

PROD: Progressive Distillation for Dense Retrieval*

Zhenghao Lin¹, Yeyun Gong^{2†}, Xiao Liu^{2*}, Hang Zhang^{2*}, Chen Lin^{1‡},
Anlei Dong³, Jian Jiao³, Jingwen Lu³, Daxin Jiang³, Rangan Majumder³, Nan Duan²

¹ Xiamen University, ² Microsoft Research, ³ Microsoft

{zhenghao, chenlin}@xiamen.edu.cn

{yegong, xiaoliu2, v-zhhang, nanduan}@microsoft.com

Abstract

Knowledge distillation is an effective way to transfer knowledge from a strong teacher to an efficient student model. Ideally, we expect the better the teacher is, the better the student. However, this expectation does not always come true. It is common that a better teacher model results in a bad student via distillation due to the nonnegligible gap between teacher and student. To bridge the gap, we propose **PROD**, a **PRO**gressive **D**istillation method, for dense retrieval. PROD consists of a *teacher progressive distillation* and a *data progressive distillation* to gradually improve the student. We conduct extensive experiments on five widely-used benchmarks, MS MARCO Passage, TREC Passage 19, TREC Document 19, MS MARCO Document and Natural Questions, where PROD achieves the state-of-the-art within the distillation methods for dense retrieval. The code and models will be released.

1 Introduction

In recent years, pre-trained models have made breakthroughs in various NLP tasks, including question answering (Devlin et al., 2018), summarization (Lewis et al., 2019; Qi et al., 2020), and dense retrieval (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2022). To further improve the performance of the various end tasks, more and more large models are proposed (Brown et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2022). As the model gets larger, the efficiency of model inference also decreases. However, in the practical scenarios of dense retrieval, online systems need to retrieve the relevant documents from a large number of candidates, answering the user queries in time. Therefore, an efficient small model is particularly critical in dense retrieval applications.

To take into account both performance and efficiency, knowledge distillation techniques have been widely used (Sanh et al., 2019; Jiao et al., 2019; Lu et al., 2022). In previous work, Zeng et al. (2022) proposed a curriculum learning method for dense retrieval distillation. Ren et al. (2021b) and Zhang et al. (2022) proposed the re-ranker as teacher method. Lin et al. (2021) proposed a in-batch negative distillation method with ColBERT (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020). Lu et al. (2022) proposed interaction distillation, cascade distillation, and dual regularization to bring the re-ranker with retriever. These methods demonstrate the importance of knowledge distillation in dense retrieval tasks from different perspectives. However, when the gap between student and teacher is very large, how to better close the gap has not been well studied. Both the experiments in the previous NLG task (Zhou et al., 2020) and our experiments in the dense retrieval task show that it is not the stronger the teacher, the stronger the distilled student.

In this paper, we propose a progressive distillation method, PROD, to minimize the gap between the teacher and the student. PROD consists of two progressive mechanisms: *teacher progressive distillation* (TPD) and *data progressive distillation* (DPD). In TPD, we gradually improve the capability of teachers, enabling student model to learn knowledge progressively. In DPD, we start by getting students to learn from all the data, and then gradually select samples that the student is confused about for strengthening. In each progressive step, we introduce regularization loss to avoid catastrophic forgetting of previous knowledge.

The motivation of PROD is from two aspects: 1) When the gap between teacher and student is huge, a stronger teacher is not necessarily better than a relatively weak teacher. Such as, the university professor may not be more suitable than a kindergarten teacher to teach a kindergarten student. Therefore, we design TPD to enhance teachers gradually. 2)

*Work in progress.

†Equal contribution.

‡Chen Lin is the corresponding author.

There are different knowledge suitable for the student model to learn at different stages, such as middle school textbooks are suitable for middle school students to learn. Thus, we design DPD to select the appropriate (not too easy or hard) knowledge for the student to learn.

We conduct extensive experiments on five widely-used benchmarks, MS MARCO Passage, TREC Passage 19, TREC Document 19, MS MARCO Document and Natural Questions. The results of extensive experiments on five popular benchmarks show the effectiveness of PROD.

2 Related Work

This work is related to two lines of work.

2.1 Dense Retrieval

Compared with sparse retrieval methods (Yang et al., 2017; Dai and Callan, 2019; Nogueira et al., 2019), dense retrieval has the potential to find more semantic correlations between queries and passages. Several directions have been explored to improve the performances of the popular dual encoder structure, including finding hard negatives with higher qualities (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Xiong et al., 2021; Qu et al., 2021), multi-vector interactions (Khattab and Zaharia, 2020), and the joint training of retrievers and re-rankers (Ren et al., 2021b; Zhang et al., 2022).

Meanwhile, another line of the work studied knowledge distillation for dense retrieval by using a single teacher model (Ren et al., 2021b), multiple teacher models with joint training techniques (Lu et al., 2022) and curriculum learning (Zeng et al., 2022). Our work is in line with these work, while having the key difference that we choose one teacher model with progressive ability level and focusing on the confusing data with progressive difficulty in each training stage.

2.2 Knowledge Distillation

The knowledge distillation (Hinton et al., 2015) has been widely studied in decades. There are a variety of off-the-shelf practical techniques, such as the response-based method (Kim et al., 2021), the feature-based method (Romero et al., 2015) and distilling the attention scores (Zagoruyko and Komodakis, 2017) with Kullback–Leibler divergence (KLD) or mean squared error (MSE). Recently, a rising group of work focuses on the relationships between the teacher model and the student model.

