue for increasing diversity. We leave this aspect of our work as future work.

Lexical Diversity Metric	<i>GenTREC</i>		Disks 4-5	
	mean	std	mean	std
TTR	0.39	0.12	0.53	0.17
Mass TTR	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.02
HDD	0.74	0.16	0.77	0.17
MTLD	60.03	11.01	77.51	32.17
Number of unique words per document	203.6	50.9	238.6	222.7
Number of lemmatized unique words per document	199.3	49.7	233.7	216.8

Table 3: Lexical diversity of documents in *GenTREC* and Disks 4-5.

### 5.3 Readability

Readability is a measure of how easily a document is understood by readers. Various factors influence readability, including the technicality of vocabulary and the complexity of sentence structures. For example, documents containing more technical terms demand higher domain expertise or education.



To assess the readability of our generated documents, we employ established readability metrics, including Kincaid [40], Flesh Reading Ease (FRE) [26] and ARI [68], and compare our collection *GenTREC* with Disk 4–5. **Table 4** shows the results. Each metric also provides a corresponding scale that indicates the education level required to comprehend the text. We observe that documents we generated require a higher level of education than those in Disk 4–5 in all evaluation metrics, suggesting that they contain more complex sentences and more technical terms. Similar to our findings on lexical diversity, the standard deviation in readability scores is lower for our generated documents than for Disks 4–5 documents.

Metric	<i>GenTREC</i>			Disks 4-5		
	mean	std	level	mean	std	level
Kincaid	10.2	1.58	11th grade	5.05	3.07	6th grade
FRE	44.61	11.98	college	74.31	19.79	7th grade
ARI	11.16	1.5	10th grade	7.25	1.94	6th grade

Table 4: Readability scores of documents in *GenTREC* and Disks 4-5. Kincaid and ARI scores correlate with the number of years of education someone needs to understand the text, i.e., texts with higher scores are more complex. On the other hand, for FRE, higher scores indicate easier reading material.

## 5.4 Topical Diversity

A well-designed collection is expected to cover a wide range of topics, thereby improving its representation of real-world diversity. In this section, we compare our collection *GenTREC* with Disks 4–5 in terms of topical diversity. We use BERTopic [28] to identify topics. BERTopic clusters documents based on their content where each cluster corresponds to one topic.

While Disks 4–5 has 528,155 documents and 4,674 identified topics, *GenTREC* contains 96,196 documents and 945 topics, resulting in 112.9 and 101.9 documents per topic, respectively. To ensure a fair comparison, we also sampled 96,196 documents from Disks 4-5 and calculated the number of topics within that sample. We repeated this process five times. On average, each sample covered 927 topics. **Figure 2** illustrates the size of topics (i.e., the number of documents) and their relative distance for *GenTREC* and the downsampled Disks 4-5. We observe that the topics in Disks 4-5 are closer to each other than those in *GenTREC*, suggesting that *GenTREC* covers more different topics than the downsampled Disks 4-5.

Furthermore, we examined whether we could generate more topics if we had more documents in our collection. Thus, we sampled various numbers of documents from *GenTREC* and calculated the number of topics for each sample (**Figure 3**). We observe that the number of topics continues to increase as the sample size grows, with no indication of a plateau. This suggests that the number of topics is likely to expand further with more documents. Overall, our results suggest that we can create a document collection covering a diverse set of topics using LLMs.




Figure 2: Inter-topic Distance Map for *GenTREC* and a downsampled version of documents in Disks 4-5. In order to make a fair comparison, we randomly sampled 96,196 documents (i.e., the size of *GenTREC*) from Disks 4-5.

## 5.5 Accuracy of Relevance Judgments

In this section, we evaluate our methods for creating relevant documents and “tricky” non-relevant documents. To conduct this evaluation, we randomly sampled 10 topics from TREC-8 and one of the authors manually annotated the generated documents categorized as relevant or tricky non-relevant for each sampled topic. **Table 5** presents the relevance rate for documents in the relevant category and the non-relevance rate for the documents in the tricky non-relevant category.

Our findings indicate an average accuracy of 83% in generating relevant documents and 94% in generating tricky non-relevant documents. However, performance in generating relevant documents varies substantially across topics. Specifically, for five topics (416, 417, 419, 434, 437), we achieve over




Figure 3: The number of BERTopic topics wrt varying collection size of *GenTREC*

Topic ID	Relevance Rate in Relevant-Judged Documents	Non-Relevance Rate Tricky Non-Relevant Documents
402	0.67 (33/49)	1.00 (60/60)
416	1.00 (42/42)	1.00 (66/66)
417	0.97 (61/63)	1.00 (43/43)
419	0.98 (47/48)	1.00 (42/42)
429	0.86 (25/29)	0.91 (60/66)
430	0.00 (0/48)	0.87 (52/60)
434	1.00 (86/86)	0.97 (64/66)
437	1.00 (68/68)	0.64 (27/42)
438	0.80 (35/44)	1.00 (60/60)
441	0.85 (67/79)	0.98 (59/60)
<b>Average</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.94</b>

Table 5: Accuracy of our method for relevant and tricky non-relevant documents for 10 topics. The numbers within parentheses show the number of correctly “judged” documents and the total number of documents for each category.

97% relevance accuracy. For the remaining topics, our method demonstrates acceptable performance, except for Topic 430. Surprisingly, none of the doc-

uments intended to be relevant for Topic 430 (which focuses on incidents of Africanized bee attacks on humans) were actually relevant. Upon closer examination, we found that although the generated documents addressed certain aspects of killer bees (e.g., origin, physical characteristics, and ecological impact), they did not reference specific historical attacks, resulting in a 0% relevance rate. Thus, we further investigated whether our method systematically underperforms on topics requiring references to specific past incidents, as in the case of Topic 430. We identified seven additional TREC-8 topics of this nature<sup>9</sup> and manually assessed the relevance of the generated documents. For these topics, the average relevance rate was 0.37, indicating that our method struggles with such topics. Addressing this limitation requires further exploration, which we leave as future work.

