

Conformal Ranked Retrieval

Yunpeng Xu¹, Wenge Guo^{*2}, and Zhi Wei¹

¹Department of Computer Science, New Jersey Institute of Technology

²Department of Mathematical Sciences, New Jersey Institute of Technology

April 30, 2024

Abstract

Given the wide adoption of ranked retrieval techniques in various information systems that significantly impact our daily lives, there is an increasing need to assess and address the uncertainty inherent in their predictions. This paper introduces a novel method using the conformal risk control framework to quantitatively measure and manage risks in the context of ranked retrieval problems. Our research focuses on a typical two-stage ranked retrieval problem, where the retrieval stage generates candidates for subsequent ranking. By carefully formulating the conformal risk for each stage, we have developed algorithms to effectively control these risks within their specified bounds. The efficacy of our proposed methods has been demonstrated through comprehensive experiments on three large-scale public datasets for ranked retrieval tasks, including the MSLR-WEB dataset, the Yahoo LTRC dataset and the MS MARCO dataset.

1 Introduction

Ranked retrieval refers to the process of retrieving and ranking documents from a document repository based on their relevance to a user’s query. As the core component in Information Retrieval (IR) systems, its goal is to present the most relevant documents at the top of the search results list, making it easier for users to find the information they seek (Baeza-Yates and Ribeiro-Neto, 1999). Over the years, ranked retrieval techniques have been successfully applied to many real-life problems, including web search engines, recommendation systems, and question-and-answer platforms, significantly impacting our daily lives.

While ranked retrieval algorithms have been extensively studied in both academia and industry, considering the uncertainty in their predictions is a relatively new challenge. As we increasingly rely on search engines for answers to a wide variety of questions, it becomes crucial to evaluate the reliability of these retrieved answers. Therefore, it is important to quantify the uncertainty of the results, determining whether they encompass all the desired documents and whether these documents are ranked in a reasonable order.

The challenges, however, lie in measuring uncertainty for ranked retrieval algorithms and developing methodologies to control this uncertainty. This is particularly challenging due to the complexity of ranked retrieval systems, which typically consist of multiple stages, each with different optimization goals. An error in one stage can cascade to subsequent stages, compounding the difficulty of accurately assessing and controlling uncertainty.

*Author e-mail addresses: yx8@njit.edu, wenge.guo@njit.edu, zhi.wei@njit.edu

Recently, conformal prediction has received significant attention in the machine learning field (Angelopoulos and Bates, 2021), offering a new perspective on addressing uncertainty. This method measures the uncertainty of an inference result by constructing a prediction set with a variable size to ensure that a specific coverage requirement is met. Furthermore, the newly developed conformal risk control framework extends the traditional concept of coverage to a more flexible definition, making it more adaptable to a broad spectrum of problems (Angelopoulos et al., 2024).

In this paper, we propose a conformal prediction method for ranked retrieval problems by utilizing the conformal risk control framework as our approach to quantify and control the uncertainty of these problems. Specifically, for the two distinct stages of the problem, we define the *retrieval risk* and the *ranking risk*, respectively, and then apply the conformal risk control method to derive their corresponding prediction sets. This method does not rely on assumptions about the underlying ranking model and can easily be integrated into an existing ranked retrieval system.

Our major contributions are as follows:

- We properly formulated the uncertainty measurement for a typical two-stage ranked retrieval problem by utilizing the conformal risk control framework.
- We developed algorithms to control the risk of both stages within guaranteed risk bounds, which is adaptable to similar multi-stage risk control problems.
- We thoroughly tested our proposed method on three datasets for real-life ranked retrieval tasks and demonstrated the validity of the method.

1.1 Related Work

Ranked retrieval problems have been extensively studied over the past few decades, with a broad spectrum of ranking models introduced, ranging from conventional Information Retrieval (IR) models like BM25 (Baeza-Yates and Ribeiro-Neto, 1999; Stephen and K., 1976) to modern learning-to-rank algorithms (Liu, 2009). Recently, as deep learning has led to breakthroughs in various machine learning problems, it has also been successfully adopted in the field of ranked retrieval (Severyn and Moschitti, 2015; Guo et al., 2016). Depending on how the loss functions are defined, these methods can generally be categorized into three types: pointwise algorithms (Crammer and Singer, 2001; Chu and Ghahramani, 2005), pairwise algorithms (Burges et al., 2005; Freund et al., 2003), and listwise algorithms (Burges et al.; Cao et al., 2007).

Conformal prediction, initially developed by Vladimir Vovk, has become a foundational technique in statistical learning (Vovk et al., 1999, 2005). Angelopoulos and Bates provide a comprehensive survey of this field, highlighting its significance and applications (Angelopoulos and Bates, 2021). Our research aligns with the category of split conformal prediction (Papadopoulos et al., 2002; Lei et al., 2015), specifically relating to the recently developed conformal risk control framework (Angelopoulos et al., 2024). This framework expands upon traditional conformal prediction by extending coverage measurement to encompass a broader risk measurement setting, offering a more generalized approach to assessing prediction reliability.

