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ABSTRACT
We present Capreolus, a toolkit designed to facilitate end-to-end ad hoc retrieval experiments with neural networks by providing implementations of prominent neural ranking models within a common framework. Our toolkit adopts a standard reranking architecture via tight integration with the Anserini toolkit for candidate document generation using standard bag-of-words approaches. Using Capreolus, we are able to reproduce Yang et al.’s recent SIGIR 2019 finding that, in a reranking scenario on the test collection from the TREC 2004 Robust Track, many neural retrieval models do not significantly outperform a strong query expansion baseline. Furthermore, we find that this holds true for five additional models implemented in Capreolus. We describe the architecture and design of our toolkit, which includes a Web interface to facilitate comparisons between rankings returned by different models.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Neural approaches to ad hoc document retrieval have become popular alternatives to learning-to-rank techniques based on massive feature engineering, but the architecture of search systems still remains dominated by a multi-stage reranking model. In this pipeline approach, an initial list of candidate documents (typically retrieved with a bag-of-words term-matching technique using an inverted index) is passed to one or more reranker stages that are based on neural models.

In this context, information retrieval researchers have a long history of developing shared, open-source IR toolkits, such as Indri [14], Terrier [10], and Anserini [17]. In a multi-stage pipeline architecture, these systems can provide the initial candidate list. This open-source tradition has carried over to neural ranking models—it is quite commonplace to find research papers paired with open-source implementations of the proposed models. This has led to a proliferation of individual model implementations that differ in both neural training decisions (e.g., sampling strategies) and in earlier stages of the pipeline, making cross-model comparisons of ranking effectiveness difficult.

Recently, the MatchZoo toolkit [5] addressed the first part of this issue by providing implementations of general text matching models, including a number of ad hoc retrieval models. In order to remain general, MatchZoo (as well as other toolkits) focus on the general text matching task and consider much of an end-to-end experimental IR pipeline to be out of scope. As modern experimental research pipelines have increased in complexity, the amount of code needed to conduct an experiment has also increased. Such code contains lots of repetitive “boilerplate” and is error prone when replicated across many different individual experiments.

For example, consider the common scenario of using a cross-validated neural model to rerank documents from a baseline bag-of-words term-matching scoring function like BM25. This scenario requires tuning of both the baseline scoring function’s parameters (which can differ depending on the training fold) and a large number of neural hyperparameters, including both hyperparameters specific to the model (e.g., CNN filter sizes) and general neural hyperparameters whose optimal values can vary with the model (e.g., loss function, which pretrained embeddings to use, learning rate, batch size, iterations to train for, micro vs. macro sampling of queries, etc). Such choices vary with each individual model implementation, making it necessary for researchers to either re-implement the models in a common framework or to identify and resolve differences before the models can be fairly compared.

In this work, we present Capreolus, a toolkit designed to facilitate end-to-end IR experiments, particularly large-scale comparative studies, by providing PyTorch implementations of ten prominent neural retrieval models in a common framework. Capreolus tightly integrates with the Anserini IR toolkit [17] for initial candidate list generation. This approach enables fair comparisons between models by allowing the entire pipeline to be controlled—from indexing raw documents to producing rankings and cross-validated metrics—thus filling the gaps in existing neural pipelines.

Contributions. Our work makes the following contributions:
- the open-source Capreolus toolkit for neural ad hoc retrieval, which includes implementations of ten prominent neural retrieval models in a common framework with Anserini integration for candidate list generation;
- a reproduction of the Neural Hype paper by Yang et al. [18], supporting the authors’ finding that many neural retrieval models
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do not significantly outperform a strong query expansion baseline on the test collection from the TREC 2004 Robust Track (Robust04); and,
- a demonstration consisting of a Web interface, allowing users to interactively query a collection and compare results between retrieval models under different configurations.

2 CAPREOLUS FRAMEWORK

In this section we describe the architecture of Capreolus, which is organized around five modules: a collection, a searcher, an extractor, a reranker, and a benchmark. These modules are responsible for providing raw queries and documents (collection), tuning a first-stage ranking method and using it to provide a list of candidate documents (searcher), transforming the query and candidate documents into inputs suitable for a reranking model (extractor), reranking the candidate documents (reranker), and managing the data splits used in the previous steps to calculate cross-validated metrics (benchmark). In the following sections we describe Capreolus’ modules, training process, and Web interface in more detail.

