

Approximate Cluster-Based Sparse Document Retrieval with Segmented Maximum Term Weights

Yifan Qiao

Department of Computer Science,
University of California
Santa Barbara, California, USA

Shanxiu He

Department of Computer Science,
University of California
Santa Barbara, California, USA

Yingrui Yang

Department of Computer Science,
University of California
Santa Barbara, California, USA

Parker Carlson

Department of Computer Science,
University of California
Santa Barbara, California, USA

Tao Yang

Department of Computer Science,
University of California
Santa Barbara, California, USA

ABSTRACT

This paper revisits cluster-based retrieval that partitions the inverted index into multiple groups and skips the index partially at cluster and document levels during online inference using a learned sparse representation. It proposes an approximate search scheme with two parameters to control the rank-safeness competitiveness of pruning with segmented maximum term weights within each cluster. Cluster-level maximum weight segmentation allows an improvement in the rank score bound estimation and threshold-based pruning to be approximately adaptive to bound estimation tightness, resulting in better relevance and efficiency. The experiments with MS MARCO passage ranking and BEIR datasets demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed scheme with a comparison to the baselines. This paper presents the design of this approximate retrieval scheme with rank-safeness analysis, compares clustering and segmentation options, and reports evaluation results.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Retrieval efficiency.**

KEYWORDS

Top- k retrieval, cluster-based index pruning, learned sparse representations, approximation and rank-safeness

1 INTRODUCTION

In last few years, sparse retrieval [6, 9–12, 25, 31, 41, 49] has exploited transformer-based neural models to learn document tokens with neural weights. Learned sparse retrieval methods can be effective in relevance on average for in-domain and out-of-domain search compared to BERT-based dense retrieval with dual encoders (e.g. [39, 40, 48]). Its query processing is relatively cheap and fast without GPU support, by taking advantages of sparse inverted indices, specially with index and model optimization [20, 22, 29, 32, 37, 38].

Traditional optimization to speed up top- k retrieval given an inverted index is through dynamic pruning techniques, such as MaxScore [45], WAND [1], and BlockMax WAND (BMW) [8] which safely skip the evaluation of low-scoring documents that are unable to appear in the final top- k results. Anytime Ranking by Mackenzie et al. [30] extends the earlier cluster-based retrieval studies [3, 13] to organize the inverted index as clusters with ranges of document

IDs, and dynamically prune clusters under a time budget. Such early search termination with a budget can be viewed as a category of “rank-unsafe” pruning. There is another line of work on dynamic unsafe pruning called threshold over-estimation [4, 28, 44] and it is a focus of this paper.

Considering the above advancement of sparse retrieval with learned representations, this paper revisits dynamic index pruning in both safe and unsafe aspects in the context of cluster-based retrieval. Our approach combines cluster-based retrieval with threshold over-estimation and improves its pruning safeness for better relevance effectiveness or being faster while retaining the same level of relevance. Specifically, the contributions of this paper are listed as follows:

- We propose cluster-level maximum weight segmentation that partitions a cluster into segments offline and collects segmented term weight information. This allows cluster-based retrieval to tighten rank score bound estimation and accurately skip more clusters that only contains low-scoring documents.
- We analyze the rank-safeness approximation property of threshold over-estimation and propose a two-parameter pruning control to provide a probabilistic approximate rank-safeness guarantee. This control utilizes randomly-segmented maximum term weights, and makes cluster-level pruning approximately adaptive to the bound estimation tightness for improved safeness.
- We exploit the use of dense token embeddings as counterparts of sparse vectors under the SPLADE-like models [11, 41] to cluster documents with k-means and support the above scheme.
- We conduct extensive evaluations on the MS MARCO and BEIR datasets to validate the effectiveness of the proposed scheme, called **ASC**. This paper demonstrates the use of ASC with three learned sparse retrieval models: SPLADE [10, 11], uniCOIL [12, 25], and LexMAE [41]. We study its benefit when used with two orthogonal efficiency optimization techniques: anytime early termination [30] and static index pruning [37].

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

Problem definition. Sparse document retrieval identifies top- k ranked candidates that match a query. Each document in a data collection is modeled as a sparse vector with many zero entries. These candidates are ranked using a simple additive formula, and

the rank score of each document d is defined as:

$$\text{RankScore}(d) = \sum_{t \in Q} w_{t,d}, \quad (1)$$

where Q is the set of search terms in the given query, $w_{t,d}$ is a weight contribution of term t in document d , possibly scaled by a corresponding query term weight. Term weights can be based on a lexical model such as BM25 [15] or are learned from a neural model such as DeepImpact [31], uniCOIL [12, 25], SPLADE [11], and LexMAE [41]. Terms are tokens in these neural models. For a sparse representation, a retrieval algorithm often uses an *inverted index* with a set of terms, and a *document posting list* for each term. A posting record in this list contains a document ID and its weight for the corresponding term.

Threshold-based skipping. During the traversal of posting lists in document retrieval, previous studies have advocated for dynamic pruning strategies to skip low-scoring documents which cannot appear on the final top- k list [1, 42]. To skip the scoring of a document, a pruning strategy computes the upper bound rank score of a candidate document d , referred to as $\text{Bound}(d)$. Namely, this bound value satisfies $\text{RankScore}(d) \leq \text{Bound}(d)$.

If $\text{Bound}(d) \leq \theta$, where θ is the rank score threshold to be in the top- k list, this document can be safely skipped. WAND [1] uses the maximum term weights of documents of each posting list to determine their rank score upper bound, while BMW [8] and its variants (e.g. [33]) optimize WAND using block-based maximum weights to compute the upper bounds. MaxScore [45] uses a similar skipping strategy with term partitioning. A retrieval method is called *rank-safe* if it guarantees that the top- k documents returned are the k highest scoring documents. All of the above algorithms are rank-safe. The underlying retriever in our evaluation uses MaxScore because it has been shown to be more effective for relatively longer queries [35, 38]. That fits in the case of SPLADE, which generates extra query tokens. For example, it has an average of over 23 tokens per query in the MS MARCO Dev set.

Previous work has also pursued a “rank-unsafe” skipping strategy that deliberately over-estimates the current top- k threshold by a factor [1, 4, 28, 44]. The previous work on threshold over-estimation does not have a formal analysis of its rank-safeness approximation, whereas our work provides such an analysis in Section 3.3 while also improving this technique for better rank-safeness control in cluster-based retrieval.

Cluster-based document retrieval and time budgets. There is a large body of studies on cluster-based document retrieval in traditional IR (e.g. [19, 26, 36]) for re-ranking an initially retrieved list by creating clusters of similar documents in this list. Then the clusters are ranked, and the cluster ranking may be further transformed to a document ranking.

A *cluster skipping inverted index* [3, 13] arranges each posting list as a set of related “clusters”, and those clusters are selected to conduct selective retrieval. Anytime Ranking [30] extends the above cluster-based retrieval to selected top clusters using bound estimations and search under a time budget [24].

Our work follows the cluster structure design in [3, 13, 30], while increasing index-skipping opportunities through cluster-level maximum weight segmentation and a probabilistic approximate rank-safeness assurance with a small impact to relevance. Both our work

and Anytime Ranking belong to the category of unsafe pruning, but the key difference is that Anytime Ranking [30] is focused more on a time-budget driven early termination that prunes low-scoring clusters after sorting with cluster rank score upper bounds. This paper is focused on the use of threshold over-estimation to prune low-scoring clusters judiciously. This effort can be combined with Anytime Ranking [30] with and without time budget. Our evaluation includes a study on the benefit of combining ASC with Anytime Ranking’s early termination technique under a time budget.