Our work bears some resemblance to the approach described by Angelopoulos et al. (2023), which employs the Learn-then-Test technique (Angelopoulos et al., 2021) to control the false discovery rate in recommendation systems and optimize for recommendation diversity. However, despite these similarities, our work and Angelopoulos’s are distinct in both their objectives and methodologies.

2 Problem Formulation

We investigate a two-stage ranked retrieval problem comprising a retrieval stage (referred to as candidate generation or $L1$) and a ranking stage (referred to as $L2$). This setup is common in many real ranked retrieval systems, where the volume of documents is too large to be processed by a single ranking model, especially if it is resource-intensive. Therefore, a two-stage or even multi-stage process is devised (Yin and et al, 2016; Khattab et al., 2020).

Specifically, for a given query q and a document repository \mathcal{D} , in the retrieval stage, we fetch a set of candidate documents $\hat{D} \subset \mathcal{D}$. Subsequently, in the ranking stage, we rank these documents in descending order based on their relevance to the query q . The primary objective is to ensure that the most relevant documents to q are retrieved and ranked at high positions in the results.

Each stage is associated with a model learned on the training data for all queries. For clarity, we denote the retrieval model as f and the ranking model as g . Also, we use superscripts for queries and subscripts for documents related to a query. The models generate a score for each document and query pair (q, d) , i.e., $f, g : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where the input is a feature vector $x_d^q \in \mathcal{X}$ extracted from (q, d) , and the output is a predicted relevance score for d w.r.t q . The model’s form, however, is not assumed: it could range from a simple Okapi BM25 model counting query term occurrences to a more complex large language model producing embeddings for EBR. Typically, the model in the retrieval stage is more efficient but less powerful than the one in the ranking stage, thus achieving a balance between efficiency and effectiveness.

For each document $d \in \mathcal{D}$, we assume it is associated with a ground truth relevance score $y_d^q \in \{0, 1, \dots, L\}$ w.r.t the query q , where a higher value of y_d^q indicates a higher relevance of d to q . This score is only observable for the training data and is hidden for the test data. For a given query, the relevance scores on all documents induce a partial ordering on these documents, where documents with the same score are interchangeable for their ranking positions. Additionally, in the context of conformal prediction, we assume there is a calibration dataset $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ drawn exchangeably from the same unknown distribution P_{XY} .

To measure the quality of the inference results, we define a certain loss function $L(\hat{D}, D)$ for each stage between the prediction document set \hat{D} and the ground truth document set D . The choice of the loss function depends on the goal of the stage. For the retrieval stage, we measure the coverage of ground truth set D by the retrieved set \hat{D} , while for the ranking stage, we measure the difference in ranking order between these two sets.

Our goal in this work is to determine the prediction set \hat{D} of each stage such that the expected retrieval and ranking losses for a new query can be controlled by a specified threshold, i.e., $E_q[L(\hat{D}, D)] \leq \alpha$, where the expectation is taken over all new queries. The prediction set size $|\hat{D}|$, on the other hand, serves as a metric to quantify the uncertainty of the retrieval or ranking results, with a large set size indicating high uncertainty of the inference and vice versa.

In the following sections, we start with the retrieval risk control for the retrieval stage. Subsequently, we show that to satisfy a ranking risk bound requirement, both retrieval and ranking risks need to be satisfied. Furthermore, if multiple solutions are feasible, we use a minimum combined prediction size as a criterion to select an optimal solution.

3 Conformal Retrieval Control

3.1 Retrieval Risk

Let D be the actual set of relevant documents w.r.t the query q , i.e., the set of documents with the required ground truth relevance level. Let \hat{D} be the set of documents fetched by the model. Since the retrieved documents are ranked by their model score f in descending order, \hat{D} can be uniquely determined if a certain threshold for the retrieved document set size is decided.

The coverage of relevant documents can be defined as:

$$\text{Coverage}(\hat{D}, D) = \frac{1}{|D|} \sum_{d \in \hat{D}} \mathbf{1}(d \in D), \quad (1)$$

where $|D|$ is the size of the set D . Correspondingly, we may define a miscoverage loss function L_1 as:

$$L_1(\hat{D}, D) = 1 - \frac{1}{|D|} \sum_{d \in \hat{D}} \mathbf{1}(d \in D). \quad (2)$$

The goal is to control this risk so that

$$E[L_1(\hat{D}, D)] \leq \alpha \quad (3)$$

where α is a predefined threshold for the risk level, and the expectation is taken over all possible new queries.

Remark 1. There is a significant difference between our method and the traditional conformal prediction method. The traditional method calculates the coverage or the risk between the ground truth label and a prediction set, while in our case, the risk is calculated between two sets of documents. However, when $|D| = 1$, our method reduces to the traditional conformal prediction method.