Some elaborate the knowledge transmission methods (Chen et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022), some introduce middle models (Mirzadeh et al., 2020), and there are also methods on distillation with multiple teachers (Wu et al., 2022). It can be noted that how to use a more reasonable teacher model to guide the learning of the student model has gradually become the current key direction.

3 Preliminary

3.1 Task Description

In this paper, we follow the basic definition of dense text retrieval (Karpukhin et al., 2020; Xiong et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022; Khattab and Zaharia, 2020). Assume we have a query set $\mathbb{Q} = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n\}$ containing n queries and a passage set $\mathbb{P} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m\}$, our target is to find the most relevant passages in corpus \mathbb{P} for each query q_i .

3.2 Dual Encoder

The currently popular architecture for dense retrieval is dual encoder (DE), which can encode queries and passages into dense vectors p and q , respectively, and calculate the similarity scores through the inner product as:

$$s_{de}(q, p) = E_Q(q)^T \cdot E_P(p) \quad (1)$$

where $E_Q(\cdot)$ and $E_P(\cdot)$ are the query encoder and the passage encoder, respectively. Based on the embedding vectors, existing solutions generally employ approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) search algorithms like faiss (Johnson et al., 2021).

3.3 Cross Encoder

In order to capture the fine-grained relationships between a pair of query and passage, the cross encoder (CE) is often used as the re-ranking model, rearranging the retriever outputs to improve the retrieval performances. In particular, the concatenation of a query q and a passage p are with the special token [SEP] is the input of CE. The similarity score is calculated by the [CLS] embedding vector of CE as:

$$s_{ce}(q, p) = w^T \cdot E_{ce}([q; p]) \quad (2)$$

where $E_{ce}(\cdot)$ is an encoder that can be initialized with any pre-trained language models, $[;]$ is concat operation, and w is the linear projector.




Figure 1: The framework of PROD.

3.4 Knowledge Distillation

Knowledge distillation is a simple yet effective approach to boost a small model (student model) with the additional knowledge from a big model (teacher model) (Hinton et al., 2015). In the task of dense retrieval, student model is usually trained with **hard labels** such as the relevance annotations for each query-passage pair using a contrastive loss. Additionally, it can also benefit from comparing with the prediction distribution of the teacher model, *aka* **soft labels**, by decreasing a measurement like KLD and MSE, indicating the differences between the prediction distributions (Ren et al., 2021b; Santhanam et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2022).

4 Method

We show the framework of the progressive distillation method, namely PROD, in Figure 1. The main idea of PROD is to gradually minimize the gap between a well-trained teacher model (24-layer CE) and the target student model (6-layer DE) by two sequential procedures, which are called *teacher progressive distillation* (TPD) and *data progressive distillation* (DPD).

4.1 Teacher Progressive Distillation

Previous work found that different data instances would have various difficulties for a particular family of models to learn (Swayamdipta et al., 2020; Ethayarajh et al., 2022). Similarly, we believe that the probability distributions of different teacher

models when selecting the relevant passages from a candidate pool are also different. Therefore, when facing the various difficulties of data instances in training, we use three different teacher models with different ability levels to civilize the student model gradually. More specifically, we employ three progressive teacher models, *i.e.*, a 12-layer DE, a 12-layer CE and a 24-layer CE, to boost a 6-layer DE student model¹ in order. Before learning from a teacher model, we retrieve the top- k negatives (Xiong et al., 2021) with the current student checkpoint, randomly sample a subset and train a teacher model using the mined hard negatives.

Distilling with a DE Teacher. We first use the original data to warm up the 12-layer teacher DE and the 6-layer student DE, and then use the isomorphic distillation, *i.e.*, 12-layer DE \rightarrow 6-layer DE. The loss function can be divided into two parts.

The first part is calculated by the output distribution of the student model and hard labels, which is called **hard loss**:

$$\mathcal{L}_h(\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-) = -\log \frac{\exp(s_{de}^S(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}^+))}{\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \{\mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-\}} \exp(s_{de}^S(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}))} \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{p}^+ and \mathbb{P}^- is the relevant passage and negative passage pool of \mathbf{q} , respectively; s_{de}^S is the similarity scores of the student model.

The other part measures the differences of the probability distributions between the teacher model

¹We use the notation “X \rightarrow Y” to denote the distillation stage of a teacher model X and a student model Y.

and the student model given the same batch of data, which is called **soft loss**:

$$\mathbf{d}_{de}^S = \frac{\exp(s_{de}^S(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-} \exp(s_{de}^S(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}'))} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_{de}^T = \frac{\exp(s_{de}^T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-} \exp(s_{de}^T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}'))} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{de \rightarrow de}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-) = D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{d}_{de}^T / \tau, \mathbf{d}_{de}^S / \tau) \quad (6)$$

where s_{de}^T is the similarity scores of the teacher model; τ is the temperature of distillation. At last, the final distillation loss with a DE teacher is a weighted sum of the before-mentioned two parts:

$$\mathcal{L}_I = \alpha_1 \mathcal{L}_h + \beta_1 \mathcal{L}_{de \rightarrow de} \quad (7)$$

where α_1 and β_1 controls the importance of hard loss and soft loss, respectively.

There are two important reasons why we use isomorphic distillation. (1) First, according to previous research on DE (Karpukhin et al., 2020), adding more hard negatives during training DE can not further improve the performances. Therefore, we think that simply training a DE is not suitable for difficult training instances. Meanwhile, the special in-batch negative techniques (Karpukhin et al., 2020) for DE allows it to assign more appropriate similarity scores for some easy negatives, which is more suitable for the first stage training of the student model. (2) Second, the performances of alone trained DE are limited. More specifically, when the student model distills to the later stage, it is difficult to quickly train a DE teacher model with better performance than the student model.