Efficiency optimization for learned sparse retrieval. There are orthogonal techniques to speedup retrieval with learned representations. BM25-guided pruning skips documents when traversing a learned sparse index [32, 38] using extra BM25 weights. Static index pruning with thresholding [22, 37] removes low-scoring term weights during offline index generation. An efficient version of SPLADE [20] uses L1 regularization for query vectors, dual document and query encoders, and language model middle training. Term impact decomposition [29] partitions each posting list into two groups with high and low impact weights. Our work is complementary to the above optimization techniques.

3 CLUSTER BASED RETRIEVAL WITH APPROXIMATION AND SEGMENTATION

The overall online inference flow of the proposed scheme during retrieval is shown in Figure 1. Initially, sparse clusters are sorted in a non-increasing order of their estimated cluster upper bounds. Then, search traverses the sorted clusters one-by-one to conduct approximate retrieval with two-level pruning with segmented term maximum weight. Section 3.1 first discusses the use of threshold over-estimation in cluster-based retrieval as μ -approximation. Section 3.2 presents (μ, η) -approximate search with two-parameter pruning control. Section 3.3 describes the theoretical properties. Section 3.4 discusses the clustering and segmentation options.




Figure 1: Flow of ASC: approximate retrieval with segmented cluster-level maximum term weights

3.1 Cluster-based μ -approximate retrieval

Cluster-based retrieval in this paper follows the concept and data structure in [3, 13, 30]. A document collection is divided into m clusters $\{C_1, \dots, C_m\}$. Then, each posting list of an inverted index is divided following the cluster mapping.

Given a query Q , the maximum rank score of a document in a cluster is estimated using the following BoundSum formula and

Anytime Ranking [30] visits sparse clusters in a non-increasing order of *BoundSum* values.

$$BoundSum(C_i) = \sum_{t \in Q} \max_{d \in C_i} w_{t,d}. \quad (2)$$

The visitation to cluster C_i can be pruned if $BoundSum(C_i) \leq \theta$, where θ is the current top- k threshold. If this cluster is not pruned, then document-level index traversal and skipping can be conducted within each cluster following a standard retrieval algorithm. Any document within such a cluster may be skipped for evaluation if $Bound(d) \leq \theta$ where $Bound(d)$ is computed on the fly based on an underlying retrieval algorithm such as MaxScore.

The cluster-level bound sum estimation in Formula (2) can be loose, especially when a cluster contains diverse document vectors, and this reduces the effectiveness of pruning. As an illustration, Figure 2 shows the average actual and estimated bound ratio using Formula (2) for MS MARCO passage clusters, which is $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\max_{d_j \in C_i} RankScore(d_j)}{BoundSum(C_i)}$, where m is the number of clusters. This ratio with value 1 means the bound estimation is accurate, and a small ratio value towards 0 means a loose estimation. This average ratio becomes bigger with a smaller error when m increases with a smaller average cluster size. This figure also plots the improved cluster upper bound computed in ASC described below.




Figure 2: The average ratio of the actual and estimated cluster bounds with Formula (2) on MS MARCO passages

Limited threshold over-estimation [4, 28, 44] can be helpful to deal with a loose bound estimation. Specifically, over-estimation of the top k threshold is applied by a factor of μ where $0 < \mu \leq 1$, and the above pruning condition is modified as $BoundSum(C_i) \leq \frac{\theta}{\mu}$ and $Bound(d) \leq \frac{\theta}{\mu}$. The extension of Anytime Ranking combined with this strategy is called **Anytime*** in this paper.

We call a retrieval algorithm μ -approximate if it satisfies that the average rank score of any top k' results produced by this algorithm, where $k' < k$, is competitive to that of rank-safe retrieval within a factor of μ . We will show Anytime* is μ -approximate in Proposition 3 of Section 3.3.

Figure 3 shows the relationship of Recall@1000 and latency of Anytime* on an Intel i7-1260P server with five different μ choices for the MS MARCO Dev set with retrieval depth $k = 1000$. Each curve in a distinct color represents a fixed number of clusters from 256 to 4096. Each curve contains five markers from left to right, representing that μ increases from 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, to 1. Recall@1000 is retained well when $\mu = 0.9$, but drops visibly as μ becomes small.

The introduction of threshold over-estimation with μ allows the skipping of more low-scoring documents when the bound estimation is too loose. However, thresholding is applied uniformly to all cases and can incorrectly prune many desired relevant documents when the bound estimation is already tight in some clusters. Alternatively, without over-estimation, Anytime Ranking imposes a time budget to conduct unsafe pruning and reduce latency. However, there is no formal approximate rank-safeness guarantee with such an early termination algorithm.




Figure 3: Recall vs. latency of Anytime* on SPLADE with no time budget when μ varies from 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9, to 1 for each fixed number of clusters. Retrieval depth $k = 1000$.

To improve the tightness of cluster-level bound estimation using Formula (2), one can decrease the size of each cluster. However, there is a significant overhead when increasing the number of clusters. One reason is that for each cluster, one needs to extract the maximum weights of query terms and estimate the cluster bound, which can become expensive for a large number of query terms. Another reason is that MaxScore [45] identifies a list of essential query terms which are different from one cluster to another. Traversing more clusters yields more overhead for essential term derivation, in addition to the cluster bound computation. Figure 3 shows that, for Anytime*, as the number of clusters increases, the aforementioned additional cluster-level overhead can offset the benefit.

3.2 ASC: (μ, η) -approximate retrieval with segmented cluster information

The proposed ASC method stands for (μ, η) -Approximate retrieval with Segmented Cluster-level maximum term weights. ASC segments cluster term maximum weights to improve the tightness of cluster bound estimation and guide cluster-level pruning. It employs two parameters, μ and η , satisfying $0 < \mu \leq \eta \leq 1$, to detect the cluster bound estimation tightness and improve pruning safeness. Details of our algorithm are described below.

- **Extension to the cluster-based skipping index.** Each cluster C_i is subdivided into n segments $\{S_{i,1}, \dots, S_{i,n}\}$ through random uniform partitioning during offline processing. The index for each cluster has an extra data structure which stores the maximum weight contribution of each term from each segment within this cluster. During retrieval, the maximum and average segment bounds of each cluster C_i are computed as shown below:

$$MaxSBound(C_i) = \max_{j=1}^n B_{i,j}, \quad (3)$$

$$AvgSBound(C_i) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n B_{i,j}, \quad (4)$$

$$\text{and } B_{i,j} = \sum_{t \in Q} \max_{d \in S_{i,j}} w_{t,d}.$$

- **Two-level pruning conditions.** Let θ be the current top- k threshold of retrieval in handling query Q .

- **Cluster-level pruning:** Any cluster is pruned when

$$MaxSBound(C_i) \leq \frac{\theta}{\mu} \quad (5)$$


and

$$AvgSBound(C_i) \leq \frac{\theta}{\eta}. \quad (6)$$

- **Document-level pruning:** If a cluster is not pruned, then when visiting such a cluster with a MaxScore or another retrieval algorithm, a document d is pruned if

$$Bound(d) \leq \frac{\theta}{\eta}.$$

Figure 4(a) illustrates a cluster skipping index of four clusters for handling query terms t_1 , t_2 , and t_3 . This index is extended to include two maximum term weight segments per cluster for ASC and these weights are marked in a different color for different segments. Document term weights in posting records are not shown. Figure 4(b) lists the cluster-level pruning decision in Anytime Ranking, Anytime*, and ASC when the current top- k threshold θ is 9. The derived bound information used for making pruning decisions by these three algorithms is also illustrated.