Remark 2. In the paper (Angelopoulos et al., 2023), the risk function is defined as $L(\hat{D}, D) = 1 - \frac{1}{|\hat{D}|} \sum_{d \in \hat{D}} \mathbf{1}(d \in D)$, where the denominator is the size of the prediction set. Its purpose is to control the false discovery rate (FDR) of the predicted documents, while in our paper, we aim to control the false negative rate (FNR) of the most relevant documents.

3.2 Risk Control

In the context of conformal prediction, to control the retrieval risk, we need to firstly construct a sequence of prediction sets indexed by a threshold parameter $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then determine the appropriate value $\hat{\lambda}$ of λ so that the risk is controlled at the desired level. For this purpose, we define the retrieved document set \hat{D}_λ for the retrieval stage as:

$$\hat{D}_\lambda = \{d : u(x_d^q) \geq \lambda\}, \quad (4)$$

where $u(x_d^q)$ is the conformal score of x_d^q calculated from the model score $f(x_d^q)$, denoted as u and f_x for brevity. As a special case, we may set $u = f_x$ if $f_x \in [0, 1]$. Alternatively we may set $u = \frac{\exp\{f_x\}-1}{\exp\{f_x\}+1}$. This way, we can ensure $u \in [0, 1]$ and is monotonic with respect to f_x .

Accordingly, the retrieval risk $L_1(\hat{D}_\lambda, D)$ is a function of λ , denoted by $L_1(\lambda)$, where a higher value of λ yields a smaller retrieval set \hat{D} and therefore a larger retrieval risk.

Let $L_1^{(i)}(\lambda)$ be the retrieval loss calculated by equation (2) for the i^{th} query, n be the total number of queries in the validation set. For any specified risk bound α , we define the value $\hat{\lambda}$ as below:

$$\hat{\lambda} = \inf\{\lambda : \sum_{i=1}^n L_1^{(i)}(\lambda) \leq (n+1)\alpha - 1\}. \quad (5)$$

Suppose $L_1(\lambda)$ is right-continuous, then by verifying the conditions in Theorem 1 in (Angelopoulos et al., 2024), we can see that if the retrieval set is constructed using the threshold $\hat{\lambda}$, then the expected retrieval risk for a new query is controlled by α . The algorithm that determines the operating threshold $\hat{\lambda}$ is presented by Algorithm 1. Essentially, it employs a binary search to determine the value of λ that satisfies equation (5).

Input: $\{(x = (q^i, D^i), y^i)\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, where $D^i = \{d_1^i, \dots, d_{n_i}^i\}$, with each d_j^i has an associated conformal score u_j^i , $y^i = \{y_1^i, \dots, y_{n_i}^i\}$, α

Output: $\hat{\lambda}$

Parameters: precision δ

```

while  $\Delta(\lambda_t) > \delta$  do
     $L_1(\lambda_t) \leftarrow 0$ 
    for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
         $\hat{D}^i = \{d_j^i : u_j^i \geq \lambda_t\}$ 
         $D^i = \{d_j^i : y_j^i \geq 1\}$ 
         $L_1(\lambda_t) \leftarrow L_1(\lambda_t) + L_1^{(i)}(\hat{D}^i, D^i)$ 
    end
    Adjust  $\lambda_t$  based on  $L_1(\lambda_t)$  and  $(n+1)\alpha - 1$ 
end
return  $\hat{\lambda} = \lambda_t$ 

```

Algorithm 1: Determine $\hat{\lambda}$ for a given α

4 Conformal Ranking Control

4.1 Ranking Risk

For the ranking stage, our focus is on the ranking quality of documents with a ground truth relevance level l or above, denoted by D_l , where $D_l = \{d \in D : y_d \geq l\}$. Here, $l \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ is pre-selected for specific problems. We treat documents in D_l interchangeably for their ranking positions. Let \hat{D}_l be the prediction set of D_l obtained by applying the ranking model g . As the documents are ranked by their model score g in descending order, \hat{D}_l can be uniquely determined if a certain threshold of the prediction size is decided.

To measure the ranking quality, we use the popular ranking metric nDCG (Järvelin and Kekäläinen, 2000), though other metrics may be considered. Specifically, the Discounted Cumulative Gain (DCG) is defined as:

$$DCG(\hat{D}_l, D_l) = \sum_{d_{(j)} \in \hat{D}_l} \frac{\mathbf{1}(d_{(j)} \in D_l)}{\log(j+1)} \quad (6)$$

where $d_{(j)}$ is the document ranked at the j^{th} position in \hat{D}_l . Notably, when \hat{D}_l equals the whole retrieved document set \hat{D} , DCG attains its maximum value.

The Ideal Discounted Cumulative Gain (iDCG) value on this query is given by:

$$iDCG(D_l) = \sum_{j=1}^{|D_l|} \frac{1}{\log(j+1)}, \quad (7)$$

where $|D_l|$ is the size of D_l . Note that this value is only achievable in a perfect retrieval scenario where all relevant documents for relevance level l and above are retrieved.