2.1 Modules and Configuration

Capreolus consists of five main modules, which dictate the steps required to train and evaluate a neural reranking model. Figure 1 illustrates the data flow between modules. While many of the modules are of general utility, they are primarily intended to be used through a Python script that takes configuration options and runs all modules accordingly (this includes loading the desired collection, retrieving a first-stage ranking, training a neural model, and producing results on test queries).

Each module is associated with its own configuration options that may be provided on the command line or in a YAML file. Non-neural modules are deterministic given their inputs and configuration options, allowing Capreolus to cache and re-use intermediate outputs (e.g., tuned BM25 results). Below, we describe each module in greater detail.

Collection. A collection describes the location of raw documents, queries, and relevance judgments (qrels) on disk, as well as the information needed to process them (e.g., the documents’ format). This module exposes only one configuration option: the name of the collection to use, such as robust04 or gov2. New collections can be added to Capreolus by creating a YAML file containing the paths to the associated files and their formats.

Searcher. The searcher module is responsible for identifying the top k candidate documents for each query so that they may be reranked. Static and cross-validated searcher types are supported. A static searcher simply queries Anserini with fixed parameters to return the candidate documents (e.g., BM25 with $k_1 = 0.9$ and $b = 0.4$), whereas a cross-validated searcher uses the validation set to tune a ranking method’s parameters before using these parameters to return the candidate documents. Candidates obtained with either searcher type are cached. Capreolus provides several searcher modules that the user may choose from, including static and tuned variants of BM25 and RM3. Users may additionally configure the associated preprocessing, such as whether stemming and stopword removal are applied. While all existing searcher modules are powered by Anserini, the backend is designed to be interchangeable and searcher modules for other search engines could be developed without substantial effort.

Extractor. The extractor module is responsible for transforming candidate documents (and the associated queries) into representations suitable for the selected neural model. Each reranking model specifies the extractor that it requires, because extractors may be closely tied to the neural model (e.g., input to DeepTileBars requires segment tokenization). Reranking models that consume similarity matrices are coupled with the general EmbedText extractor, which tokenizes the input text and then provides two inputs: a query-document similarity matrix constructed using embeddings and the IDF of each query term. Configuration options are specific to the extractor selected, but include choices like the type of embeddings to use and whether stopwords should be removed.

Reranker. The reranker module is responsible for reranking the candidate documents. Capreolus provides implementations of ten neural reranking models for ad hoc retrieval. The rerankers available include representation-focused models (DSSM [6], CDSSM [13]), interaction-focused models (DRMM [4], KNRM [16], PACRR [7], ConvKNRM [2], POSITDRMM [12]), hybrid models (DUET [11]), and hierarchical models (HiNT [3] and DeepTileBars [15]). Each reranker is associated with model-specific configuration options.
As a demonstration of Capreolus, we conduct experiments reproduc-
ing a recent finding: Yang et al. [18] showed that many neural IR models cannot beat a well-tuned query expansion baseline in the "low data" scenario on Robust04. We replicate the experimental setup used in the paper, confirming their findings and presenting results on five additional models provided by Capreolus.

### 3 EXPERIMENTS

As a demonstration of Capreolus, we conduct experiments reproducing a recent finding: Yang et al. [18] showed that many neural IR models cannot beat a well-tuned query expansion baseline in the "low data" scenario on Robust04. We replicate the experimental setup used in the paper, confirming their findings and presenting results on five additional models provided by Capreolus.

#### 3.1 Experimental Setup

Following Yang et al. [18], we conduct experiments on the TREC Robust04 collection, and use BM25 with RM3 (tuned) to retrieve 1000 candidate documents to rerank for each query. As in the original work, we use 5-fold cross-validation with three folds for training, one for validation, and the remaining fold for evaluation. We report Mean Average Precision (MAP), P@20, and nDCG@20.