Topic 402 also yielded a relatively low relevance rate (0.67). Regarding this topic, we observed that the first 35 generated documents were mostly relevant, but the relevance rate decreased significantly beyond this point, lowering the overall relevance rate for this topic. This implies that the optimal number of relevant documents (or subtopics) may vary by topic, indicating a need for future work on how to detect the most suitable number of subtopics to generate.

Our method demonstrates a higher performance in generating tricky non-relevant documents, with an average success rate of 94%. We again observe that the success of our method varies across topics. For instance, while we achieve 100% non-relevance rate in five topics, Topic 437 exhibits a noticeably lower accuracy (0.64). Therefore, determining how to identify topics best suited for generating tricky non-relevant documents remains an open question for further exploration.

## 6 System Evaluation with *GenTREC*

In this section, we investigate whether we can use *GenTREC* to reliably evaluate IR systems. We first explain our experimental setup (Section 6.1). Next, we present our results, seeking answers for our research questions (Section 6.2).

---

<sup>9</sup>The ID of these topics are 408, 422, 424, 425, 429, 442, and 448.

## 6.1 Experimental setup

### 6.1.1 Systems Used In Experiments

To assess the evaluation reliability of *GenTREC*, we implemented various retrieval systems using Pyserini library [42]. Specifically, we developed a lexical retrieval model, two dense retrieval models, and a re-ranker model, which were combined in various configurations to obtain additional systems. For lexical retrieval, we use BM25, a classic bag-of-words approach that incorporates the Porter stemmer. The two dense-retrieval models are *aggretriever-distilbert* [43] and *tct\_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarco* [44]. Additionally, we use *monot5-base-msmarco* [53] as our re-ranker model. We use Pyserini’s “hybrid search” module to combine different retrieval models. For example, BM25 and *aggretriever-distilbert* serve as two independent retrieval models. By merging their scores, we create a third hybrid retriever, yielding an additional system distinct from BM25 and *aggretriever-distilbert*. Furthermore, we enhance system diversity by incorporating MonoT5 re-ranker. This approach generates alternative systems by re-ranking the documents retrieved by other models. In total, we implemented 10 different systems. **Table 6** shows these IR systems used in this study.

Retrieval Model	Description
BM25	The popular lexical retrieval model with Porter Stemmer
aggretriever-distilbert[43]	A single-vector dense retrieval model where all contextualized token embeddings provided to BERT as input.
tct_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarc [44]	A dense retrieval model applying knowledge distillation using the ColBERT late-interaction model.
bm25 + aggretriever-distilbert	The hybrid model using both BM25 and aggretriever-distilbert model
bm25 + tct_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarco	The hybrid model using both BM25 and tct_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarco
bm25 + MonoT5	The results of BM25 are reranked by MonoT5
aggretriever-distilbert + MonoT5	The results of aggretriever-distilbert are reranked by MonoT5
tct_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarco + MonoT5	The results of aggretriever-distilbert are reranked by MonoT5
bm25 + aggretriever-distilbert + MonoT5	The results of the hybrid model (bm25 + aggretriever-distilbert) are reranked by MonoT5
bm25 + tct_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarco + MonoT5	The results of the hybrid model (bm25 + tct_colbert-v2-hnp-msmarco) are reranked by MonoT5

Table 6: The IR systems we use in our evaluations.

### 6.1.2 Test Collections

We evaluate our IR systems on our test collection and also several existing TREC collections for comparative analysis. In particular, we use TREC-5 [32], TREC-6 [78], TREC-7 [80], TREC-8 [30], Robust2004 [74] collections as baselines. Furthermore, since all these TREC collections use the same document collection, we artificially create another test collection, named  $TREC_{All}$  that contains all TREC topics and the respective relevance judgments. We selected these test collections because we generated documents using their topics, allowing us to conduct a fair comparison between *GenTREC* and them. **Table 7** presents general statistics for all test collections used in this study.

	<i>GenTREC</i>	TR5	TR6	TR7	TR8	R04	$TREC_{All}$
The number of topics	300	50	50	50	50	249	299
The number of relevant documents	18,964	5,524	4,611	4,674	4,728	16,381	22,226
The number of unique relevant documents	18,964	5,306	4,482	4,555	4,628	15,020	20,360
Relevant document ratio	0.197	0.010	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.031	0.042
The average number of relevant documents per topic	63.2	110.5	92.2	93.5	94.6	66.1	74.6
The std of relevant documents per topic	16.1	139.1	103.1	85.2	80.0	75.6	92.1
The max of relevant documents per topic	100	594	474	361	347	448	594

Table 7: Statistics about *GenTREC* and the test collections we use in our experiments.

### 6.1.3 Evaluation Metrics

In our experiments, we use five metrics to quantify the performance of IR systems, including Precision@10 (P@10), Precision@100 (P@100), mean average precision (MAP), and R-Precision. We compare rankings of IR systems in *GenTREC* against rankings in TREC collections to assess the evaluation

reliability. We use Kendall’s  $\tau$  for ranking comparisons.

## 6.2 Experimental Results

### 6.2.1 Rank Correlation across Test Collections

*GenTREC* differs from traditional test collections in several aspects, such as its construction methodology, the volume of documents, the number of topics, and the distribution of relevant documents per topic. As these factors can significantly impact IR system evaluations, we start by analyzing the variations in IR system rankings across different test collections, including *GenTREC* and the five selected TREC collections. Specifically, we evaluate the IR systems we developed on *GenTREC* and each of the five TREC collections independently, using four evaluation metrics to generate system rankings. Subsequently, we compare the rankings derived from *GenTREC* with those from the TREC collections. We also analyze how system rankings change across the TREC collections. This allows us to observe the impact of topic set changes on system rankings, as the only difference across the selected TREC collections are the topic sets. **Table 8** presents the results for MAP, RPREC, P@100, and P@10, separately.