Distilling with CE Teachers. After learning with a 12-layer DE, we use two CEs as the teacher models. Since CE can capture the fine-grained correlations between a pair of query and passage, it is more suitable for training with difficult data. However, CE can not make an effective distinction between hard and easy negatives. Such probability distributions of CE teachers are somehow confusing and inconducive for the student model. Therefore, when deploying CE as the teacher model, we only use hard negatives in distillation.

In our preliminary study, we also find that it is critical to select a proper CE. Generally speaking, the CE with more parameters can give more accurate predictions, but the more accurate predictions may not benefit distillation (Mirzadeh et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2020). When the difficulties of training instances are not very conflating, the premature use

of CE will lead to the performance loss of student model. We think the main reason is that CE with high performances will output so confident results that the predicted probability distribution is often unfavorable to the student model. Therefore, we perform 12-layer CE \rightarrow 6-layer DE before 24-layer CE \rightarrow 6-layer DE.

To overcome the catastrophic forgetting in learning with multiple teachers, we additionally follow Li and Hoiem (2018) and Cao et al. (2020), using regularization to maintain the stability of training. We first save a frozen copy of the student model as S' and involve a **regularization loss** item \mathcal{L}_r in distilling the student model S :

$$\mathbf{d}_{de}^{S'} = \frac{\exp(s_{de}^{S'}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{p}' \in \{\mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-\}} \exp(s_{de}^{S'}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}'))} \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_r(\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-) = D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{d}_{de}^{S'} / \tau, \mathbf{d}_{de}^S / \tau) \quad (9)$$

where $s_{de}^{S'}$ is calculated by the copied student S' .

The overall loss function consists of three parts: the hard loss in equation (3), the soft loss that adopts the relevant scores s_{ce}^T calculated by the CE teacher model, and the regularization loss \mathcal{L}_r . Finally, the loss function with a CE teacher is like:

$$\mathbf{d}_{ce}^T = \frac{\exp(s_{ce}^T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}))}{\sum_{\mathbf{p}' \in \{\mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-\}} \exp(s_{ce}^T(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}'))} \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{ce \rightarrow de}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbb{P}^+, \mathbb{P}^-) = D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbf{d}_{ce}^T / \tau, \mathbf{d}_{de}^S / \tau) \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{II} = \alpha_2 \mathcal{L}_h + \beta_2 \mathcal{L}_{ce \rightarrow de} + \gamma \mathcal{L}_r \quad (12)$$

where α_2 , β_2 and γ control the relative importance.

4.2 Data Progressive Distillation

After learning from the progressively stronger teachers, the student model will be improved with knowledge distillation. But there are still many confusing negative passages that leads to the disagreement of the teacher model and the student model, limiting the performance of the student model. Therefore, we aim to fill the performance gap between the 24-layer CE teacher and the student model from the perspective of training data.

Intuitively, the data difficulty needs to be progressively raised to fit the capacity of the teacher, enhancing the student model in a clearer direction. Therefore, our solution is to adopt an iterative data selection procedure. Starting with the last 24-layer CE teacher, let us say there are N iterations, the steps are as follow in each iteration. (1) First, retrieve the top- k negatives with the current student

Dataset	Train	Dev	Test	#Doc
MS-PAS	502,939	6,980	-	8,841,823
TREC-PAS-19	-	-	200	8,841,823
MS-DOC	367,013	5,193	-	3,213,835
TREC-DOC-19	-	-	200	3,213,835
NQ	58,880	8,757	3,610	21,015,324

Table 1: Statistics of the text retrieval datasets.

and randomly sample a subset. (2) Next, extract the positive passage that the teacher model can predict as top-1 but the student model can only predict as top- k' for each query. (3) At last, after continue training the 24-layer CE teacher, use the subset training data and the newly-retrieved top- k negatives to distil with the teacher and the loss function in equation (12).

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setting

We conduct experiments on several text retrieval datasets: MS MARCO Passage Ranking (MS-PAS) (Nguyen et al., 2016), TREC 2019 Deep Learning Track (TREC-PAS-19, TREC-DOC-19) (Craswell et al., 2020), MS MARCO Document Ranking (MS-DOC) (Nguyen et al., 2016), and Natural Questions (NQ) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019). The statistics are shown in Table 1. For MS-PAS, We follow the existing work (Ren et al., 2021b; Zhan et al., 2021), reporting **MRR@10**, **R@50** and **R@1k** on the dev set. For TREC-PAS-19, we select **nDCG@10** and **MAP@1k** as the evaluation metrics. For MS-DOC, we report **MRR@10** and **R@100** on the dev set. For TREC-DOC-19, we select **nDCG@10** and **R@100** as the evaluation metrics. For NQ, we choose **R@5**, **R@20** and **R@100** as the evaluation metrics.

5.2 Baselines

We compare PROD with two groups of widely-used baselines. The first group represents sparse retrieval methods and state-of-the-art dense retrieval methods without knowledge distillation or multiple vectors, including BM25 (Yang et al., 2017), DeepCT (Dai and Callan, 2019), docT5query (Nogueira et al., 2019), SPARTA (Zhao et al., 2021), GAR (Mao et al., 2021), DPR (Karpukhin et al., 2020), ANCE (Xiong et al., 2021), RDR (Yang and Seo, 2020), Joint Top- k (Sachan et al., 2021), DPR-PAQ (Oguz et al., 2022), Individual Top- k (Sachan et al., 2021), STAR (Zhan et al., 2021), and ADORE (Zhan et al., 2021).