(a) Cluster skipping inverted index with 2 weight segments per cluster

$\theta = 9$	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
<i>BoundSum</i>	3.3	9.8	13.7	16.3
Anytime	Pruned	Kept	Kept	Kept
Anytime* $\mu = 0.9$	Pruned	Pruned	Kept	Kept
<i>MaxSBound</i>	3.1	9.6	9.7	13.6
<i>AvgSBound</i>	3.0	9.2	7.6	12.4
ASC $\mu=0.9, \eta=1$	Pruned	Kept	Pruned	Kept

(b) Decisions of dynamic cluster-level pruning during retrieval

Figure 4: A pruning example of Anytime, Anytime*, and ASC

Extra online space cost for segmented maximum weights.

The extra space cost in ASC is to maintain non-zero maximum term weights for multiple segments at each cluster in a sparse format. For example, Figure 4 shows four non-zero maximum segment term weights at Cluster 1 are accessed for the given query. To save space, we use the quantized value. Our evaluation uses 1 byte for each weight, which is sufficiently accurate to guide pruning. For MS MARCO passages in our evaluation, the default configuration has 4096 clusters and 8 segments per cluster. This results in about 550MB extra space. With that, the total cluster-based inverted SPLADE index size increases from about 5.6GB for MaxScore without clustering to 6.2GB for ASC. This 9% space overhead is still acceptable in practice. The extra space overhead for Anytime Ranking is smaller because only cluster-level maximum term weights are needed.

3.3 Properties of ASC and Anytime*

Table 1 compares the properties of ASC and Anytime* on their bound relationship and pruning safeness control in four aspects. In this context, Anytime* and ASC are compared without imposing a time budget. The last row lists the propositions that give a justification accordingly.

We call an algorithm (μ, η) -approximate if it is μ -approximate, and it satisfies that the expected average rank score of any top k' results produced by this algorithm, where $k' < k$, is competitive to that of rank-safe retrieval within a factor of η . When choosing $\eta = 1$, we call a (μ, η) -approximate retrieval algorithm to be *probabilistically safe*. ASC satisfies the above condition and Proposition 4 gives more details. In our evaluation, the default setting of ASC uses $\eta = 1$.

Table 1: A comparison of ASC and Anytime* properties with no time budget

	Cluster bound	Adaptive to bound quality	μ -approx. safeness	η -approx. prob. safeness
Anytime*	Loose	No	Yes	No
ASC	Tighter	Yes	Yes	Yes
Proposition	1	2	3	4

Proposition 1.

$$BoundSum(C_i) \geq MaxSBound(C_i) \geq \max_{d \in C_i} RankScore(d).$$

The above result shows that Formula (3) provides a tighter upperbound estimation than Formula (2) as demonstrated by Figure 2.

In ASC, choosing a small μ value prunes clusters more aggressively, and having the extra safeness condition using the average segment bound with η counteracts such pruning decisions. Given the requirement $\mu \leq \eta$, we can choose η to be close to 1 or exactly 1 for being safer. When the average segment bound is close to their maximum bound in a cluster, this cluster may not be pruned by ASC. This is characterized by the following property.

Proposition 2. Cluster-level pruning in ASC does not occur to cluster C_i when one of the two following conditions is true:

- $MaxSBound(C_i) > \frac{\theta}{\mu}$
- $MaxSBound(C_i) - AvgSBound(C_i) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\mu} - \frac{1}{\eta}\right) \theta$.

From the above proposition, when μ is small and/or the gap between $MaxSBound(C_i)$ and $AvgSBound(C_i)$ is small, cluster-level pruning will not occur. This difference of the maximum and average segment bounds provides an approximate indication of the bound estimation tightness with $MaxSBound$, and Figure 5 gives an illustration as to why this difference is a meaningful indicator approximately. Figure 5 depicts the correlation between the average ratio of $AvgSBound(C_i)$ over $MaxSBound(C_i)$ for all clusters, and average ratio of the exact bound over the estimated bound $MaxSBound(C_i)$. The data is collected from the index of MS MARCO dataset with 4096 clusters and 8 segments per cluster. This figure shows that when $AvgSBound(C_i)$ is closer to $MaxSBound(C_i)$ on average, the gap between exact upper bound and $MaxSbound$ value becomes smaller, which means the bound estimation becomes tighter. Table 3 in Section 3.4 will further corroborate that the above smaller gap yields less cluster skipping opportunities in ASC for safer pruning, consistent with the result of Proposition 2.




Figure 5: The correlation between bound estimation tightness and average $AvgSBound(C_i)/MaxSBound(C_i)$ for MS MARCO passage clusters

Define $Avg(x, A)$ as the average rank score of the top- x results by algorithm A . Let integer $k' \leq k$. The proposition below characterizes the approximate rank-safeness of pruning in ASC and Anytime*.

Proposition 3. *The average top- k' rank score of ASC and Anytime* without imposing a time budget is the same as any rank-safe retrieval algorithm R within a factor of μ . Namely $Avg(k', ASC) \geq \mu Avg(k', R)$ and $Avg(k', Anytime^*) \geq \mu Avg(k', R)$.*

The proposition below characterizes the extra probabilistic approximate rank-safeness of ASC.

Proposition 4. *The average top- k' rank score of ASC achieves the expected value of any rank-safe retrieval algorithm R within a factor of η . Namely $E[Avg(k', ASC)] \geq \eta E[Avg(k', R)]$ where $E[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value.*

The probabilistic rank-safeness approximation of ASC relies upon a condition where each document having an equal chance to be in any segment within a cluster. That is true because our segmentation method is random uniform partitioning.

3.4 Clustering and segmentation choices

We first discuss how to cluster documents. Here, we assume that a learned sparse representation is produced from a trained transformer encoder T . For example, SPLADE [10, 11] and LexMAE [41]

provide a trained BERT transformer to encode a document and a query. There are two approaches to represent documents for clustering:

- **K-means clustering of sparse vectors.** Encoder T is applied to each document in a data collection to produce a sparse weighted vector. Similar as Anytime Ranking [30], we follow the approach of [17, 18] to apply the Lloyd’s k-means clustering [27]. Naively applying the k-means algorithm to the clustering of learned sparse vectors presents a challenge owing to their high dimensionality and a large number of sparse vectors as the dataset size scales. For example, each sparse SPLADE document vector is of dimension 30,522 although most elements are zero. Despite its efficacy and widespread use, the k-means algorithm is known to deteriorate when the dimensionality grows. Previous work on sparse k-means has addressed that with feature selection and dimension reduction [7, 50]. These studies explored dataset sizes much smaller than our context and with different applications. Thus our retrieval application demands new considerations. Another difficulty is a lack of efficient implementations for sparse k-means in dealing with large datasets. We address the above challenge below by taking advantage of the dense vector representation produced by the transformer encoder as counterparts corresponding to their sparse vectors, with a much smaller dimensionality.
 - **K-means clustering of dense vector counterparts.** Assuming this trained transformer T is BERT, we apply T to each document and produce a token embedding set $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_L\}$ and a CLS token vector. Here t_i is the BERT output embedding of i -th token in this document and L is the total number of tokens of this document. Then, we have three ways to produce a dense vector of each document for clustering.
 - The CLS token vector.
 - The element-wise maximum pooling of all output token vectors. The i -th entry of this dense vector is $\max_{j=1}^L t_{i,j}$ where $t_{i,j}$ is the i -th entry of j -th token embedding.
 - The element-wise mean pooling of all output token vectors. The i -th entry of this dense vector is $\frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L t_{i,j}$ where $t_{i,j}$ is the i -th entry of j -th token embedding.
- In addition to the above options, we have compared the use of a dense representation based on SimLM [46], a state-of-the-art dense retrieval model.