MAP							
	<i>GenTREC</i>	TREC5	TREC6	TREC7	TREC8	R04	TREC <sub>All</sub>
<i>GenTREC</i>	-	0.51	0.69	0.78	0.82	0.73	0.78
TREC5	0.51	-	0.38	0.56	0.69	0.51	0.56
TREC6	0.69	0.38	-	0.73	0.6	0.87	0.82
TREC7	0.78	0.56	0.73	-	0.78	0.87	<b>0.91</b>
TREC8	0.82	0.69	0.6	0.78	-	0.73	0.78
R04	0.73	0.51	0.87	0.87	0.73	-	<b>0.96</b>
TREC <sub>All</sub>	0.78	0.56	0.82	<b>0.91</b>	0.78	<b>0.96</b>	-
<b>Average</b>	0.72	0.53	0.68	0.77	0.73	0.78	0.8

RRec							
	<i>GenTREC</i>	TREC5	TREC6	TREC7	TREC8	R04	TREC <sub>All</sub>
<i>GenTREC</i>	-	0.75	0.85	0.85	0.75	0.85	0.85
TREC5	0.75	-	0.67	0.76	0.84	0.76	0.76
TREC6	0.85	0.67	-	0.82	0.81	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>
TREC7	0.85	0.76	0.82	-	0.81	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>
TREC8	0.75	0.84	0.81	0.81	-	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.9</b>
R04	0.85	0.76	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.9</b>	-	<b>1.0</b>
TREC <sub>All</sub>	0.85	0.76	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>	-
<b>Average</b>	0.82	0.76	0.83	0.85	0.83	0.89	0.89

P@100							
	<i>GenTREC</i>	TREC5	TREC6	TREC7	TREC8	R04	TREC <sub>All</sub>
<i>GenTREC</i>	-	0.77	<b>1.0</b>	0.86	0.77	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>
TREC5	0.77	-	0.77	0.81	<b>0.91</b>	0.81	0.81
TREC6	<b>1.0</b>	0.77	-	0.86	0.77	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.95</b>
TREC7	0.86	0.81	0.86	-	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>
TREC8	0.77	<b>0.91</b>	0.77	<b>0.91</b>	-	0.81	0.81
R04	<b>0.95</b>	0.81	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.91</b>	0.81	-	<b>1.0</b>
TREC <sub>All</sub>	<b>0.95</b>	0.81	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.91</b>	0.81	<b>1.0</b>	-
<b>Average</b>	0.88	0.81	0.88	0.88	0.83	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>

P@10							
	<i>GenTREC</i>	TREC5	TREC6	TREC7	TREC8	R04	TREC <sub>All</sub>
<i>GenTREC</i>	-	-0.1	0.23	0.32	0.23	0.3	0.23
TREC5	-0.1	-	0.71	0.61	0.66	0.63	0.71
TREC6	0.23	0.71	-	0.75	0.8	0.85	0.89
TREC7	0.32	0.61	0.75	-	0.89	0.85	0.84
TREC8	0.23	0.66	0.8	0.89	-	<b>0.94</b>	<b>0.93</b>
R04	0.3	0.63	0.85	0.85	<b>0.94</b>	-	<b>0.94</b>
TREC <sub>All</sub>	0.23	0.71	0.89	0.84	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.94</b>	-
<b>Average</b>	0.2	0.54	0.7	0.71	0.74	0.75	0.76

Table 8: Kendall’s  $\tau$  correlation across test collections using MAP, RRec, P@100, and P@10. The correlation scores higher than 0.90 are written in **bold**.



Firstly, we observe that rank correlations vary across both test collections and metrics. Notably, TREC-5 produces the lowest correlations on all metrics except P@10. Meanwhile, *GenTREC* achieves higher Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores than TREC-5 in three of the four metrics, showing comparable results to TREC-6, TREC-7, and TREC-8. Only R04 and TREC<sub>All</sub> achieve consistently higher  $\tau$  scores than *GenTREC*, likely because they are constructed by combining topics from other TREC collections and therefore exhibit higher similarity to those collections.

Next, focusing on *GenTREC*, P@100 yields the highest correlation on average. In particular, against the TREC<sub>All</sub> collection, Kendall’s  $\tau$  score reaches 0.95 when using P@100. However, P@10 diverges from the other metrics, producing the lowest correlation scores. This might be because *GenTREC*’s average relevant document ratio is much higher than that of other TREC collections (see Table 2), allowing systems to retrieve many relevant documents in the top 10 and thus limiting P@10’s ability to differentiate among systems. We observe a similar pattern in the TREC collections, where P@100 again yields the most similar rankings and P@10 the least.

To further investigate system rankings in *GenTREC*, we compare each system’s scores in *GenTREC* and TREC<sub>All</sub> across the four metrics. **Figure 4** presents the results. Our findings show that all systems achieve higher scores on *GenTREC* than on TREC<sub>All</sub>. In addition, the system scores in P@10 lie within a narrow range, with every system exceeding 0.8 on *GenTREC*, while their P@10 scores range between 0.3 and 0.5 on TREC<sub>All</sub>. This suggests that *GenTREC* contains several “easy” documents to retrieve, thus weakening P@10’s ability to distinguish performance differences. Nevertheless, the rankings based on other metrics remain generally consistent, with only slight shifts for some systems. Indeed, the top two performing systems are the same in both *GenTREC* and TREC<sub>All</sub> under these three metrics.

Overall, *GenTREC* produces rankings similar to those of TREC<sub>All</sub> in P@100, MAP, and RPrec metrics, successfully identifying the same best-performing systems as observed in TREC<sub>All</sub>. Minor ranking differences are expected, given that *GenTREC* consists of different topics and documents from those in TREC collections. However, it leads to substantially different evaluations for P@10, which requires further investigation and possibly different approaches to generate relevant documents. We leave this direction of research as future work.




Figure 4: Scores for each system in *GenTREC* vs.  $TREC_{All}$ .