The second group is about dense retrieval methods producing single vector for each document and query enhanced by knowledge distillation, including Margin-MSE (Hofstätter et al., 2020), TCT-ColBERT (Lin et al., 2020), TAS-B (Hofstätter et al., 2021), SPLADE v2 (Formal et al., 2021), RocketQA v1 (Qu et al., 2021), RocketQA v2 (Ren et al., 2021b), PAIR (Ren et al., 2021a), and CL-DRD (Zeng et al., 2022).

5.3 Implementation Details

Model Initialization. Following the settings of AR2 (Zhang et al., 2022) and RocketQA v2 (Ren et al., 2021b), both the 12-layer DE and the 12-layer CE use ERNIE-2.0-BASE as the encoders. Besides, the 24-layer CE uses ERNIE-2.0-LARGE as the encoder. Please note that a well-pretrained checkpoint is not required for the student. Therefore, we adopt the first six layers of ERNIE-2.0-BASE as the 6-layer DE student for simplicity.

Distillation Warming Up. Before TPD, we need to warm up the first teacher. We use random or BM25 negatives to train a 12-layer DE, retrieving the top- k negatives with it and retraining a 12-layer DE with the mined negatives as the first teacher. Specially, while retrieving the top- k negatives for NQ, we additionally filter positive passages by matching the passages and answers.

Hyper-parameter Setting. For mining the hard negatives, we choose $k = 100$. In DPD, we set $k' = 15$ and the iteration number $N = 1$. Detailed hyper-parameters for reproducing our experiments are listed in Appendix A.

5.4 Main Results

The results comparing PROD with the baselines on MS-PAS, TREC-PAS-19, TREC-DOC-19, NQ and MS-DOC are shown in Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, respectively. It can be easily observed that PROD achieves the state-of-the-art results in all the five datasets, which can be concluded from two perspectives.

With or Without Distillation. As we can see from Table 2 and Table 3, the baselines are divided into two groups, representing without and with distillation. Comparing against ADORE+STAR (the best on MS-PAS, TREC-PAS-19, MS-DOC and TREC-DOC-19 without distillation), Individual Top- k (the best on NQ without distillation), RocketQA v2 (the best on MS-PAS and NQ with distil-

Method	#Params	MS-PAS			TREC-PAS-19	
		MRR@10	R@50	R@1k	nDCG@10	MAP@1k
BM25 (Yang et al., 2017)	-	18.7	59.2	85.7	49.7	29.0
DeepCT (Dai and Callan, 2019)	-	24.3	69.0	91	55.0	34.1
docT5query (Nogueira et al., 2019)	-	27.2	75.6	94.7	64.2	40.3
ANCE (Xiong et al., 2021)	12-layer (110M)	33.0	-	95.9	64.8	37.1
ADORE (Zhan et al., 2021)	12-layer (110M)	34.7	-	-	68.3	41.9
TCT-ColBERT (Lin et al., 2020)	12-layer (110M)	33.5	-	96.4	67.0	39.1
RocketQA v1 (Qu et al., 2021)	12-layer (110M)	37.0	85.5	97.9	-	-
PAIR (Ren et al., 2021a)	12-layer (110M)	37.9	86.4	98.2	-	-
RocketQA v2 (Ren et al., 2021b)	12-layer (110M)	38.8	86.2	98.1	-	-
Margin-MSE (Hofstätter et al., 2020)	6-layer (66M)	32.3	-	95.7	69.9	40.5
TAS-B (Hofstätter et al., 2021)	6-layer (66M)	34.4	-	97.6	71.7	44.7
SPLADE v2 (Formal et al., 2021)	6-layer (66M)	36.8	-	97.9	72.9	-
CL-DRD (Zeng et al., 2022)	6-layer (66M)	38.2	-	-	72.5	45.3
PROD	6-layer (66M)	39.3	87.0	98.4	73.3	48.4

Table 2: The main results on MS-PAS and TREC-PAS-19. “#Params” represents the number of trainable parameters in a specific model.

Method	R@5	R@20	R@100
BM25 (Yang et al., 2017)	-	59.1	73.7
GAR (Mao et al., 2021)	60.9	74.4	85.3
DPR (Karpukhin et al., 2020)	-	78.4	85.4
ANCE (Xiong et al., 2021)	-	81.9	87.5
RDR (Yang and Seo, 2020)	-	82.8	88.2
Joint Top- k (Sachan et al., 2021)	72.1	81.8	87.8
DPR-PAQ (Oguz et al., 2022)	74.5	83.7	88.6
Individual Top- k (Sachan et al., 2021)	75.0	84.0	89.2
RocketQA v1 (Qu et al., 2021)	74.0	82.7	88.5
PAIR (Ren et al., 2021a)	74.9	83.5	89.1
RocketQA v2 (Ren et al., 2021b)	75.1	83.7	89.0
PROD	75.6	84.7	89.6

Table 3: The main results on NQ. All the baselines are 12-layer.