BERT vectors are of dimension 768, and we leverage the FAISS library [14] for dense vector clustering with quantization support, which can compress vectors and further reduce the dimensionality.

Table 2: K-means clustering of MS MARCO passages for safe ASC ($\mu = \eta = 1$) with SPLADE sparse model

Passage representation	w/o segmentation		w/ segmentation	
	MRT	%C	MRT	%C
Sparse-SPLADE	91.6	67%	70.3	53%
Dense-SPLADE-CLS	115	80%	82.7	64%
Dense-SPLADE-Avg	95.3	76%	74.2	58%
Dense-SPLADE-Max	90.8	68%	71.8	54%
Dense-SimLM-CLS	105	78%	78.5	60%

Table 2 compares the performance of ASC in a safe mode ($\mu = \eta = 1$) using the above five different vector representation options to apply k-means clustering for SPLADE-based sparse retrieval. There are 4096 clusters and eight random segments per cluster. MRT is the mean retrieval time in milliseconds. Column marked with “%C” shows the percentage of clusters that are not pruned during ASC retrieval. For sparse vectors, we leverage FAISS dense k-means implementation with sampling, which is still expensive. Table 2 shows that the maximum pooling of SPLADE-based dense token vectors has a similar latency as the sparse vector representation. These two options are better than other three options. Considering the accuracy and implementation challenge in clustering high-dimension sparse vectors, our evaluation chooses max-pooled dense vectors derived from the corresponding transformer model.

Cluster segmentation methods for weight information collection. There are two approaches to subdivide each cluster for segmented term weights during offline processing.

- **Random uniform partitioning.** This random partitioning allows ASC to satisfy the probabilistic safeness condition that each document in a cluster has an equal chance to appear in any segment.
- **K-means sub-clustering.** This is to use the same clustering for partitioning the entire dataset based on document similarity. As shown below, this method turns out to be less effective than random uniform partitioning.

Table 3: Segmentation for 4096 clusters (8 segments/cluster)

μ, η	K-means subclustering		Random even partitioning	
	MRR, Recall	MRT	MRR, Recall	MRT
0.3, 1	0.3926, 0.9390	11.9	0.3960, 0.9716	20.7
0.4, 1	0.3933, 0.9418	12.6	0.3960, 0.9718	20.8
0.5, 1	0.3954, 0.9588	17.7	0.3962, 0.9739	21.8
0.6, 1	0.3966, 0.9770	29.0	0.3966, 0.9787	27.7
0.7, 1	0.3966, 0.9799	41.6	0.3966, 0.9799	38.7
1, 1	0.3966, 0.9802	69.1	0.3966, 0.9802	66.6

Average ratio	$\frac{Actual}{MaxSBound}$	$\frac{MaxSBound - AvgSBound}{Actual}$
Random even partitioning	0.55	0.49
K-means subclustering	0.53	0.69

The top portion of Table 3 compares the above two segmentation methods when applying SPLADE to MS MARCO passages with 4098 clusters and 8 segments per cluster. Random uniform partitioning offers equal or better relevance in terms of MRR@10 and Recall@1000, especially when μ is small. As μ affects cluster-level pruning in ASC, random segmentation results in a better prevention of incorrect aggressive pruning, although this can result in less cluster-level pruning and a longer latency. To provide an explanation for the above result, the lower portion of Table 3 shows the average ratio of actual cluster upper bound over the estimated *MaxSBound*, and the average difference of *MaxSBound* and *AvgSBound* scaled by the actual bound. Random uniform partitioning provides slightly better cluster upper bound estimation, while its average difference of *MaxSBound* and *AvgSBound* is much

smaller than k-means sub-clustering. Then, when μ is small, there are more un-skipped clusters, following Proposition 2.

The above result also indicates cluster-level pruning in ASC becomes safer due to its adaptiveness to the gap between the maximum and average segment bounds, which is consistent with Proposition 2. The advantage of random uniform partitioning shown above corroborates with Proposition 4 and demonstrates the usefulness of possessing probabilistic approximate rank-safeness.

4 EVALUATION

This section addresses the following research questions: RQ1) How does ASC compare against the other baselines, including Anytime Ranking and its extension Anytime*, when no time budget is imposed? RQ2) What is the benefit of (μ, η) -approximate retrieval over μ -approximate retrieval? RQ3) Can ASC be still effective when combined with early termination of Anytime Ranking with a time budget [30] and static index pruning [37]?

Datasets and metrics. We use the MS MARCO ranking dataset [2, 5] with 8.8 million passages. The average number of WordPiece [47] tokens per passage is 67.5. Following the standard practice in literature, we report mean reciprocal rank (MRR@10) for the development (Dev) query set, which contains 6980 queries, and report the commonly used nDCG@10 score for the TREC deep learning (DL) 2019 and 2020 tracks with 43 and 54 test queries respectively. We also report recall, which is the percentage of relevant-labeled results that appear in the final top- k results. When there are multiple relevance label levels in DL’19 and DL’20, the lowest level is considered as irrelevant, and other levels as relevant. We test two retrieval depths: $k = 10$ and $k = 1000$.

The second data collection used is BEIR [43], which contains the 13 publicly available datasets for evaluating zero-shot retrieval performance. The size of these datasets ranges from 3,633 to 5.4M documents, with the average query length ranging from 5.4 to 193, and the average document length ranging from 11.4 to 635.8.

Experimental setup. The documents are tokenized using the BERT’s Word Piece tokenizer. We test ASC on a version of SPLADE [10, 11], uniCOIL [12, 25], and LexMAE [41]. For LexMAE, we report two configurations: one encodes passages with title information, which has yielded a higher relevance score than SPLADE for the MS MACRO Dev test set; the other encodes passages without title information. Title annotation is considered to be non-standard in [21] since the originally released MS MARCO dataset does not utilize this information. The SPLADE and uniCOIL models do not use title information, following the standard practice.

The ASC implementation uses C++, extended from the Anytime Ranking code release [30], which is based on the PISA retrieval package [34]. The inverted index is compressed using SIMD-BP128 [23], following [35]. The underlying retrieval algorithm for each cluster is MaxScore. We applied an efficiency optimization to both ASC and Anytime Ranking code in extracting cluster-based term maximum weights when dealing with a large number of clusters. All timing results are collected by running as a single thread on a Linux server with Intel i7-1260P and 64GB memory. Our code will be released after publication.