### 6.2.2 Impact of Tricky Non-relevant Documents

In this experiment, we examine the impact of including tricky non-relevant (TNR) documents in *GenTREC*. In particular, we exclude TNR documents from *GenTREC* ( $GenTREC_{wo\_TNR}$ ) and evaluate the IR systems accordingly. Next we compare the system rankings against TREC collections. **Figure 5** shows the ranking correlation scores between  $GenTREC_{wo\_TNR}$  and TREC collections for four metrics. We observe that exclusion of TNR documents has no impact rankings for MAP and P@100 metrics. However,

in contrary to our expectations, the rank correlations increases in almost all cases for P@10 and Rprec. This might be because of challenges in creating TNR documents and possible errors in generation such as generating relevant documents instead of non-relevant ones.




Figure 5: Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores for the system rankings compared to TREC collections when we use TNR documents and do not use TNR documents. While solid lines denote the case when TNR documents are included, i.e., the original *GenTREC*, dashed lines correspond to when TNR documents are removed, i.e, *GenTREC*<sub>wo.TNR</sub>.

### 6.2.3 Impact of Randomly Generated Documents

In this experiment, we explore the impact of randomly generated documents on the system ranking. Therefore, we first exclude all randomly generated documents from *GenTREC* and then rank the IR systems based on the four metrics separately. Next, we calculate Kendall’s  $\tau$  correlation between the rankings we achieved with the rankings based on TREC collections. **Figure 6** provides Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores for both cases. Interestingly, we observe that the rankings do not change for our metrics except P@10. Upon our deeper investigation, we found that the performance of IR systems are slightly affected in these metrics (i.e., MAP, Rprec, and P@100) because systems do not retrieve the majority of them. Thus, the changes in performance scores do not cause a ranking change. Regarding P@10 metric, randomly generated documents have positive impact on system ranking.




Figure 6: Kendall’s  $\tau$  of system ranking with respect to TREC collections when we use randomly generated documents (solid lines) and when we exclude them (dashed lines).

#### 6.2.4 Impact of Document Collection Size on System Ranking

One of the most apparent differences between *GenTREC* and TREC’s Disk 4–5 collection is that *GenTREC* contains roughly 5.5 times fewer documents, which may significantly affect system rankings. To investigate this effect, we create smaller versions of Disk 4–5 by randomly sampling 96,196 documents, matching the size of *GenTREC*. After forming 100 such samples, we rank the systems based on each sample and measure the correlation between these rankings and the ranking obtained when using all documents in Disk 4–5. For this evaluation, we use the full set of available TREC topics, i.e., TREC<sub>All</sub>. **Figure 7** shows the resulting Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores for each metric as a box plot.

As shown in the figure, the ranking correlation between *GenTREC* and TREC<sub>All</sub> is similar to the correlations we observe when the number of documents in Disk 4–5 is reduced. In particular, *GenTREC* achieves Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores of 0.78, 0.85, 0.95, and 0.23 for MAP, Rprec, P@100, and P@10, respectively (see Table 8). By comparison, when using TREC<sub>All</sub> on the full Disk 4–5 collection versus the 96,196-document samples, the average Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores are 0.78, 0.81, 0.91, and 0.23 for these same metrics.




Figure 7: Box plot representation of Kendall’s  $\tau$  scores between rankings when we use all documents in Disks 4-5 vs. a sample of documents. The diamonds represent the average  $\tau$  score. Each sample contains randomly picked 96,196 documents, matching the size of *GenTREC*. We use all available topics in TREC collections we have (i.e.,  $TREC_{All}$ ).

Overall, these results show that collection size can substantially affect system rankings.

### 6.2.5 Impact of Prevalence of Relevant Documents

In this experiment, we explore how the evaluation of systems are affected with varying number of relevant documents per topic. In particular, we vary the maximum number of relevant documents per topic ( $N_R$ ) in *GenTREC* from 10 to 100 and rank systems accordingly. Next, we compare system rankings with TREC collections. **Figure 8** shows how the average tau correlations across TREC collections for varying maximum number of relevant topics per topic.

We observe that  $\tau$  score increases when  $N_R$  increases from 10 to 20, and then become stable for P@100 and Rprec metrics. Regarding MAP score, the maximum  $\tau$  score is achieved with  $N_R = 30$ . The ranking correlation be-




Figure 8: Average Kendall’s  $\tau$  score between system rankings based on *GenTREC* and TREC collections for varying number of relevant documents per topic in *GenTREC*.  $N_R$  represents the maximum number of relevant documents per topic.

comes stabilized for  $N_R \geq 50$ . The results for P@10 only becomes stabilized after  $N_R \geq 60$  and are affected by the number of relevant documents per topic more than the other metrics. Overall, varying the maximum number of relevant documents per topic does not produce any results that would alter the conclusions drawn from our previous experiments.

## 7 Limitations

In this section, we discuss the limitations of our study and draw a roadmap for future studies.

### 7.1 Document Collection

The size of a document collection is vital for the reliability of a test collection. In our proof-of-concept study, we employed ChatGPT to generate

96,196 documents and explored various prompts to increase textual diversity. Despite consisting of a substantial number of documents, *GenTREC* remains relatively small compared to widely used collections such as Disks 4–5, which contain around 500,000 documents, and web-based collections that are even larger. Conducting experiments with a larger set of documents might yield different outcomes. To address this limitation, we illustrate the impact of collection size on system rankings in Section 6.2.4; however, we leave the exploration of larger document sets for future work.

The diversity of the generated documents is another key factor in evaluating systems reliably. In this study, we exclusively used ChatGPT with a fixed set of prompts. However, the content of generated documents may be influenced by various factors, such as the choice of the language model and the prompts used. Exploring other large language models (e.g., LLAMA [70]) to generate documents represents an interesting direction for future research.

Regarding the prompt design, we examined various prompts for document generation (Section 3). Initially, we instructed ChatGPT to produce news articles, because Disks 4-5 also consists of news articles. However, this approach yielded limited textual diversity, leading us to modify our prompt to generate long texts, which improved diversity. We also incorporated subtopics to further enhance textual diversity. Nevertheless, prompt selection undeniably influences generated content, so exploring alternative prompts could be highly beneficial for constructing test collections.