Therefore, nDCG is defined as follows:

$$nDCG(\hat{D}_l, D_l) = \frac{DCG(\hat{D}_l, D_l)}{iDCG(D_l)} = \frac{\sum_{d_{(j)} \in \hat{D}_l} \frac{\mathbf{1}(d_{(j)} \in D_l)}{\log(j+1)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{|\hat{D}_l|} \frac{1}{\log(j+1)}} \quad (8)$$

It is easy to verify that $nDCG(\hat{D}, D) \in [0, 1]$. Correspondingly, the loss function is defined as:

$$L_2(\hat{D}_l, D_l) = 1 - nDCG(\hat{D}_l, D_l) \quad (9)$$

To control the ranking risk, we need to determine the prediction set for documents with a relevance level at or above l , while satisfying a required loss of nDCG:

$$E[L_2(\hat{D}_l, D_l)] \leq \beta \quad (10)$$

where $\beta \in [0, 1]$ is a predefined threshold for the risk level, and the expectation is taken over all possible new queries.

4.2 Risk Control

To control ranking risk, we construct a sequence of prediction sets \hat{D}_{l, ϕ_l} indexed by a threshold parameter ϕ_l , i.e.,

$$\hat{D}_{l, \phi_l} = \{d \in \hat{D} : v(x_d^q) \geq \phi_l\}, \quad (11)$$

where $v(x_d^q)$ is the conformal scores of x_d^q , defined from the ranking model score $g(x_d^q)$ in a similar way as in the retrieval stage.

Similar to the retrieval stage, the ranking risk $L_2(\hat{D}_{l, \phi_l}, D_l)$ is a function of ϕ_l , denoted by $L_2(\phi_l)$, where a higher value of ϕ_l yields a smaller prediction set \hat{D}_l and, therefore, a larger ranking risk.

Let $L_2^{(i)}(\phi_l)$ be the ranking loss calculated by equation (9) for the i^{th} query. Correspondingly, we define the value $\hat{\phi}_l$ for any desired risk bound β as below:

$$\hat{\phi}_l = \inf\{\phi_l : \sum_{i=1}^n L_2^{(i)}(\phi_l) \leq (n+1)\beta - 1\}. \quad (12)$$

The value of $\hat{\phi}_l$ can be calculated through a similar process as Algorithm (1).

On the other hand, however, adjusting ϕ_l alone may not deliver a controlled ranking risk, as the risk also depends on the quality of the retrieval results. In an extreme case where no relevant document is fetched by the retrieval stage, the ranking loss will be 1, regardless of the chosen ϕ_l value. Therefore, the ranking risk should be a function of both λ and ϕ_l , denoted by $L_2(\lambda, \phi_l)$. To control the ranking risk, we need to find the right values for both λ and ϕ_l .

Furthermore, if there exist multiple choices of (λ, ϕ_l) for a controlled risk, from a practical perspective, we prefer a solution that produces a smaller combined prediction set:

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\phi}_l) &= \arg \min_{(\lambda, \phi_l)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{D}^{(i)}| + \rho |\hat{D}_l^{(i)}| \right\}, \\ \text{s.t. } & E[L_2(\lambda, \phi_l)] \leq \beta \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where ρ is a weight parameter to balance the importance between the two stages.

It is evident that the minimal ranking risk for a retrieved document set \hat{D} is given by $L_2^*(\hat{D}_l, D_l) = 1 - \frac{\sum_{d(j) \in \hat{D}} \frac{\mathbf{1}(d(j) \in D_l)}{\log(j+1)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{|\hat{D}_l|} \frac{1}{\log(j+1)}}$. The minimum value is attained when $\hat{D}_l = \hat{D}$. If $E[L_2^*(\hat{D}, D_l)] > \beta$, then the ranking risk cannot be controlled. With this insight, we need to first determine the value of λ such that $E[L_2^*(\hat{D}_l, D_l)] = \beta$, as the maximal feasible value for λ , denoted as λ^* . Subsequently, a linear search is conducted to find the combination of (λ, ϕ_l) that produces optimal prediction sizes. Suppose $L_2(\lambda)$ is right-continuous, then by verifying the conditions for the Theorem 1 in (Angelopoulos et al., 2024), we see that the constructed prediction set for a new query has an expected ranking risk controlled by β .

The algorithm to find the solution for equation (13) is presented in Algorithm 2.