Before timing queries, all compressed posting lists and metadata for tested queries are pre-loaded into memory, following the same

Table 4: A comparison with baselines using SPLADE on MS MARCO passages

Methods	C%	MS MARCO Dev		DL'19		DL'20	
		MRR, Recall	MRT (P_{99})	nDCG, Recall	MRT	nDCG, Recall	MRT
$k = 10$. No time budget							
Rank-safe							
MaxScore	-	0.3966, 0.6824	26.4 (116)	0.7398, 0.1764	26.3	0.7340, 0.2462	24.8
- Anytime Ranking-512	69.8%	0.3966, 0.6824	20.7 (89.3)	0.7398, 0.1764	18.4	0.7340, 0.2462	17.6
- ASC-512*16, $\mu=\eta=1$	49.1%	0.3966, 0.6824	15.2 (62.2)	0.7398, 0.1764	15.3	0.7340, 0.2462	14.8
μ vs. (μ, η)-approximate							
- Anytime*-512- $\mu=0.9$	62.7%	0.3815, 0.6111	15.3 (61.1)	0.7392, 0.1775	15.9	0.7126, 0.2382	15.2
- ASC-4096*8, $\mu=0.9, \eta=1$	7.99%	0.3964, 0.6813	11.4 (55.9)	0.7403, 0.1764	11.6	0.7338, 0.2464	11.5
$k = 1000$. No time budget							
Rank-safe							
MaxScore	-	0.3966, 0.9802	65.8 (209)	0.7398, 0.8207	67.0	0.7340, 0.8221	63.2
- Anytime Ranking-512	93.0%	0.3966, 0.9802	50.1 (158)	0.7398, 0.8207	54.3	0.7340, 0.8221	51.1
- ASC-512*16, $\mu=\eta=1$	86.3%	0.3966, 0.9802	45.8 (148)	0.7398, 0.8207	49.9	0.7340, 0.8221	46.6
μ vs. (μ, η)-approximate							
- Anytime*-512- $\mu = 0.9$	91.4%	0.3966, 0.9801	46.0 (149)	0.7398, 0.8205	45.1	0.7340, 0.8206	42.8
- ASC-4096*8, $\mu=0.7, \eta=1$	21.7%	0.3966, 0.9799	38.8 (135)	0.7398, 0.8188	40.5	0.7340, 0.8218	37.3
- Anytime*-512- $\mu = 0.7$	88.9%	0.3963, 0.9696	37.1 (127)	0.7398, 0.7881	37.9	0.7340, 0.7937	36.7
- ASC-4096*8, $\mu=0.5, \eta=1$	8.10%	0.3962, 0.9739	21.8 (101)	0.7398, 0.7977	22.8	0.7355, 0.7989	21.7

assumption in [16, 33]. For all of our experiments, we perform pairwise t-tests on the relevance between ASC and corresponding baselines. No statistically significant degradation is observed at 95% confidence level.

4.1 Baseline comparison on MS MARCO

Table 4 lists the overall comparison of ASC with two baselines using SPLADE sparse passage representations on MS MARCO Dev and TREC DL'19/20 test sets. Recall@10 and Recall@1000 are reported for retrieval depth $k = 10$ and 1000, respectively. Retrieval mean response time (MRT) and 99th percentile latency (P_{99}) in parentheses are reported in milliseconds. Column marked "C%" is the percentage of clusters that are not pruned during retrieval. For the rank-safe original MaxScore without clustering, we have incorporated a document reordering technique in [30] to optimize its index based on document similarity, which shortens its latency by about 10-15%.

Anytime Ranking and Anytime* are configured with 512 clusters and Anytime* uses $\mu = 0.9$ or 0.7, and these are good choices for the low latency and reasonable relevance based on Figure 3. ASC is configured with "4096*8" which means 4096 clusters and 8 randomized segments per cluster, and uses $\eta = 1$ with $\mu = 0.9$ for $k = 10$, and $\mu = 0.7$ or 0.5 for $k = 1000$.

Comparing the three rank-safe versions for SPLADE in Table 4, ASC is about 27% faster than Anytime Ranking for $k = 10$, and 8.6% faster for $k = 1000$, because segmentation offers a tighter cluster bound as shown in Proposition 1. For approximate safe configurations when $k = 10$, ASC with $\mu = 0.9/\eta = 1$ has 3.9% higher MRR@10, 11% higher recall, and is 25% faster than Anytime* with $\mu = 0.9$. When $k = 1000$, ASC with $\mu = 0.7/\eta = 1$ is 1.2x faster than Anytime* with $\mu = 0.9$, and ASC with $\mu = 0.5/\eta = 1$ is 1.7x faster than Anytime* with $\mu = 0.7$. ASC offers similar relevance scores in

Table 5: Other learned sparse retrieval models

Methods	uniCOIL		LexMAE w/ title		LexMAE w/o title	
	MRR (R)	T	MRR (R)	T	MRR (R)	MRT
$k = 10$. No time budget						
Rank-safe						
MaxScore	.352 (.617)	6.0	.425 (.718)	47	.392 (.677)	46
- Anytime-512	.352 (.617)	5.0	.425 (.718)	27	.392 (.677)	25
- ASC-512*16	.352 (.617)	4.1	.425 (.718)	21	.392 (.677)	21
μ vs. (μ, η)-approximate						
- Anytime*- $\mu=0.9$.345 (.585)	4.2	.413 (.654)	22	.382 (.623)	21
- ASC- $\mu=0.9, \eta=1$.352 (.614)	3.9	.425 (.718)	16	.393 (.677)	15
$k = 1000$. No time budget						
Rank-safe						
MaxScore	.352 (.958)	19	.425 (.988)	94	.392 (.983)	92
- Anytime-512	.352 (.958)	14	.425 (.988)	67	.392 (.983)	64
- ASC-512*16	.352 (.958)	13	.425 (.988)	64	.392 (.983)	61
μ vs. (μ, η)-approximate						
- Anytime*- $\mu=0.7$.351 (.940)	8.9	.425 (.978)	46	.392 (.972)	50
- ASC- $\mu=0.5, \eta=1$.351 (.946)	6.4	.425 (.980)	26	.392 (.975)	25

both of these two comparisons. This demonstrates the importance of Proposition 4. For this reason, ASC is configured to be probabilistically safe with $\eta = 1$ while choosing μ value modestly below 1 for efficiency. There is a small relevance degradation compared to the original retrieval, but ASC performs competitively while it is up-to 3.0x faster than the original MaxScore without using clusters. ASC can skip more than 90% of 4098 clusters, but its latency does not decrease proportionally compared to the 512-cluster setting. This is because like Anytime Ranking, increased overhead for dealing with a large number of clusters reduces ASC's benefit, as discussed in Section 3.1.

Table 5 compares ASC with uniCOIL, LexMAE with and without title annotation in MRR@10, Recall@10 or @1000 (shortened as R),

and latency time (shortened as T). The conclusions are similar as the ones obtained above for SPLADE.

4.2 Zero-shot retrieval on BEIR

Table 6: Zero-shot performance of SPLADE on BEIR datasets

Dataset	MaxScore		Anytime* $\mu=0.9$		ASC	
	nDCG	MRT	nDCG	MRT	nDCG	MRT
$k = 10$						
DBPedia	0.4430	81.2	0.4314	58.1	0.4415	50.8
FiQA	0.3581	3.64	0.3563	2.49	0.3584	2.67
NQ	0.5551	44.9	0.5454	39.8	0.5486	25.6
HotpotQA	0.6815	323	0.6738	270	0.6798	260
NFCorpus	0.3517	0.17	0.3498	0.15	0.3516	0.17
T-COVID	0.7188	5.20	0.6727	2.48	0.7188	2.64
Touche-2020	0.3069	4.73	0.2814	2.27	0.3069	2.00
ArguAna	0.4318	9.07	0.4110	9.17	0.4319	9.02
C-FEVER	0.2429	895	0.2419	735	0.2429	738
FEVER	0.7855	694	0.7823	587	0.7857	557
Quora	0.8061	5.16	0.7949	2.05	0.8059	1.73
SCIDOCS	0.1508	2.53	0.1501	2.17	0.1509	2.13
SciFact	0.6764	2.54	0.6733	2.45	0.6764	2.42
Average	0.5007	-	0.4896	1.43x	0.5006	1.54x
$k = 1000$						
Average	0.5007	-	0.4982	1.96x	0.4994	3.12x

Table 6 shows the nDCG@10 and mean latency in milliseconds on zero-shot performance in searching 13 BEIR datasets with retrieval depth $k = 10$ and 1000 using SPLADE. For smaller datasets, the number of clusters is proportionally reduced so that each cluster contains approximately 2000 documents, which is aligned with 4096 clusters setup for MS MARCO. The number of segments is kept 8. ASC uses $\mu = 0.9/\eta = 1$ for $k = 10$ and $\mu = 0.5/\eta = 1$ for $k = 1000$. Anytime* uses $\mu = 0.9$. There is no time budget imposed. The training of the SPLADE model is only based on MS MARCO passages.