Method	MS-Doc		TREC-Doc-19	
	MRR@10	R@100	nDCG@10	R@100
BM25 (Yang et al., 2017)	27.9	80.7	51.9	39.5
DeepCT(Dai and Callan, 2019)	-	-	54.9	-
ANCE (Xiong et al., 2021)	37.7	89.4	61.0	27.3
STAR (Zhan et al., 2021)	39.0	91.3	60.5	31.3
ADORE (Zhan et al., 2021)	40.5	93.0	62.8	31.7
PROD	42.8	93.3	63.6	32.6

Table 4: The main results on MS-DOC and TREC-DOC-19. All baselines are 12-layer without distillation.

lation) and CL-DRD (the best on TREC-PAS-19 with distillation), PROD can achieve better performances in all the groups.

6-layer or 12-layer. In Table 2, the performance of the best 12-layer method RocketQA v2 is better than the best 6-layer method CL-DRD on MS-PAS. However, PROD further exceeds RocketQA v2 with a 6-layer architecture. Besides, among all the 12-layer baselines on NQ and MS-DOC, PROD achieve the best results, showing the effectiveness of the progressive distillation method even with a 6-layer student.

Method	MRR@10	R@50	R@1k
Random Batch	37.94	85.82	98.09
Merge Score	37.64	84.93	97.68
Merge Loss	38.09	86.10	98.09
TPD	38.75	86.56	98.41
TPD+DPD	39.34	87.06	98.44

Table 5: The results of different methods with multiple teachers on MS-PAS.

5.5 Comparison with Multi-Teacher Methods

To further prove the effectiveness of our method, we compare PROD with three methods that also incorporated with multiple teachers. Random Batch (Fukuda et al., 2017) randomly selects a teacher in each batch of training. Merge Score (Fukuda et al., 2017) averages the soft labels of multiple teachers in training. And Merge Loss (Fukuda et al., 2017) adds up all the distillation loss of each teacher, before calculating gradients. Please note that all the methods use the same set of teachers as PROD, *i.e.*, 12-layer DE, 12-layer CE and 24-layer CE. As we can see from the results of MS-PAS in Table 5, PROD can achieve the best performances among these multi-teacher methods even just uses TPD, which also reflects the effectiveness of our method.

5.6 Ablation Study

To investigate the effectiveness of TPD and DPD, we conduct careful ablation study on the two parts.

Effect of TPD. The performances of each distillation step on MS-PAS and NQ are shown in Table 6. Compared with the original 6-layer DE without distillation, the performance of “12DE/12CE/24CE/DTD” on MS-PAS has been improved about 7.7% in MRR@10, 7.1% in R@50

Dataset	Teacher Variant	Student	MRR@10	R@1	R@5	R@20	R@50	R@100	R@1k	
MS-PAS	-	6DE	31.66	20.14	47.45	68.95	79.99	85.59	96.19	
	12DE*	6DE	35.69	23.65	52.54	73.94	84.09	89.31	97.59	
	12CE	6DE	37.44	25.11	54.11	75.03	84.44	88.81	97.15	
	24CE	6DE	36.18	23.80	53.08	74.57	84.15	89.13	97.46	
	12DE / 12CE*	6DE	38.09	25.34	55.54	76.75	86.12	90.83	97.72	
	12CE / 12DE	6DE	34.90	22.98	51.07	73.01	82.95	88.44	97.22	
	12DE / 24CE	6DE	38.08	25.46	55.46	76.76	85.72	90.53	97.82	
	12DE / 12CE / 24CE*	6DE	38.75	25.89	55.86	77.68	86.56	91.33	98.41	
	12CE / 12CE / 24CE	6DE	38.29	25.87	55.14	75.64	84.58	88.62	96.40	
	12DE / 12CE / 12CE	6DE	37.88	24.94	55.53	76.62	86.12	90.76	98.01	
	12DE / 24CE / 24CE	6DE	37.63	24.87	54.99	76.39	85.54	90.26	98.07	
	12DE / 12CE / 24CE / DTD*	6DE	39.34	26.66	56.35	78.09	87.06	91.52	98.44	
	-	2DE	27.31	17.18	40.83	61.65	72.79	79.79	93.57	
	12DE	2DE	30.78	19.27	46.48	67.87	78.88	85.32	96.29	
	12DE / 12CE	2DE	34.10	22.41	50.59	71.15	80.62	86.32	95.56	
	12DE / 24CE	2DE	32.92	21.68	48.47	69.84	80.24	85.95	95.49	
	NQ	-	6DE	-	45.96	67.76	78.88	-	86.24	-
		12DE*	6DE	-	54.82	73.73	82.70	-	88.29	-
12CE		6DE	-	52.16	71.54	81.78	-	88.24	-	
24CE		6DE	-	51.19	70.57	80.62	-	87.15	-	
12DE / 12CE*		6DE	-	57.12	75.12	84.30	-	88.82	-	
12DE / 24CE		6DE	-	56.87	74.75	84.22	-	88.81	-	
12DE / 12CE / 24CE*		6DE	-	57.20	75.54	84.66	-	89.48	-	
12DE / 12CE / 24CE / DTD*		6DE	-	57.63	75.61	84.72	-	89.56	-	

Table 6: The results of ablation study on MS-PAS and NQ. “*” means the actual steps in PROD. For simplicity, we use “ n DE” and “ n CE” to denote the n -layer DE and n -layer CE, respectively. We use “A / B” to denote continual distillation using A and B as the teachers in turn and the refreshed top- k negatives before learning from each teacher.