Lastly, we did not explore generating documents in different file formats, as our comparison focuses on TREC collections that contain only news articles. We leave the creation of test collections using other content types, such as web pages and scholarly articles, as future work.

## 7.2 Topics

In our work, we use topics from existing collections to generate documents. This design choice allows us to make a fair comparison against established test collections. However, we could also generate topics using LLMs, as explored in prior work [58]. Such an approach would enable fully automated test collection construction without relying on any resource other than LLMs. We leave this work as future work because it makes the evaluation of the resulting collection more challenging. Moreover, having control over topic selection allows us to control the evaluation process with minimal manual effort.

### 7.3 Relevance Judgments

In our approach, we assume that documents generated for a specific topic are relevant to that topic, while documents generated for other topics are considered non-relevant. Although this assumption may not always hold, it aligns with the standard pooling technique, where unjudged documents are treated as non-relevant. In our study, we specifically investigate the impact of this assumption by conducting multiple experiments, including an analysis of randomly generated documents. Our results show that evaluations conducted using *GenTREC* are comparable to those based on existing TREC collections when assessed with P@100, MAP, and RPre metrics. However, our analysis reveals that our assumption does not hold for all documents. Future work can focus on prompting strategies to improve the accuracy of generating relevant documents. Such improvements in accuracy are likely to lead to more reliable and robust system evaluations.

Another limitation of our methodology is that it relies on binary relevance judgments, without differentiating levels of document relevance. LLMs could potentially be used to predict the grade of relevance or generate documents at varying relevance levels, which is a direction we leave for future investigation.

### 7.4 Evaluation

Assessing the reliability of our test collection requires the design and implementation of IR systems capable of operating on it. This process involves several critical considerations. For example, a diverse and sufficiently large set of systems is essential to evaluate whether the collection can effectively differentiate them. However, developing such an extensive set of IR systems is costly. In this study, we could implement 10 IR systems with different retrieval strategies. The exploration of a more extensive set is left for future research.

Moreover, determining the reliability of an evaluation method is inherently challenging, given that we cannot definitively know which IR system is “truly” better. Therefore, to evaluate our test collection, we analyze evaluation stability and compare its system rankings with those of existing test collections, under the assumption that strong correlations imply similar evaluation quality. However, it is important to note that even perfect correlation does not ensure validity in all cases. To address this limitation, we adopt established methodologies from the literature to assess evaluation reliability and use well-known high-quality TREC collections such as



TREC-8 [76]. Voorhees et al. [81] report that TREC-8 remains reliable for assessing modern neural retrieval models despite being created decades ago. However, exploring additional TREC collections —particularly more recent ones— remains an important direction. Since such assessments require different documents and topics, we leave this exploration for future work.

## 8 Conclusion

In this study, we introduce a new approach to creating IR test collections using LLMs. In particular, our approach relies on the assumption that documents generated by an LLM are naturally relevant to the prompts they are based on. Utilizing this principle, we used existing TREC search topics to generate documents. Each document is deemed relevant only to its specific generating prompt, while other document-topic pairs are treated as non-relevant. Furthermore, we generated non-relevant documents to introduce realistic challenges for retrieval systems. Using these techniques, we created *GenTREC* with 96,196 documents, 300 topics, and 18,964 relevant document-topic pairs.

In our comprehensive experiments, we first analyze both the quantitative and linguistic properties of our collection. Our analysis reveals the following key findings: *GenTREC* includes shorter documents and sentences with lower lexical diversity, while requiring a higher educational level compared to the documents in Disks 4-5. However, the topical diversity per document is similar in both collections.

Next, we evaluate the system rankings generated by *GenTREC* by comparing them with those derived from TREC collections. Our findings indicate that system rankings based on *GenTREC* align closely with those from TREC collections when evaluated using P@100, MAP, and RPrec metrics. However, rankings differ significantly when using the P@10 metric. Moreover, we examine the impact of tricky non-relevant and random documents on ranking correlations. Contrary to our expectations, tricky non-relevant documents either have no effect or slightly decrease ranking correlations. On the other hand, random documents increase correlations for P@10 but do not affect the system rankings for other metrics. Finally, we observe that variations in collection size alone can substantially alter system rankings. This suggests that if *GenTREC* were scaled to include a comparable number of documents as Disks 4-5, it might produce rankings more closely aligned with TREC test collections.

Our work can be expanded in several directions for future research. First, we aim to investigate the generation of other document types, such as web pages and social media posts. Test collections that contain generated social media posts are particularly valuable due to the inherent challenges of collecting such data, including the dynamic nature of platforms, redistribution data policies of platforms, and privacy concerns. In addition, we plan to generate documents with graded relevance levels, enabling more nuanced evaluation scenarios. Finally, expanding both the number of generated documents and the diversity of IR systems included in the experiments will allow us to evaluate our approach in contexts that more closely resemble real-world scenarios.

## References

- [1] ALTUN, B., AND KUTLU, M. Building test collections using bandit techniques: a reproducibility study. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management* (2020), pp. 1953–1956.
- [2] ASADI, N., METZLER, D., ELSAYED, T., AND LIN, J. Pseudo test collections for learning web search ranking functions. In *Proceedings of the 34th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information Retrieval* (2011), pp. 1073–1082.
- [3] ASKARI, A., ALIANNEJADI, M., KANOULAS, E., AND VERBERNE, S. A test collection of synthetic documents for training rankers: Chatgpt vs. human experts. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (2023), pp. 5311–5315.
- [4] ASKARI, A., ALIANNEJADI, M., MENG, C., KANOULAS, E., AND VERBERNE, S. Expand, highlight, generate: RL-driven document generation for passage reranking. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2023), pp. 10087–10099.
- [5] ASLAM, J. A., AND YILMAZ, E. Inferring document relevance from incomplete information. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth ACM conference on Conference on information and knowledge management* (2007), pp. 633–642.