The SPLADE model that we trained has an average nDCG@10 score 0.5007, close to the 0.507 reported in the SPLADE++ paper. ASC offers nDCG@10 similar as MaxScore while being 1.54x faster for $k = 10$ and 3.12x faster for $k = 1000$. Comparing with Anytime*, ASC is 7.7% faster and has 2.2% higher nDCG@10 on average for $k = 10$, and it is 1.59x faster while maintaining similar relevance scores for $k = 1000$.

4.3 Varying μ , #clusters, and #segments

Figure 6 examines the relation of Recall@1000 of ASC and its latency when varying μ , the number of clusters, and the number of segments per cluster on MS MARCO Dev for SPLADE sparse retrieval. $k = 1000$, and Parameter η is fixed as 1. Each curve with a distinct color represents a different setting in the number of clusters and segments per cluster. " $m * n$ " means m clusters and n segments per cluster. Each curve is marked with 5 markers from left to right, representing that μ increases from 0.3 to 1.

The curves representing more clusters have a longer span, indicating their latency is more sensitive to the value of μ . More clusters allows for more accurate cluster bound estimation, and more finer-grained and effective decisions on cluster pruning, but there is

more cluster oriented overhead that affects latency, as discussed in Section 3.1. For safe pruning with $\mu = 1$, having 512 clusters is more appropriate for ASC. When $\mu < 1$, the choice of 4096 clusters allows for better latency when choosing a small μ value.




Figure 6: Each curve has different #clusters and #segments with μ increased from left to right as 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, and 1

4.4 Compatibility with other efficiency optimization techniques

Table 7: SPLADE by Anytime and ASC with time budgets

Method	MRR, Recall	MRT (P_{99})
$k = 10$. Time budget 10ms		
Anytime-512- $\mu = 1$	0.3697, 0.6316	8.34 (10.3)
ASC-4096*8- $\mu = 1, \eta = 1$	0.3950, 0.6779	7.31 (10.1)
Anytime*-512- $\mu = 0.9$	0.3604, 0.5750	7.70 (10.2)
ASC-4096*8- $\mu = 0.9, \eta = 1$	0.3951, 0.6782	6.81 (10.0)
$k = 1000$. Time budget 20ms		
Anytime-512- $\mu = 1$	0.3642, 0.8648	19.1 (20.4)
ASC-4096*8- $\mu = 1, \eta = 1$	0.3941, 0.9656	19.9 (20.1)
Anytime*-512- $\mu = 0.9$	0.3631, 0.8635	19.1 (20.3)
ASC-4096*8- $\mu = 0.7, \eta = 1$	0.3954, 0.9695	17.0 (20.0)

Table 7 lists MRR@10 and Recall@1000 of combining ASC with early termination technique of Anytime Ranking [30] under a time budget on MS MARCO Dev set for SPLADE. We set time budget 10ms for $k = 10$ and time budget 20ms for $k = 1000$ respectively. Comparing with previous results in Table 4, there is a small relevance degradation for ASC with time budgets, but the 99th percentile time is improved substantially by this combination. Under the same time constraint, this ASC/Anytime combination has higher MRR@10 and Recall@1000 than Anytime Ranking or Anytime* alone in both $k = 10$ and 1000. This result again demonstrates that ASC with $\eta = 1$ and $\mu < 1$ is able to filter out some clusters with low ranking scores but loose cluster-wide maximum bounds.

We also apply ASC to a fast version of SPLADE with static index pruning called HT3 [37]. HT3 has 0.3942 MRR@10 on MS MARCO Dev set with a retrieval latency of 24.7ms for retrieval depth $k = 1000$. ASC configured with "4096*8" and $\mu = 0.5/\eta = 1$ reduces the retrieval latency by 3.3x to 7.43ms, while the relevance slightly degrades to 0.3933 MRR@10.

5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has proposed an approximate sparse retrieval scheme with randomly segmented cluster maximum term weights, and provided an analysis to characterize the improved rank-safeness for better relevance effectiveness. The evaluation on the MS MARCO and BEIR datasets has shown the following results.

- Use of segmented maximum term weights tightens the cluster rank score upper bound estimation, which allows retrieval to skip more clusters safely. For example, ASC is 27% faster for $k = 10$ and 8.6% faster for $k=1000$ than Anytime Ranking using SPLADE and MS MARCO Dev when no time budget is imposed.
- (μ, η) -approximation adapts to cluster bound estimation tightness and adds probabilistic approximate rank-safeness. This provides more flexible pruning control compared to single-parameter μ -approximation and allows ASC to be faster than Anytime* at a similar relevance level or outperform in relevance and efficiency depending on configurations, when no time budget is imposed. For example, with $\mu = 0.9/\eta = 1$, ASC has 3.9% higher MRR@10, 11% higher recall, and is 25% faster than Anytime* with $\mu = 0.9$ on MS MARCO Dev when $k = 10$.
- With a time budget, combining ASC with Anytime Ranking early termination has better relevance than Anytime Ranking or Anytime* alone in both $k = 10$ and 1000. This combination also yields much faster 99th percentile latency. ASC also works well with a statically-pruned index.
- The maximum pooled dense vectors in a SPLADE-like model performs competitively to sparse vectors, which simplifies the use of k-means clustering.

There is a manageable space overhead for storing cluster-wise segmented maximum weights. Increasing the number of clusters for a given dataset is useful to reduce ASC latency up to a point because having more clusters leads to more overhead.

Acknowledgments. This work is supported in part by NSF IIS-2225942 and has used the computing resource of the ACCESS program supported by NSF. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

A PROOFS OF FORMAL PROPERTIES

Proof of Proposition 1. Without loss of generality, assume in Cluster C_i , the maximum cluster bound $MaxSBound(C_i)$ is the same as the bound of Segment $S_{i,j}$. Then

$$MaxSBound(C_i) = B_{i,j} = \sum_{t \in Q} \max_{d \in S_{i,j}} w_{t,d} \leq \sum_{t \in Q} \max_{d \in C_i} w_{t,d} = BoundSum(C_i).$$

For any document d , assume it appears in j -th segment of C_i , then

$$RankScore(d) = \sum_{t \in Q} w_{t,d} \leq \sum_{t \in Q} \max_{d \in S_{i,j}} w_{t,d} = B_{i,j} \leq MaxSBound(C_i). \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Proposition 2. When a cluster C_i is not pruned by ASC, that is because one of Inequalities (5) and (6) is false. When Inequality (5) is true but Inequality (6) is false, we have

$$MaxSBound(C_i) \leq \frac{\theta}{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad -AvgSBound(C_i) \leq -\frac{\theta}{\eta}.$$

Add these two inequalities together, that proves this proposition. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 3. Let $L(x)$ be the top- k' list of Algorithm x . To prove $Avg(k', ASC) \geq \mu Avg(k', R)$, we first remove any document that appears in both $L(ASC)$ and $L(R)$ in both side of the above inequality. Then, we only need to show:

$$\sum_{d \in L(ASC), d \notin L(R)} RankScore(d) \geq \mu * \sum_{d \in L(R), d \notin L(ASC)} RankScore(d).$$

For the right side of above inequality, if the rank score of every document d in $L(R)$ (but $d \notin L(ASC)$) does not exceed the lowest score in $L(ASC)$ divided by μ , then the above inequality is true. There are two cases to prove this condition.