Input: $\{(x = (q^i, D^i), y^i)\}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, where $D^i = \{d_1^i, \dots, d_{n_i}^i\}$, with each d_j^i has two associated conformal scores u_j^i and v_j^i , $y^i = \{y_1^i, \dots, y_{n_i}^i\}$, α, β, ρ

Output: $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\phi}_l)$

Parameters: precision δ , step size η

```

while  $\Delta\lambda_t > \delta$  do
     $L_2(\lambda_t, 0) \leftarrow 0$ 
    for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
         $\hat{D}^i = \{d_j^i : u_j^i \geq \lambda_t\}$ 
         $D_l^i = \{d_j^i : y_j^i \geq l\}$ 
         $L_2(\lambda_t, 0) \leftarrow L_2(\lambda_t, 0) + L_2^{(i)}(\hat{D}^i, D_l^i)$ 
    end
    Adjust  $\lambda_t$  based on  $L_2(\lambda_t, 0)$  and  $(n+1)\beta - 1$ 
end
 $S_{min} \leftarrow \infty$ 
while  $\lambda_t \geq 0$  do
    while  $\Delta\phi_{l,t} > \delta$  do
         $L_2(\lambda_t, \phi_{l,t}) \leftarrow 0, S \leftarrow 0$ 
        for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
             $\hat{D}^i = \{d_j^i : u_j^i \geq \lambda_t\}$ 
             $D_l^i = \{d_j^i : y_j^i \geq l\}$ 
             $\hat{D}_l^i = \{d_j^i \in \hat{D}^i : v_j^i \geq \phi_{l,t}\}$ 
             $S \leftarrow S + |\hat{D}^i| + \rho|\hat{D}_l^i|$ 
             $L_2(\lambda_t, \phi_{l,t}) \leftarrow L_2(\lambda_t, \phi_{l,t}) + L_2^{(i)}(\hat{D}_l^i, D_l^i)$ 
        end
        Adjust  $\phi_{l,t}$  per  $L_2(\lambda_t, \phi_{l,t})$  and  $(n+1)\beta - 1$ 
    end
    if  $S/n < S_{min}$  then
         $S_{min} \leftarrow S/n, \hat{\lambda} \leftarrow \lambda_t, \hat{\phi}_l \leftarrow \phi_{l,t}$ 
    end
     $\lambda_t \leftarrow \lambda_t - \eta$ 
end
return  $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\phi}_l)$ 

```

Algorithm 2: Determine $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\phi}_l)$ for given β

Remark 3. If there is also a risk control requirement for the retrieval stage, an additional constraint is

introduced to equation (13), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\phi}_l) &= \arg \min_{(\lambda, \phi_l)} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{D}^{(i)}| + \rho |\hat{D}_l^{(i)}| \right\}, \\
\text{s.t. } E[L_1(\lambda)] &\leq \alpha, \\
E[L_2(\lambda, \phi_l)] &\leq \beta
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

For implementation, the λ satisfying Equation (3) is first identified. It is then compared with the value of λ^* from Equation (13), and the smaller one is used as the maximal feasible value for λ to conduct the linear search, thereby further reducing the search space. Otherwise, the entire algorithm remains the same as Algorithm 1.

Remark 4. Even with the linear search, the algorithm is still fast to run, given that the calculation for the maximum feasible λ^* significantly reduces the search space. Furthermore, once the values of $(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\phi}_l)$ are determined on the validation set, the inference on the test set requires only constant time. This is because all needed is to compare u_j^i against $\hat{\lambda}$ to determine the retrieved documents, followed by a comparison of v_j^i against $\hat{\phi}_l$ to determine the final ranked documents.

5 Experiments and Results

We validate our methods on three widely-used public datasets for ranked retrieval tasks: the MSLR-WEB dataset (10K)¹ (Qin and Liu, 2013), the Yahoo LTRC dataset (Set 1)² (Chapelle and Chang, 2011) and the MS MARCO Question Answering dataset (V2.1)³ (Bajaj et al., 2016). Due to page limitations, we present results only for the MSLR-WEB dataset in this section and reserve the remaining two datasets for the appendix.

For all the tasks, models are trained on a hold out training set, where we didn’t particularly tune the model for an optimal ranking results, as it is not the primary focus of this work. Subsequently, we randomly split the remaining labeled data into validation and test sets using a 50-50 ratio. We repeat for 100 times and report the averaged results. Our code is accessible at https://github.com/git4review/conformal_ranked_retrieval.

5.1 MSLR-WEB dataset

The MSLR-WEB dataset, a large-scale Learning-to-Rank dataset released by Microsoft Research, is curated through a commercial web search engine (Microsoft Bing). It comprises 10K queries, each associated with an average of 120 documents. The dataset consists of 136-dimensional feature vectors extracted from query-url pairs, accompanied by human-assigned relevance judgment labels ranging from 0 (irrelevant) to 4 (perfectly relevant).

For the L1 model, i.e., the retrieval model, we train a 3-layer MLP, with 128 and 32 neurons in the hidden layers. For the L2 model, i.e., the ranking model, we utilize the LambdaRank model (Burges et al.) implemented by the open-source Pytorch package PT-Rank (Yu, 2020). This choices of the model emulates real search engine practices, where the retrieval stage employs a lightweight model for efficiency, while the ranking stage adopts a more sophisticated model for quality.