For the neural rerankers, which require input of a fixed size, we remove stopwords, set the maximum query length to 4 tokens, and set the maximum document length to 800 tokens. For the rerankers that use term embeddings, we employ GloVe 6B embeddings with 300 dimensions and freeze the embedding layer. Unless otherwise mentioned, each reranking model is trained using the Adam optimizer [8] with a learning rate of $10^{-3}$ for 50 iterations of 4,096 training instances using a batch size of 32. We use hinge loss with a margin of 1.0. The model-specific hyperparameters are as follows:

- **CDSSM**: We reduce the model’s size by using only 1 filter in the CNN. Both the kernel size and feed forward layer’s size were set to 30. To improve effectiveness, we replace the character-trigram inputs with term embeddings and set the window size to 4.
- **ConvKNRM**: We use 300 filters in the convolution layers and the same kernel functions as in the original paper, but treat $\mu_k$ and $\sigma_k$ as trainable parameters.
- **DeepTileBars**: For the TextTiling algorithm, the passage length and window size were set to 30 and 6, respectively. For the model, we set $l = 7$, the number of CNN filters to 3, the LSTM size to 3, and used MLPs of size 32 and 16.
- **DRMM**: We use LogCount-based Histograms (LCH) and weight query terms with their IDF. The numbers of histogram bins and hidden nodes were set to 29 and 5, respectively.
- **DSSM**: We use one CNN layer with 56 filters to reduce overfitting. As in the original work, input is provided as character-trigrams.
- **DUET**: We used 10 filters with both the local and distributed model, with hidden dimensions set to 30 and 699, respectively.
- **HiNT**: We set the global decision layer’s LSTM size to 6, $k = 10$, the learning rate to 0.005, and the batch size to 128.
- **KNRM**: We use the same kernel functions as the original paper, but treat $\mu_k$ and $\sigma_k$ as trainable parameters.
- **PACRR**: We use 32 CNN filters and set $k = 2$ with $k$-max pooling.
- **POSTDRMM**: We implemented the multi-view POSTDRMM variant. This includes the features described in the original paper, except that we use BM25+RM3 in place of the BM25 score.

Following the original paper, we report interpolated results in order to examine the additivity of each neural model when combined with a non-neural ranking method (i.e., BM25+RM3). To do so, we use the interpolation formula:

$$\text{score} = \alpha \cdot \text{score}_{\text{Neural}} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \text{score}_{\text{RM3}}$$

where the parameter $\alpha$ is tuned on the validation set. We additionally report results without interpolation for comparison.

#### 3.2 Results

The results are shown in Table 1. The left half of the table presents results interpolated with the relevance score produced by BM25+RM3, which corresponds to the setup in Yang et al.’s original work, while the right half presents results without interpolation. We put these results in context by displaying additional results from the BERT-based Birch [20] (3S variant) and CEDR (KNRM variant) [9] neural

---

1Due to their much higher computational requirements, we leave results using BERT-based rerankers for future work.

2The folds used by Yang et al. are available at https://github.com/castorini/anserini/blob/master/src/main/resources/fine_tuning/robust04-paper2-folds.json.
Table 1: Results on the Robust04 dataset. The symbol * indicates significant difference (p < 0.05) based on a paired t-test between the reranker and baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>MAP</th>
<th>P@20</th>
<th>nDCG</th>
<th>MAP</th>
<th>P@20</th>
<th>nDCG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM25+RM3</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpolation</th>
<th>No Interpolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITDRMM</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.396 0.449 0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACRR</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.402 0.457 0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRMM</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.397 0.454 0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNRM</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.399 0.456 0.248*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConvKNRM</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.396 0.455 0.184*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeepTileBars</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.391 0.450 0.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiNT</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.402 0.459 0.176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUET</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.395 0.451 0.132*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSM</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.394 0.451 0.067*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSSM</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.397 0.449 0.081*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

too small, with only 250 queries (though it contains over 300,000 judged query–documents pairs). Many of the models implemented in Caperoleus have a large number of learnable parameters (e.g., POSITDRMM with 3.6 million); it is perhaps no coincidence that DRMM and KNRM, with only 149 parameters and 34 parameters, respectively, perform slightly better with interpolation. However, recent experiments with BERT-based rerankers [1, 9, 19] show impressive improvements on Robust04, even with limited data. These models, however, benefit from massive pretraining (albeit without relevance judgements). Untangling these various effects to gain a better understanding of “pre-BERT” and “post-BERT” neural models represents future work that we are currently pursuing.
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