- [6] AZZOPARDI, L., AND DE RIJKE, M. Automatic construction of known-item finding test beds. In *Proceedings of the 29th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2006), pp. 603–604.
- [7] AZZOPARDI, L., DE RIJKE, M., AND BALOG, K. Building simulated queries for known-item topics: an analysis using six european languages. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2007), pp. 455–462.
- [8] BÉNÉDICT, G., ZHANG, R., METZLER, D., YATES, A., AND JIANG, Z. Gen-ir@ sigir 2024: The second workshop on generative information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2024), pp. 3029–3032.
- [9] BERENDSEN, R., TSAGKIAS, M., DE RIJKE, M., AND MEIJ, E. Generating pseudo test collections for learning to rank scientific articles. In *Information Access Evaluation. Multilinguality, Multimodality, and Visual Analytics: Third International Conference of the CLEF Initiative, CLEF 2012, Rome, Italy, September 17-20, 2012. Proceedings 3* (2012), Springer, pp. 42–53.
- [10] BERENDSEN, R., TSAGKIAS, M., WEERKAMP, W., AND DE RIJKE, M. Pseudo test collections for training and tuning microblog rankers. In *Proceedings of the 36th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2013), pp. 53–62.
- [11] BUCKLEY, C., AND VOORHEES, E. M. Retrieval evaluation with incomplete information. In *Proceedings of the 27th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2004), pp. 25–32.
- [12] BUENO, M., DE OLIVEIRA, E. S., NOGUEIRA, R., LOTUFO, R. A., AND PEREIRA, J. A. Quati: A brazilian portuguese information retrieval dataset from native speakers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06976* (2024).
- [13] BÜTTCHER, S., CLARKE, C. L., YEUNG, P. C., AND SOBOROFF, I. Reliable information retrieval evaluation with incomplete and biased

- judgements. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2007), pp. 63–70.
- [14] CARTERETTE, B., AND ALLAN, J. Incremental test collections. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management* (2005), pp. 680–687.
- [15] CHEN, J., QADRI, R., WEN, Y., JAIN, N., KIRCHENBAUER, J., ZHOU, T., AND GOLDSTEIN, T. Genqa: Generating millions of instructions from a handful of prompts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10323* (2024).
- [16] COLLINS-THOMPSON, K., MACDONALD, C., BENNETT, P., DIAZ, F., AND VOORHEES, E. M. Trec 2014 web track overview. Tech. rep., MICHIGAN UNIV ANN ARBOR, 2015.
- [17] COOPER, M. D. A simulation model of an information retrieval system. *Information Storage and Retrieval* 9, 1 (1973), 13–32.
- [18] CORMACK, G. V., AND GROSSMAN, M. R. Beyond pooling. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval* (2018), pp. 1169–1172.
- [19] CORMACK, G. V., PALMER, C. R., AND CLARKE, C. L. Efficient construction of large test collections. In *Proceedings of the 21st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (1998), pp. 282–289.
- [20] DE JESUS, G., AND NUNES, S. Exploring large language models for relevance judgments in tetun. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07299* (2024).
- [21] DIETZ, L., CHATTERJEE, S., LENNOX, C., KASHYAPI, S., OZA, P., AND GAMARI, B. Wikimarks: harvesting relevance benchmarks from wikipedia. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2022), pp. 3003–3012.
- [22] DIETZ, L., AND DALTON, J. Humans optional? automatic large-scale test collections for entity, passage, and entity-passage retrieval. *Datenbank-Spektrum* 20, 1 (2020), 17–28.

- [23] EGUCHI, K., OYAMA, K., ISHIDA, E., KANDO, N., AND KURIYAMA, K. Overview of the web retrieval task at the third ntcir workshop. In *NTCIR (2002)*, Citeseer.
- [24] FAGGIOLI, G., DIETZ, L., CLARKE, C. L., DEMARTINI, G., HAGEN, M., HAUFF, C., KANDO, N., KANOULAS, E., POTTHAST, M., STEIN, B., ET AL. Perspectives on large language models for relevance judgment. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM SIGIR International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval (2023)*, pp. 39–50.
- [25] FARZI, N., AND DIETZ, L. An exam-based evaluation approach beyond traditional relevance judgments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00309* (2024).
- [26] FLESCH, R. F., AND GOULD, A. J. The art of readable writing. (*No Title*) (1949).
- [27] GRADY, C., AND LEASE, M. Crowdsourcing document relevance assessment with mechanical turk. In *Proceedings of the NAACL HLT 2010 workshop on creating speech and language data with Amazon's mechanical turk* (2010), pp. 172–179.
- [28] GROOTENDORST, M. Bertopic: Neural topic modeling with a class-based tf-idf procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.05794* (2022).
- [29] GUIVER, J., MIZZARO, S., AND ROBERTSON, S. A few good topics: Experiments in topic set reduction for retrieval evaluation. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 27, 4 (2009), 1–26.
- [30] HARMAN, D. Overview of the eighth text retrieval conference.
- [31] HARMAN, D., AND VOORHEES, E. Overview of the fifth text retrieval conference (trec-5). In *Information Technology: The Fifth Text REtrieval Conference (TREC-5)*, D. Harman and E. Voorhees, eds., National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication (1996), pp. 500–238.
- [32] HARMAN, D., AND VOORHEES, E. Overview of the fifth text retrieval conference (trec-5). In *Information Technology: The Fifth Text REtrieval Conference (TREC-5)*, D. Harman and E. Voorhees, eds., National Institute of Standards and Technology Special Publication (1996), pp. 500–238.