¹Available at www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/mslr

²Available at <https://research.yahoo.com/datasets>

³Available at <https://microsoft.github.io/msmarco/>

Table 1: Actual risk at different value of α on MSLR-WEB

α	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.20	0.30	0.40
risk	0.0496	0.0996	0.1495	0.1997	0.3001	0.3997

5.1.1 Retrieval Risk Control

To verify the risk control, we vary the value of α and evaluate the retrieval risk on the test set. The results are presented in Table 1, and the risk distribution histogram for selected α are depicted in Figure 7. It is evident that the risks are well controlled within a narrow range of the target values. We also provide the average prediction set sizes (i.e., the size of the retrieved documents) for different α values in Figure 2. For comparison, we include results from two other retrieval models: one using the L2 model and the other employing a model that returns random scores. It shows that both L1 model (MLP) and L2 model (LambdaRank) yield smaller prediction sizes than the random model, indicating that they are more efficient in fetching relevant documents. Notably, LambdaRank demonstrates even better efficiency compared to L1, given its significant smaller prediction size. This offers an alternative approach for the retrieval model selection, supplementing traditional metrics such as recall at K .




Figure 1: Risk distributions at a fixed α on MSLR-WEB.

5.1.2 Ranking Risk Control

To verify the control of the ranking risk, we firstly fix the value of β , e.g., by setting $\beta = 0.3$. To better illustrate the impact by the choice of the retrieval risk threshold, we employ a linear search on α rather than on λ in the actual implementation, which is slight deviation from Algorithm 2. Specifically, we firstly calculate the maximal feasible α^* corresponding to the maximal feasible λ^* , then do a linear search for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha^*]$. For each α value, we calculate the corresponding λ and use it along with ϕ_l to assess the ranking risk. We also examine the impact of different choices for the relevance level l . Specifically, we compared the results between $l = 1$ and $l = 2$. We skipped the results for higher levels due to data sparsity on this dataset.

The results of the actual risk are depicted in Figure 3, revealing well-controlled ranking risks for both relevance levels $l = 1$ and $l = 2$ at the target risk level $\beta = 0.3$ across all α values. The retrieval risks for both levels align with the diagonal line $y = x$, indicating retrieval risks being controlled by their respective target α values, except for $\alpha < 0.05$ for $l = 2$. The miss of control at these two points is due to that 4.8% of queries in this dataset do not have documents with relevance level equal to or above 2, making retrieval of relevant documents impossible for these queries, regardless of the λ value used.

We also presented in Figure 4 the prediction sizes at different α values, encompassing the retrieval (L1) size, the ranking (L2) size and the combined set size, for both $l = 1$ and $l = 2$. It illustrates that as the α




Figure 2: Retrieval sizes at different values of α by using different retrieval models




Figure 3: Actual risks at different values of α while $\beta = 0.3$

value increases, the L1 size monotonically decreases, as expected. The L2 size, however, initially decreases due to the significant reduction in candidate sizes by the L1 stage, then increases at a certain point, due to it needing more documents to compensate for the candidates reduced by the L1 stage. The optimal size

of prediction for both stages occurs at a point close to the maximal feasible retrieval risk. Comparing the results for the two relevance levels, $l = 2$ produces a smaller prediction set than $l = 1$, since there are fewer documents for a higher relevance level.




Figure 4: Prediction sizes at different α while $\beta = 0.3$

Next, we explore the impact of different thresholds of the ranking risk. To achieve this, we vary the value for β and determine the actual risk that yields optimal prediction sizes. For simplicity and without losing generality, we chose $\rho = 1$ in 14 when calculating the combined prediction size, i.e., the goal is $\min\{|\hat{D}| + |\hat{D}_l|\}$. Figure 5 depicts the actual risk, while Figure 6 shows optimal prediction sizes, for both $l = 1$ and $l = 2$. As β increases, the actual L2 risks are well-controlled on the diagonal line, and the actual L1 risks monotonically increases, since a larger β permits a higher retrieval risk. The optimal prediction sets, on the other hand, decreases as β increases, with a higher relevance level producing a smaller optimal prediction set, as expected.

6 Conclusion & Discussion

By utilizing the conformal risk control framework, we developed a method to quantify and manage the prediction risk for a typical two-stage ranked retrieval problem. The method adjusts its prediction set sizes for different queries, while ensuring that retrieval and ranking risks remain within predefined bounds. Empirical results from real-world tasks underscore the effectiveness of the proposed method.

Several pertinent questions warrant further exploration. In our current research, we exclusively employed nDCG to measure ranking quality, given its prevalence in numerous practical ranked retrieval tasks. However, there exist various other ranking metrics, such as MAP (mean average precision) and MRR (mean reciprocal rank), among others. Some metrics may not adhere to the monotonic risk condition required for the application of our control algorithm. It would be interesting to explore how to define proper risk functions for those metrics, or to adapt the risk control framework so that it is applicable to more general risk functions. We




Figure 5: Actual risk level at different β values when the combined prediction size is optimal




Figure 6: Optimal prediction sizes at different values of β

intend to investigate these questions in our future work.