Dataset	Teacher	MRR@10	R@1	R@5	R@20	R@50	R@100	R@1k
MS-PAS	12DE	35.77	23.50	52.72	74.18	84.10	89.14	97.61
	12CE	40.81	27.88	58.58	79.04	86.52	90.81	97.61
	24CE	41.96	28.84	59.81	80.00	87.89	92.23	97.61
NQ	12DE	-	52.94	73.15	82.70	-	88.68	-
	12CE	-	60.38	79.46	86.02	-	88.68	-
	24CE	-	64.78	80.57	86.24	-	88.68	-

Table 7: The performance of the teachers in the first step of TPD on MS-PAS and NQ. For simplicity, we use “ n DE” and “ n CE” to denote the n -layer DE and n -layer CE, respectively. The performances of CEs are the reranking results based on the retrieval output of the 12-layer DE.

and 2.2% in R@1k, proving the overall effectiveness of PROD method. In addition, by comparing with the actual teacher variants used in PROD, we can easily find that each step of PROD has achieved stable improvement. We focus on the selection of the teacher model in each steps and conduct further experiments to prove the correctness and necessity of teacher’s order in each step of PROD.

• **Influence of Teacher #1.** How to choose Teacher #1 is a problem worth exploring. Therefore, in the first step of teacher progressive, we use three different teachers, “12DE”, “12CE” and “24CE”, to distill 6-layer DE. Although the experimental results show that “12DE” on MS-PAS is worse than “12CE” and “24CE” for MRR@10 and R@<100, there are several important reasons why we still choose 12-layer DE as Teacher #1.

(1) Comparing “12DE” with “12CE” and

“24CE”, R@>50 on MS-PAS are higher than CEs. We believe that this is because DE uses in-batch negatives, which increases the overall understanding of retrieval task, and is helpful for the student model to further learn more difficult knowledge.

(2) Comparing with more later distillation steps, it is surprising that we can not get better results by adjusting the order of DE distillation backward or completely abandon DE. It shows that DE distillation mainly increases the model’s cognition of easy negatives. With the increase of data difficulty and student model performance in the training, it is too late to use DE distillation.

(3) In Table 7, we can see the performance of different teacher models on MS-PAS and NQ, where CE performances are measured by rerank the results of DE. Although the performance of 12-layer DE is the worst, the distillation efficiency is the

highest, that is, the student model is the closest to the teacher’s performance after distillation. This phenomenon is more obvious on NQ shown in Table 6, where the student model can perform best by using 12-layer DE as Teacher #1, while the performance of the 12-layer DE is the worst compared with CE. These results further support that the selection of distillation teachers at different steps should not take the performance of teacher models as the only standard.

- **Influence of Teacher #2.** In the second and third steps of teacher progressive, we adopt 12-layer CE and 24-layer CE as teacher models to distill student model. As shown in Table 6, using 24-layer CE as Teacher #2 is almost the same or even worse than 12-layer CE. We believe that this is caused by the excessive gap between teacher and student. To verify this opinion, we increase gap between teacher and student, repeated the experiment of the second step on a 2-layer DE student model, whose results are shown in Table 6. It can be seen from the results that the performance of 24-layer CE distillation and 12-layer CE distillation in the second step becomes more obvious.

Moreover, in order to explore whether 12-layer CE distillation can also perform well in the third step, we replaced the 24-layer CE in the third step with 12-layer CE, which is denoted as “12DE/12CE/12CE”. By comparing with “12DE/12CE/24CE”, we can see that 24-layer CE, a more powerful teacher, must be used in the third step to achieve the best results, and this process must be transited from the 12-layer CE distillation.

Specifically, by comparing “12DE/12CE/24CE” with “12DE/24CE/24CE”, we can see that replacing the 12 layer CE in the second step with the 24 layer CE for distillation cannot achieve satisfactory performance. Therefore, it is necessary and reasonable for us to adopt two different layers of CE, with 12-layer CE distillation in the second step and 24-layer CE distillation in the third step in TPD.

Effect of DPD. We also care about how much DPD contributes to PROD. By comparing “12DE/12CE/24CE/DTD” with “12DE/12CE/24CE” on MS-PAS and NQ, we can see that appending DTD after TPD can lead to consistent improvements on all the evaluation metrics used in both MS-PAS and NQ, showing the necessity of continual distillation using the confusing negative passages.

Selection Strategy	MRR@10	R@50
ST-(1,2] & TT-(0,1]	39.13	86.89
ST-(1,5] & TT-(0,1]	39.26	87.02
ST-(1,15] & TT-(0,1]	39.34	87.06
ST-(5,20] & TT-(0,5]	39.29	86.82
ST-(0,15] < TT-(0,15]	39.30	86.98
ST-(0,31] < TT-(0,31]	39.13	87.12

Table 8: The impact of different strategies of selecting the confusing negative passages on MS-PAS. “ST” and “TT” means student’s and teacher’s top ranking passages. respectively. “A & B” denotes the intersection of A and B. “A < B” represents the passages in B have higher relevance scores than A.

Iteration Number	MRR@10	R@50
$N = 0$	38.75	86.56
$N = 1$	39.34	87.06
$N = 2$	39.43	86.89
$N = 3$	39.28	87.09
$N = 4$	39.17	86.93
$N = 5$	39.08	86.95
$N = 6$	38.83	86.83
$N = 7$	38.73	86.82

Table 9: The results of different iteration number of DPD on MS-PAS.

6 Intrinsic Evaluation

In this section, we explore the intrinsic properties of PROD from several aspects.