- [33] HASANAIN, M., BARKALLAH, Y., SUWAILEH, R., KUTLU, M., AND ELSAYED, T. Artest: The first test collection for arabic web search with relevance rationales. In *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM sigir conference on research and development in information retrieval* (2020), pp. 2017–2020.
- [34] HAUFF, C., AND DE JONG, F. Retrieval system evaluation: Automatic evaluation versus incomplete judgments. In *Proceedings of the 33rd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2010), pp. 863–864.
- [35] HAWKING, D., BILLERBECK, B., THOMAS, P., AND CRASWELL, N. *Simulating information retrieval test collections*. Springer, 2020.
- [36] HOSSEINI, M., COX, I. J., MILIC-FRAYLING, N., SHOKOUHI, M., AND YILMAZ, E. An uncertainty-aware query selection model for evaluation of ir systems. In *Proceedings of the 35th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2012), pp. 901–910.
- [37] JONES, S. Report on the need for and provision of an” ideal” information retrieval test collection.
- [38] KANOULAS, E., LI, D., AZZOPARDI, L., AND SPIJKER, R. Clef 2018 technologically assisted reviews in empirical medicine overview. In *CEUR workshop proceedings* (2018), vol. 2125.
- [39] KIM, J., AND CROFT, W. B. Retrieval experiments using pseudo-desktop collections. In *Proceedings of the 18th acm conference on information and Knowledge Management* (2009), pp. 1297–1306.
- [40] KINCAID, J. P., FISHBURNE JR, R. P., ROGERS, R. L., AND CHISSOM, B. S. Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count and flesch reading ease formula) for navy enlisted personnel.
- [41] KUTLU, M., ELSAYED, T., AND LEASE, M. Intelligent topic selection for low-cost information retrieval evaluation: A new perspective on deep vs. shallow judging. *Information Processing & Management* 54, 1 (2018), 37–59.
- [42] LIN, J., MA, X., LIN, S.-C., YANG, J.-H., PRADEEP, R., AND NOGUEIRA, R. Pyserini: A Python toolkit for reproducible information retrieval research with sparse and dense representations. In

*Proceedings of the 44th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR 2021)* (2021), pp. 2356–2362.

- [43] LIN, S.-C., LI, M., AND LIN, J. Aggretriever: A simple approach to aggregate textual representations for robust dense passage retrieval. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 11 (2023), 436–452.
- [44] LIN, S.-C., YANG, J.-H., AND LIN, J. In-batch negatives for knowledge distillation with tightly-coupled teachers for dense retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (RepL4NLP-2021)* (2021), pp. 163–173.
- [45] MACAVANEY, S., AND SOLDAINI, L. One-shot labeling for automatic relevance estimation. In *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2023), pp. 2230–2235.
- [46] MASS, H.-D. Über den zusammenhang zwischen wortschatzumfang und länge eines textes. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 2, 8 (1972), 73.
- [47] MCCARTHY, P. M. *An assessment of the range and usefulness of lexical diversity measures and the potential of the measure of textual, lexical diversity (MTLD)*. PhD thesis, The University of Memphis, 2005.
- [48] MCCARTHY, P. M., AND JARVIS, S. vocd: A theoretical and empirical evaluation. *Language Testing* 24, 4 (2007), 459–488.
- [49] MCDONNELL, T., LEASE, M., KUTLU, M., AND ELSAYED, T. Why is that relevant? collecting annotator rationales for relevance judgments. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing* (2016), vol. 4.
- [50] MEHRDAD, N., MOHAPATRA, H., BAGDOURI, M., CHANDRAN, P., MAGNANI, A., CAI, X., PUTHENPUHUSSERY, A., YADAV, S., LEE, T., ZHAI, C., ET AL. Large language models for relevance judgment in product search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.00247* (2024).
- [51] MOFFAT, A., WEBBER, W., AND ZOBEL, J. Strategic system comparisons via targeted relevance judgments. In *Proceedings of the 30th*

*annual international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval* (2007), pp. 375–382.

- [52] MOGHADASI, S. I., RAVANA, S. D., AND RAMAN, S. N. Low-cost evaluation techniques for information retrieval systems: A review. *Journal of Informetrics* 7, 2 (2013), 301–312.
- [53] NOGUEIRA, R., JIANG, Z., AND LIN, J. Document ranking with a pre-trained sequence-to-sequence model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.06713* (2020).
- [54] NURAY, R., AND CAN, F. Automatic ranking of information retrieval systems using data fusion. *Information processing & management* 42, 3 (2006), 595–614.
- [55] OOSTERHUIS, H., JAGERMAN, R., QIN, Z., WANG, X., AND BENDERSKY, M. Reliable confidence intervals for information retrieval evaluation using generative ai. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (2024), pp. 2307–2317.
- [56] PAVLU, V., AND ASLAM, J. A practical sampling strategy for efficient retrieval evaluation. *College of Computer and Information Science, Northeastern University* (2007).
- [57] RAHMAN, M. M., KUTLU, M., ELSAYED, T., AND LEASE, M. Efficient test collection construction via active learning. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGIR on International Conference on Theory of Information Retrieval* (2020), pp. 177–184.
- [58] RAHMANI, H. A., CRASWELL, N., YILMAZ, E., MITRA, B., AND CAMPOS, D. Synthetic test collections for retrieval evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2024), pp. 2647–2651.
- [59] RAHMANI, H. A., SIRO, C., ALIANNEJADI, M., CRASWELL, N., CLARKE, C. L., FAGGIOLI, G., MITRA, B., THOMAS, P., AND YILMAZ, E. Report on the 1st workshop on large language model for evaluation in information retrieval (llm4eval 2024) at sigir 2024. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05388* (2024).
- [60] RAHMANI, H. A., WANG, X., YILMAZ, E., CRASWELL, N., MITRA, B., AND THOMAS, P. Syndl: A large-scale synthetic test collection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16312* (2024).