References

- A.N. Angelopoulos, K. Krauth, S. Bates, Y. Wang, and M.I. Jordan. Recommendation systems with distribution-free reliability guarantees. In *Symposium on Conformal and Probabilistic Prediction with Applications (COPA)*, 2023, 2023.
- Anastasios N. Angelopoulos and Stephen Bates. A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification. *arXiv:2107.07511*, 2021.
- Anastasios N. Angelopoulos, Stephen Bates, Emmanuel J. Candès, Michael I. Jordan, and Lihua Lei. Learn then test: Calibrating predictive algorithms to achieve risk control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01052*, 2021.
- Anastasios N Angelopoulos, Stephen Bates, Adam Fisch, Lihua Lei, and Tal Schuster. Conformal risk control. *ICLR*, 2024.
- R. Baeza-Yates and B. Ribeiro-Neto. *Modern Information Retrieval*. ACM Press / Addison-Wesley, 1999.
- Payal Bajaj, Daniel Campos, Nick Craswell, Li Deng, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong Liu, Rangan Majumder, Andrew McNamara, Bhaskar Mitra, Tri Nguyen, et al. MS MARCO: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09268*, 2016.
- C. J. Burges, T. Shaked, E. Renshaw, A. Lazier, M. Deeds, N. Hamilton, and G. Hullender. Learning to rank using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, 2005.
- Christopher J.C. Burges, Robert Ragno, and Quoc Viet Le. Learning to rank with nonsmooth cost functions. In *In Proceedings of NIPS conference*, 2006.
- Zhe Cao, Tao Qin, Tie-Yan Liu, Ming-Feng Tsai, and Hang Li. Learning to rank: From pairwise approach to listwise approach. In *MSR-TR-2007-40*, 2007.
- Olivier Chapelle and Yi Chang. Yahoo! learning to rank challenge overview. In *Proceedings of the Learning to Rank Challenge*, volume 14 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*. PMLR, 2011.
- W. Chu and Z. Ghahramani. Preference learning with gaussian processes. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, 2005.
- Koby Crammer and Yoram Singer. Pranking with ranking. In *In Proceedings of NIPS conference*, 2001.
- Y. Freund, R. Iyer, R. E. Schapire, and Y. Singer. An efficient boosting algorithm for combining preferences. In *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2003.
- Jiafeng Guo, Yixing Fan, Qingyao Ai, and W. Bruce Croft. A deep relevance matching model for ad-hoc retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 39th International ACM SIGIR conference*, 2016.
- Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. IR evaluation methods for retrieving highly relevant documents. *Proceedings of the 23rd international ACM SIGIR conference*, 2000.
- Omar Khattab, Mohammad Hammoud, and Tamer Elsayed. Finding the best of both worlds: Faster and more robust top-k document retrieval. *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference*, 2020.
- Jing Lei, Alessandro Rinaldo, and Larry Wasserman. A conformal prediction approach to explore functional data. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.

- Tie-Yan Liu. Learning to rank for information retrieval. *Proceedings of the 33rd international ACM SIGIR conference*, 2009.
- Harris Papadopoulos, Kostas Proedrou, Volodya Vovk, and Alex Gammerman. Inductive confidence machines for regression. In *ECML*, 2002.
- Tao Qin and Tie-Yan Liu. Introducing LETOR 4.0 datasets. *CoRR*, abs/1306.2597, 2013. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.2597>.
- Aliaksei Severyn and Alessandro Moschitti. Learning to rank short text pairs with convolutional deep neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference*, 2015.
- Robertson. Stephen and Jones. K., Sparck. Relevance weighting of search terms. *journal of the association for information science and technology*. 27(3):129-146. doi: 10.1002/ASI.4630270302, 1976.
- Vladimir Vovk, Alex Gammerman, and Craig Saunders. Machine-learning applications of algorithmic randomness. *Sixteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-1999)*, 1999.
- Vladimir Vovk, Alexander Gammerman, and Glenn Shafer. *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, volume 29. Springer, 2005.
- Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Xiaolong Huang, Binxing Jiao, Linjun Yang, Daxin Jiang, Rangan Majumder, and Furu Wei. Text embeddings by weakly-supervised contrastive pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03533*, 2022.
- Dawei Yin and et al. Ranking relevance in Yahoo search. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD Conference*, 2016.
- Hai-Tao Yu. PT-Ranking: A benchmarking platform for neural learning-to-rank, 2020.

Table 2: Actual retrieval risk at different value of α on MS MARCO

α	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.20	0.30	0.40
risk	0.0502	0.1018	0.1498	0.1997	0.2985	0.4020

A Additional experimental results

We present supplementary experimental results conducted on the MS MARCO dataset and the Yahoo LTRC dataset dataset.