- Case 1. If d is not pruned by ASC, then d is ranked below k' -th position in ASC.
- Case 2. Document d is pruned by ASC when the top- k threshold is θ_{ASC} . The final top- k threshold when ASC finishes is Θ_{ASC} . If this document d is pruned at the cluster level, then $RankScore(d) \leq \max_{j=1}^n B_{i,j} \leq \frac{\theta_{ASC}}{\mu} \leq \frac{\Theta_{ASC}}{\mu}$. If it is pruned at the document level, $RankScore(d) \leq \frac{\theta_{ASC}}{\eta} \leq \frac{\Theta_{ASC}}{\mu} \leq \frac{\Theta_{ASC}}{\mu}$.

In both cases, $RankScore(d)$ does not exceed the lowest score in $L(ASC)$ divided by μ .

Anytime* with no time budget imposed behaves in the same way as ASC with $\mu = \eta$. Thus this proposition is also true for Anytime*.

Proof of Proposition 4: Define $Top(k', ASC)$ as the score of top k' -th ranked document produced by ASC. $\Theta_{ASC} = Top(k, ASC)$.

The first part of this proof shows that for any document d such that $d \in L(R)$ and $d \notin L(ASC)$, the following inequality is true:

$$E[RankScore(d)] \leq \frac{Top(k', ASC)}{\eta}.$$

There are two cases that $d \notin L(ASC)$:

- Case 1. If d is not pruned by ASC, then d is ranked below k' -th position in ASC. $RankScore(d) \leq Top(k', ASC)$.
- Case 2. If document d is pruned at the document level by ASC when the top k -th rank score is θ_{ASC} ,

$$RankScore(d) \leq \frac{\theta_{ASC}}{\eta} \leq \frac{Top(k, ASC)}{\eta} \leq \frac{Top(k', ASC)}{\eta}.$$

If document d is pruned at the cluster level, notice that ASC uses random uniform partitioning, and thus this document has an equal chance being in any segment within its cluster.

$$E[RankScore(d)] \leq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n B_{i,j}}{n} \leq \frac{\theta_{ASC}}{\eta} \leq \frac{Top(k, ASC)}{\eta} \leq \frac{Top(k', ASC)}{\eta}.$$

The second part of this proof shows the probabilistic rank-safeness approximation inequality based on the expected average top- k' rank score. Notice that list size $|L(R)| = |L(ASC)| = k'$, and $|L(R) - L(S) \cap L(ASC)| = |L(ASC) - L(R) \cap L(ASC)|$ where minus notation '-' denotes the set subtraction. Using the result of the first part, the