- [61] RAJAPAKSE, T. C., AND DE RIJKE, M. Improving the generalizability of the dense passage retriever using generated datasets. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval (2023)*, Springer, pp. 94–109.
- [62] ROITERO, K., BRUNELLO, A., SERRA, G., AND MIZZARO, S. Effectiveness evaluation without human relevance judgments: A systematic analysis of existing methods and of their combinations. *Information Processing & Management* 57, 2 (2020), 102149.
- [63] ROITERO, K., SOPRANO, M., AND MIZZARO, S. Effectiveness evaluation with a subset of topics: A practical approach. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval (2018)*, pp. 1145–1148.
- [64] SAKAI, T. Alternatives to bpref. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval (2007)*, pp. 71–78.
- [65] SAKAI, T. Topic set size design. *Information Retrieval Journal* 19, 3 (2016), 256–283.
- [66] SANDER, D. P., AND DIETZ, L. Exam: How to evaluate retrieve-and-generate systems for users who do not (yet) know what they want. In *DESIREES (2021)*, pp. 136–146.
- [67] SANDERSON, M., ET AL. Test collection based evaluation of information retrieval systems. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 4, 4 (2010), 247–375.
- [68] SENTER, R., AND SMITH, E. A. Automated readability index. Tech. rep., Technical report, DTIC document, 1967.
- [69] THOMAS, P., SPIELMAN, S., CRASWELL, N., AND MITRA, B. Large language models can accurately predict searcher preferences. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (2024)*, pp. 1930–1940.
- [70] TOUVRON, H., LAVRIL, T., IZACARD, G., MARTINET, X., LACHAUX, M.-A., LACROIX, T., ROZIÈRE, B., GOYAL, N., HAMBRO, E., AZHAR, F., ET AL. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971 (2023)*.

- [71] UPADHYAY, S., KAMALLOO, E., AND LIN, J. Llms can patch up missing relevance judgments in evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04727* (2024).
- [72] URBANO, J., MARRERO, M., AND MARTÍN, D. On the measurement of test collection reliability. In *Proceedings of the 36th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2013), pp. 393–402.
- [73] VOORHEES, E. M. Variations in relevance judgments and the measurement of retrieval effectiveness. *Information processing & management* 36, 5 (2000), 697–716.
- [74] VOORHEES, E. M. Overview of the trec 2004 robust retrieval track.
- [75] VOORHEES, E. M. Topic set size redux. In *Proceedings of the 32nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2009), pp. 806–807.
- [76] VOORHEES, E. M. On building fair and reusable test collections using bandit techniques. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on information and knowledge management* (2018), pp. 407–416.
- [77] VOORHEES, E. M., AND HARMAN, D. Overview of the sixth text retrieval conference (trec-6). *Information Processing & Management* 36, 1 (2000), 3–35.
- [78] VOORHEES, E. M., AND HARMAN, D. Overview of the sixth text retrieval conference (trec-6). *Information Processing & Management* 36, 1 (2000), 3–35.
- [79] VOORHEES, E. M., AND HARMAN, D. K. Overview of the eighth text retrieval conference (trec-8). In *Text Retrieval Conference* (1999).
- [80] VOORHEES, E. M., AND HARMAN, D. K. Overview of the seventh text retrieval conference (trec-7).
- [81] VOORHEES, E. M., SOBOROFF, I., AND LIN, J. Can old trec collections reliably evaluate modern neural retrieval models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11086* (2022).
- [82] YE, J., GAO, J., LI, Q., XU, H., FENG, J., WU, Z., YU, T., AND KONG, L. Zerogen: Efficient zero-shot learning via dataset generation.

In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (2022), pp. 11653–11669.

- [83] YU, Y., ZHUANG, Y., ZHANG, J., MENG, Y., RATNER, A. J., KRISHNA, R., SHEN, J., AND ZHANG, C. Large language model as attributed training data generator: A tale of diversity and bias. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [84] YU, Y., ZHUANG, Y., ZHANG, R., MENG, Y., SHEN, J., AND ZHANG, C. Regen: Zero-shot text classification via training data generation with progressive dense retrieval. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023* (2023), pp. 11782–11805.
- [85] ZHAI, C. Large language models and future of information retrieval: Opportunities and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2024), pp. 481–490.
- [86] ZHANG, E., WANG, X., GONG, P., LIN, Y., AND MAO, J. Usimagent: Large language models for simulating search users. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2024), pp. 2687–2692.
- [87] ZOBEL, J., MOFFAT, A., AND RAMAMOZHANARAO, K. Inverted files versus signature files for text indexing. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS)* 23, 4 (1998), 453–490.

## Appendices

Phase	Prompt	ChatGPT's response
Initialization Query	<topic description>. Can you write a <document type> about that?	Environmental protection is a critical issue that affects the health and wellbeing of people and the planet as a whole. While many countries have taken significant steps to protect the environment and promote sustainable development, there are still countries that either do not practice or ignore environmental protective measures. ...
Subtopic Generation Query	Can you write 100 subtopics related to this? Please be specific as much as possible.	1) The impact of deforestation on the environment and local communities 2) The effects of oil and gas exploration on the environment 3) The impact of plastic pollution on marine life and ecosystems 4) The dangers of industrial pollution on air and water quality ...
Document generation	Can you write a long text with a title about <subtopic>, within the scope of <topic description> ?	Title: The Devastating Impact of Deforestation on the Environment and Local Communities in Countries with Negligible Environmental Protective Measures  Deforestation is the removal of trees from forests on a massive scale. It has been a critical issue in many countries, particularly those with weak environmental laws or enforcement mechanisms. Deforestation is a serious environmental problem that has far-reaching impacts on the planet and local communities. ...
Random Non-Relevant Document Generation	Write me a <document type> about any topic	Title: The Importance of Mental Health Awareness and Self-Care  Mental health is a critical aspect of our overall well-being. It refers to our psychological and emotional well-being and affects how we think, feel, and act. Mental health can be influenced by various factors, including genetics, environment, and lifestyle. It is essential to take care of our mental health, just like our physical health, to live a healthy and fulfilling life. ...
Altered topic generation	Can you generate 10 variants of the next sentence by filling [MASK]: < masked topic description >  Example: <topic description>	1) Countries that do not practice or ignore public health protective measures. 2) Countries that do not practice or ignore workplace safety protective measures. 3) Countries that do not practice or ignore cybersecurity protective measures. 4) Countries that do not practice or ignore wildlife conservation protective measures. ...

Table A1: ChatGPT prompts and corresponding responses for Topic 255 of TREC5. The topic description reads: "Countries that do not practice or ignore environmental protective measures". The masked version of the description is: "Countries that do not practice or ignore [MASK] protective measures."