A.1 MS MARCO Dataset

MS MARCO (MicroSoft MAchine Reading COmprehension) (Bajaj et al., 2016) is a collection of large-scale datasets focused on machine reading comprehension. For our experiment, we opted for the Question and Answering v2.1 task within this dataset. This dataset comprises approximately 100K queries and 1M passages, with each query has 10 candidate passages. The objective is to select the most relevant passage from the provided candidates to answer the corresponding query. Each passage is associated with a binary flag `is_selected`, where 1 denotes it is a good answer and 0 otherwise.

In the retrieval (L1) stage, we utilized Okapi BM25 (Stephen and K., 1976), which provides a TF-IDF like score function to measure the relevance between the query and the document. For the ranking (L2) stage, we use the e5-base model⁴(Wang et al., 2022) to encode both the query and the document into embedding vectors, which is more resource-intensive to deploy and run compared to a simple score function. Subsequently, we calculate the cosine similarity between the query embedding and the document embedding to obtain the relevance score for ranking the documents.

A.1.1 Retrieval Risk Control

We followed the same procedure as with the MSLR-WEB dataset to verify the effectiveness of risk control. Table 2 displays the actual retrieval risks for different α values, while Figure 13 depicts histograms of risk distribution for selected α values, showing the risks are well controlled within a narrow range of their target values.

Figure 8 illustrates the average retrieval prediction set sizes for different α values, by utilizing the L1 model, L2 model and a random score model for retrieval. It shows that e5-base is much more efficient in document retrieval compared to BM25, and both significantly outperform the random model.

A.1.2 Ranking Risk Control

Similar to the MSLR-WEB dataset, we set $\rho = 1$ when calculating the combined prediction sizes in 14. With $\beta = 0.3$ as a fixed parameter, Figure 9 and 10 depict the actual risk levels and corresponding prediction set sizes at different values of α . It is evident that the risks for both retrieval and ranking are effectively controlled at their target values. As α increases, the L1 size decreases while L2 size increases, reaching an optimal combined size when α is in proximity to the maximal feasible α^* .

Furthermore, we varied the β value and studied the optimal α and the optimal prediction size, as depicted in Figure 11 and 12. The figures demonstrate that with an increase in β , the optimal α also increases, while

⁴Available at <https://huggingface.co/intfloat/e5-base>.




Figure 7: Risk distributions at a fixed α on MSLR-WEB.




Figure 8: Retrieval prediction sizes at different values of α by using different retrieval models on MS MARCO

the optimal prediction sizes decrease as expected.

A.2 Yahoo LTRC dataset

Yahoo LTRC dataset (Chapelle and Chang, 2011) was released by Yahoo in 2011. This dataset has 709,877 query-document pairs, with each pair represented by a 700-dimensional feature vector normalized to the $[0, 1]$ range. Relevance levels range from 0 (least relevant) to 4 (most relevant). We employ a 3-Layer MLP for the retrieval stage and LambdaRank for the ranking stage, the same models as in the MSLR-WEB dataset due to their similar format. The experiment setup mirrors that of the other two datasets.

A.2.1 Retrieval Risk Control

The actual retrieval risks at different α values are detailed in Table 3, with histograms depicting the risk distribution for selected α values in Figure 13, demonstrating effective control within a narrow range of the targeted risk.




Figure 9: Actual risks at different values of α while $\beta = 0.3$ on MS MARCO




Figure 10: Prediction sizes at different values of α while $\beta = 0.3$ on MS MARCO

Figure 14 illustrates the average prediction sizes for different α values, by employing the L1 model, L2 model and a random score model for retrieval, showing the different retrieval efficiency by models with different capacities.




Figure 11: Actual risk level at different β values when the combined prediction size is optimal on MS MARCO




Figure 12: Optimal prediction sizes at different values of β on MS MARCO

Table 3: Actual retrieval risk at different value of α on Yahoo-LTRC

α	0.05	0.1	0.15	0.20	0.30	0.40
risk	0.0500	0.0999	0.1504	0.1994	0.2990	0.3987




Figure 13: Risk distributions at a fixed α on Yahoo LTRC.




Figure 14: Retrieval prediction sizes at different values of α by using different retrieval models on Yahoo LTRC

A.2.2 Ranking Risk Control

The actual risks for different α values and a fixed $\beta = 0.3$ are shown in Figure 15, for relevance levels of $l = 1$ and $l = 2$, which shows the risks of both stages are well controlled except the retrieval risk for $l = 2$ when $\alpha < 0.05$, due to the data sparsity issue. The corresponding prediction sizes are shown in Figure 16.

In Figure 17, we depict the actual risks for different β values when the combined prediction size is optimal for $l = 1$ and $l = 2$. The corresponding optimal prediction sizes are displayed in Figure 18 .




Figure 15: Actual risks at different values of α while $\beta = 0.3$ on Yahoo LTRC




Figure 16: Prediction sizes at different values of α while $\beta = 0.3$ on Yahoo LTRC




Figure 17: Actual risk level at different β values when the combined prediction size is optimal on Yahoo LTRC




Figure 18: Optimal prediction sizes at different values of β on Yahoo LTRC