following inequality sequence is true:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E\left[\sum_{d \in L(R)} \text{RankScore}(d)\right] \\
 &= E\left[\sum_{d \in L(R) \cap L(ASC)} \text{RankScore}(d)\right] + E\left[\sum_{d \in L(R), d \notin L(ASC)} \text{RankScore}(d)\right] \\
 &\leq E\left[\sum_{d \in L(R) \cap L(ASC)} \text{RankScore}(d)\right] + E\left[\sum_{d \in L(R), d \notin L(ASC)} \frac{\text{Top}(k', ASC)}{\eta}\right] \\
 &\leq E\left[\sum_{d \in L(R) \cap L(ASC)} \text{RankScore}(d)\right] + E\left[\sum_{d \in L(ASC), d \notin L(R)} \frac{\text{RankScore}(d)}{\eta}\right] \\
 &\leq E\left[\sum_{d \in L(ASC)} \text{RankScore}(d)\right] \frac{1}{\eta}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $E[\text{Avg}(k', ASC)] \geq \eta E[\text{Avg}(k', R)]$. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrei Z. Broder, David Carmel, Michael Herscovici, Aya Soffer, and Jason Zien. 2003. Efficient Query Evaluation Using a Two-level Retrieval Process. In *Proc. of the 12th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 426–434.
- [2] Daniel Fernando Campos, Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, Li Deng, and Bhaskar Mitra. 2016. MS MARCO: A Human Generated MACHine Reading COmprehension Dataset. *ArXiv abs/1611.09268* (2016).
- [3] Fazli Can, Ismail Altıngöyde, and Engin Demir. 2004. Efficiency and effectiveness of query processing in cluster-based retrieval. *Information Systems* 29 (12 2004), 697–717.
- [4] Matt Crane, J. Shane Culpepper, Jimmy Lin, Joel Mackenzie, and Andrew Trotman. 2017. A Comparison of Document-at-a-Time and Score-at-a-Time Query Evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (Cambridge, United Kingdom) (WSDM '17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 201–210.
- [5] Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Fernando Campos, and Ellen M. Voorhees. 2020. Overview of the TREC 2020 Deep Learning Track. *ArXiv abs/2102.07662* (2020).
- [6] Zhuyun Dai and Jamie Callan. 2020. Context-Aware Term Weighting For First Stage Passage Retrieval. *SIGIR* (2020).
- [7] Sayak Dey, Swagatam Das, and Rammohan Mallipeddi. 2020. The Sparse MinMax k-Means Algorithm for High-Dimensional Clustering. In *Proc. of the Twenty-Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-20*. 2103–2110.
- [8] Shuai Ding and Torsten Suel. 2011. Faster Top-k Document Retrieval Using Block-Max Indexes. In *Proc. of the 34th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 993–1002.
- [9] Thibault Formal, C. Lassance, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2021. SPLADE v2: Sparse Lexical and Expansion Model for Information Retrieval. *ArXiv abs/2109.10086* (2021).
- [10] Thibault Formal, Carlos Lassance, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2022. From Distillation to Hard Negative Sampling: Making Sparse Neural IR Models More Effective. *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2022).
- [11] Thibault Formal, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2021. SPLADE: Sparse Lexical and Expansion Model for First Stage Ranking. *SIGIR* (2021).
- [12] Luyu Gao, Zhuyun Dai, and Jamie Callan. 2021. COIL: Revisit Exact Lexical Match in Information Retrieval with Contextualized Inverted List. *NAACL* (2021).
- [13] Fatih Hafızoglu, Emre Can Kucukoglu, and Ismail Sengör Altıngöyde. 2017. On the Efficiency of Selective Search. In *ECIR 2017*, Vol. 10193. 705–712.
- [14] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2019. Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Trans. on Big Data* 7, 3 (2019), 535–547.
- [15] Karen Spärck Jones, Steve Walker, and Stephen E. Robertson. 2000. A probabilistic model of information retrieval: development and comparative experiments. In *Information Processing and Management*. 779–840.
- [16] Omar Khattab, Mohammad Hammoud, and Tamer Elsayed. 2020. Finding the best of both worlds: Faster and more robust top-k document retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1031–1040.
- [17] Yubin Kim, Jamie Callan, J. Shane Culpepper, and Alistair Moffat. 2017. Efficient distributed selective search. *Inf. Retr. J.* 20, 3 (2017), 221–252.
- [18] Anagha Kulkarni and Jamie Callan. 2015. Selective Search: Efficient and Effective Search of Large Textual Collections. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 33, 4 (2015), 17:1–17:33.
- [19] Oren Kurland. 2008. The opposite of smoothing: A language model approach to ranking query-specific document clusters. In *Proc. of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 171–178.
- [20] Carlos Lassance and Stéphane Clinchant. 2022. An efficiency study for SPLADE models. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 2220–2226.
- [21] Carlos Lassance and Stéphane Clinchant. 2023. The Tale of Two MSMARCO - and Their Unfair Comparisons. In *Proceed. of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '23)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2431–2435.
- [22] Carlos Lassance, Simon Lupart, Hervé Déjean, Stéphane Clinchant, and Nicola Tonello. 2023. A Static Pruning Study on Sparse Neural Retrievers. In *Proc. of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Taipei, Taiwan) (SIGIR '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1771–1775.
- [23] Daniel Lemire and Leonid Boytsov. 2015. Decoding billions of integers per second through vectorization. *Softw. Pract. Exp.* 45, 1 (2015), 1–29.
- [24] Jimmy Lin and Andrew Trotman. 2015. Anytime Ranking for Impact-Ordered Indexes. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on The Theory of Information Retrieval (Northampton, Massachusetts, USA) (ICTIR '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 301–304. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2808194.2809477>
- [25] Jimmy J. Lin and Xueguang Ma. 2021. A Few Brief Notes on DeepImpact, COIL, and a Conceptual Framework for Information Retrieval Techniques. *ArXiv abs/2106.14807* (2021).
- [26] Xiaoyong Liu and W Bruce Croft. 2004. Cluster-based retrieval using language models. In *Proc. of the 27th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. 186–193.
- [27] Stuart Lloyd. 1982. Least squares quantization in PCM. *IEEE Trans. on Information Theory* 28, 2 (1982), 129–137. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.1982.1056489>
- [28] Craig Macdonald, Nicola Tonello, and Iadh Ounis. 2012. Effect of Dynamic Pruning Safety on Learning to Rank Effectiveness. In *Proceedings of the 35th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Portland, Oregon, USA) (SIGIR '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1051–1052.
- [29] Joel Mackenzie, Antonio Mallia, Alistair Moffat, and Matthias Petri. 2022. Accelerating Learned Sparse Indexes Via Term Impact Decomposition. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, Yoav Goldberg, Zornitsa Kozareva, and Yue Zhang (Eds.). ACL, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2830–2842.
- [30] Joel Mackenzie, Matthias Petri, and Alistair Moffat. 2021. Anytime Ranking on Document-Ordered Indexes. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 40, 1, Article 13 (sep 2021), 32 pages.
- [31] Antonio Mallia, O. Khattab, Nicola Tonello, and Torsten Suel. 2021. Learning Passage Impacts for Inverted Indexes. *SIGIR* (2021).
- [32] Antonio Mallia, Joel Mackenzie, Torsten Suel, and Nicola Tonello. 2022. Faster learned sparse retrieval with guided traversal. In *Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 1901–1905.
- [33] Antonio Mallia, Giuseppe Ottaviano, Elia Porciani, Nicola Tonello, and Rossano Venturini. 2017. Faster BlockMax WAND with Variable-sized Blocks. In *Proc. of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 625–634.
- [34] Antonio Mallia, Michal Siedlaczek, Joel Mackenzie, and Torsten Suel. 2019. PISA: Performant indexes and search for academia. *Proceedings of the Open-Source IR Replicability Challenge* (2019).
- [35] Antonio Mallia, Michal Siedlaczek, and Torsten Suel. 2019. An Experimental Study of Index Compression and DAAT Query Processing Methods. In *Proc. of 41st European Conference on IR Research, ECIR' 2019*. 353–368.
- [36] Egor Markovskiy, Fiana Raiber, Shoham Sabach, and Oren Kurland. 2022. From Cluster Ranking to Document Ranking. In *Proc. of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (Madrid, Spain) (SIGIR '22)*. 2137–2141.
- [37] Yifan Qiao, Yingrui Yang, Shanxiu He, and Tao Yang. 2023. Representation Sparsification with Hybrid Thresholding for Fast SPLADE-based Document Retrieval. *ACM SIGIR'23* (2023).
- [38] Yifan Qiao, Yingrui Yang, Haixin Lin, and Tao Yang. 2023. Optimizing Guided Traversal for Fast Learned Sparse Retrieval. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023 (WWW '23)*. ACM, Austin, TX, USA.
- [39] Ruiyang Ren, Yingqi Qu, Jing Liu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Qiaoqiao She, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021. RocketQAV2: A Joint Training Method for Dense Passage Retrieval and Passage Re-ranking. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. ACM, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2825–2835.
- [40] Keshav Santhanam, O. Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei A. Zaharia. 2022. ColBERTv2: Effective and Efficient Retrieval via Lightweight Late Interaction. *NAACL '22 ArXiv abs/2112.01488* (2022).
- [41] Tao Shen, Xiubo Geng, Chongyang Tao, Can Xu, Xiaolong Huang, Bingxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, and Daxin Jiang. 2023. LexMAE: Lexicon-Bottlenecked Pretraining

- for Large-Scale Retrieval. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PfpEtB3-csK>
- [42] Trevor Strohman and W. Bruce Croft. 2007. Efficient document retrieval in main memory. In *Proc. of the 30th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*. 175–182.
- [43] Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. BEIR: A Heterogeneous Benchmark for Zero-shot Evaluation of Information Retrieval Models. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=wCu6T5xFje>
- [44] Nicola Tonello, Craig Macdonald, and Iadh Ounis. 2013. Efficient and Effective Retrieval Using Selective Pruning. In *Proc. of the Sixth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '13)*. ACM, 63–72.
- [45] Howard Turtle and James Flood. 1995. Query Evaluation: Strategies and Optimizations. *Information Processing & Management* 31, 6 (1995), 831–850.
- [46] Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. 2023. SimLM: Pre-training with Representation Bottleneck for Dense Passage Retrieval. *ACL* (2023).
- [47] Y. Wu, M. Schuster, Z. Chen, Q. Le, M. Norouzi, W. Macherey, M. Krikun, Y. Cao, Q. Gao, K. Macherey, J. Klingner, A. Shah, M. Johnson, X. Liu, L. Kaiser, S. Gouws, Y. Kato, T. Kudo, H. Kazawa, K. Stevens, G. Kurian, N. Patil, W. Wang, C. Young, J. Smith, J. Riesa, A. Rudnick, O. Vinyals, G. Corrado, M. Hughes, and J. Dean. 2016. Google's Neural Machine Translation System: Bridging the Gap between Human and Machine Translation. *ArXiv abs/1609.08144* (2016).
- [48] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Yingxia Shao, and Zhao Cao. 2022. RetroMAE: Pre-training Retrieval-oriented Transformers via Masked Auto-Encoder. *EMNLP* (2022).
- [49] Hamed Zamani, Mostafa Dehghani, William Bruce Croft, Erik G. Learned-Miller, and J. Kamps. 2018. From Neural Re-Ranking to Neural Ranking: Learning a Sparse Representation for Inverted Indexing. *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management* (2018).
- [50] Zhiyue Zhang, Kenneth Lange, and Jason Xu. 2020. Simple and Scalable Sparse k-means Clustering via Feature Ranking. In *NeurIPS 2020: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin (Eds.), Vol. 33. 10148–10160.