6.1 Confusing Negatives Selection in DPD

We first explore the impact of different confusing negative passages selection strategies in DPD. All experiments are based on the same student model after TPD, the results are shown in Table 8. The experiment results show that different selection strategies can improve the student model performance to a certain extent. Among them, “ST-(1,15] & TT-(0,1]” performs best in MRR@10, which is the strategy we finally use.

6.2 Iteration Number of DPD

In this section, we discuss the impact of different iteration number N of DPD by gradually increasing it. As results shown in Table 9, when the iteration is at early stage, the improvement of data progressive is obvious. Specifically, MRR@10 reaches the best 37.44 when $N = 2$ and Recall@50 reaches the best 87.09 when $N = 3$. However, when the iteration number is bigger than 3, the performance of the student model decreases. We think the reason may be the long training steps of a small amount of data, which leads to the inevitable knowledge forgetting of student model. Therefore, considering

Method	R@1	R@5	R@20	R@100
12DE / 12CE	57.12	75.12	84.30	88.82
w/o \mathcal{L}_r	55.45	74.00	82.78	87.73
12DE / 12CE / 24CE	57.20	75.54	84.66	89.48
w/o \mathcal{L}_r	56.78	74.61	83.97	89.09
PROD	57.63	75.61	84.72	89.56
w/o \mathcal{L}_r	57.45	75.30	84.52	89.45

Table 10: The impact of the regularization loss item \mathcal{L}_r in PROD on NQ. For simplicity, we use “ n DE” and “ n CE” to denote the n -layer DE and n -layer CE, respectively. We use “A / B” to denote continual distillation using A and B as the teachers in turn and the refreshed top- k negatives before learning from each teacher.

the training steps and the average performance of MRR@10 and R@50, we choose $N = 1$.

6.3 Regularization Loss Item \mathcal{L}_r

In this section, we explore the influence of the regularization loss item \mathcal{L}_r in distillation. Since the essence of the regularization loss item is to use the model in the previous step as a teacher and distill the current students, it is particularly effective in the case of less data and unstable training. In order to observe the effect of the regularization loss item more intuitively, we show the results on NQ in Table 10. In the experiment, we compare between the distillation results with and without the regularization loss item. The results show that the regularization loss item not only stabilizes the model performance in CE distillation, but also improves distillation effect, effectively alleviating the trend of over fitting in distillation training.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel distillation method PROD for dense retriever. To be specific, we respectively adopt *teacher progressive distillation* and *data progressive distillation* to gradually improve the performance of the student model. Extensive experiments on four widely-used benchmarks show that PROD can effectively improve the performance of the student model after distillation, achieving new state-of-art within the the distillation methods for dense retriever, even surpassing some existing 12-layer models. We further carried out a lot of analysis experiments and ablation experiments to prove the effectiveness and necessity of each step of PROD, which inspired more research on distillation for dense retriever in the future.

References

- Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901.
- Pengfei Cao, Yubo Chen, Jun Zhao, and Taifeng Wang. 2020. [Incremental event detection via knowledge consolidation networks](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 707–717.
- Pengguang Chen, Shu Liu, Hengshuang Zhao, and Jiaya Jia. 2021. Distilling knowledge via knowledge review. In *CVPR*, pages 5008–5017.
- Nick Craswell, Bhaskar Mitra, Emine Yilmaz, Daniel Campos, and Ellen M. Voorhees. 2020. [Overview of the TREC 2019 deep learning track](#). *CoRR*, abs/2003.07820.
- Zhuyun Dai and Jamie Callan. 2019. Deeper text understanding for IR with contextual neural language modeling. In *SIGIR*, pages 985–988.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Kawin Ethayarajh, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. 2022. [Understanding dataset difficulty with V-usable information](#). In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162, pages 5988–6008.
- Thibault Formal, Carlos Lassance, Benjamin Piwowarski, and Stéphane Clinchant. 2021. [SPLADE v2: Sparse lexical and expansion model for information retrieval](#). *CoRR*, abs/2109.10086.
- Takashi Fukuda, Masayuki Suzuki, Gakuto Kurata, Samuel Thomas, Jia Cui, and Bhavana Ramabhadran. 2017. Efficient knowledge distillation from an ensemble of teachers. In *INTERSPEECH*, pages 3697–3701. ISCA.
- Geoffrey E. Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. 2015. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *CoRR*, abs/1503.02531.
- Sebastian Hofstätter, Sophia Althammer, Michael Schröder, Mete Sertkan, and Allan Hanbury. 2020. [Improving efficient neural ranking models with cross-architecture knowledge distillation](#). *CoRR*, abs/2010.02666.
- Sebastian Hofstätter, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Allan Hanbury. 2021. [Efficiently teaching an effective dense retriever with balanced topic aware sampling](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 113–122.

- Xiaoqi Jiao, Yichun Yin, Lifeng Shang, Xin Jiang, Xiao Chen, Linlin Li, Fang Wang, and Qun Liu. 2019. Tinybert: Distilling bert for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10351*.
- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2021. Billion-scale similarity search with gpus. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3):535–547.
- Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oguz, Sewon Min, Patrick S. H. Lewis, Ledell Wu, Sergey Edunov, Danqi Chen, and Wen-tau Yih. 2020. Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6769–6781.
- Omar Khattab and Matei Zaharia. 2020. Colbert: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over BERT. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in Information Retrieval*, pages 39–48.
- Taehyeon Kim, Jaehoon Oh, Nakyil Kim, Sangwook Cho, and Se-Young Yun. 2021. Comparing kullback-leibler divergence and mean squared error loss in knowledge distillation. In *IJCAI*, pages 2628–2635.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur P. Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, Llion Jones, Matthew Kelcey, Ming-Wei Chang, Andrew M. Dai, Jakob Uszkoreit, Quoc Le, and Slav Petrov. 2019. Natural questions: a benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. Bart: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.13461*.
- Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. 2018. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947.
- Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, and Jimmy Lin. 2020. Distilling dense representations for ranking using tightly-coupled teachers. *CoRR*, abs/2010.11386.
- Sheng-Chieh Lin, Jheng-Hong Yang, and Jimmy Lin. 2021. In-batch negatives for knowledge distillation with tightly-coupled teachers for dense retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Representation Learning for NLP (RepL4NLP-2021)*, pages 163–173.
- Yuxiang Lu, Yiding Liu, Jiayang Liu, Yunsheng Shi, Zhengjie Huang, Shikun Feng, Yu Sun, Hao Tian, Hua Wu, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Haifeng Wang. 2022. Ernie-search: Bridging cross-encoder with dual-encoder via self on-the-fly distillation for dense passage retrieval. *CoRR*, abs/2205.09153.
- Yuning Mao, Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Yelong Shen, Jianfeng Gao, Jiawei Han, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. Generation-augmented retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 4089–4100. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Seyed-Iman Mirzadeh, Mehrdad Farajtabar, Ang Li, Nir Levine, Akihiro Matsukawa, and Hassan Ghasemzadeh. 2020. Improved knowledge distillation via teacher assistant. In *AAAI*, pages 5191–5198.
- Tri Nguyen, Mir Rosenberg, Xia Song, Jianfeng Gao, Saurabh Tiwary, Rangan Majumder, and Li Deng. 2016. MS MARCO: A human generated machine reading comprehension dataset. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Cognitive Computation: Integrating neural and symbolic approaches 2016*, volume 1773 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*.
- Rodrigo Frassetto Nogueira, Wei Yang, Jimmy Lin, and Kyunghyun Cho. 2019. Document expansion by query prediction. *CoRR*, abs/1904.08375.
- Barlas Oguz, Kushal Lakhota, Anchit Gupta, Patrick Lewis, Vladimir Karpukhin, Aleksandra Piktus, Xilun Chen, Sebastian Riedel, Scott Yih, Sonal Gupta, and Yashar Mehdad. 2022. Domain-matched pre-training tasks for dense retrieval. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, pages 1524–1534. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weizhen Qi, Yu Yan, Yeyun Gong, Dayiheng Liu, Nan Duan, Jiusheng Chen, Ruofei Zhang, and Ming Zhou. 2020. Prophetnet: Predicting future n-gram for sequence-to-sequence pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04063*.
- Yingqi Qu, Yuchen Ding, Jing Liu, Kai Liu, Ruiyang Ren, Wayne Xin Zhao, Daxiang Dong, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. 2021. Rocketqa: An optimized training approach to dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 5835–5847.
- Ruiyang Ren, Shangwen Lv, Yingqi Qu, Jing Liu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Qiaoqiao She, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021a. PAIR: leveraging passage-centric similarity relation for improving dense passage retrieval. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL/IJCNLP 2021*, volume ACL/IJCNLP 2021 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 2173–2183.

- Ruiyang Ren, Yingqi Qu, Jing Liu, Wayne Xin Zhao, Qiaobao She, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2021b. [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*, pages 2825–2835.
- Adriana Romero, Nicolas Ballas, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Antoine Chassang, Carlo Gatta, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets. In *ICLR (Poster)*.
- Devendra Singh Sachan, Mostofa Patwary, Mohammad Shoeybi, Neel Kant, Wei Ping, William L. Hamilton, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2021. [End-to-end training of neural retrievers for open-domain question answering](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 6648–6662. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. Distilbert, a distilled version of bert: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*.
- Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. [Colbertv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL 2022, Seattle, WA, United States, July 10-15, 2022*, pages 3715–3734. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shaden Smith, Mostofa Patwary, Brandon Norrick, Patrick LeGresley, Samyam Rajbhandari, Jared Casper, Zhun Liu, Shrimai Prabhumoye, George Zerveas, Vijay Korthikanti, et al. 2022. Using deepspeed and megatron to train megatron-turing nlg 530b, a large-scale generative language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.11990*.
- Swabha Swayamdipta, Roy Schwartz, Nicholas Lourie, Yizhong Wang, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2020. [Dataset cartography: Mapping and diagnosing datasets with training dynamics](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9275–9293.
- Chuhan Wu, Fangzhao Wu, Tao Qi, and Yongfeng Huang. 2022. Unified and effective ensemble knowledge distillation. *CoRR*, abs/2204.00548.
- Lee Xiong, Chenyan Xiong, Ye Li, Kwok-Fung Tang, Jialin Liu, Paul N. Bennett, Junaid Ahmed, and Arnold Overwijk. 2021. [Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Peilin Yang, Hui Fang, and Jimmy Lin. 2017. Anserini: Enabling the use of lucene for information retrieval research. In *SIGIR*, pages 1253–1256.
- Sohee Yang and Minjoon Seo. 2020. [Is retriever merely an approximator of reader?](#) *CoRR*, abs/2010.10999.
- Sergey Zagoruyko and Nikos Komodakis. 2017. Paying more attention to attention: Improving the performance of convolutional neural networks via attention transfer. In *ICLR (Poster)*.
- Hansi Zeng, Hamed Zamani, and Vishwa Vinay. 2022. Curriculum learning for dense retrieval distillation. In *SIGIR*, pages 1979–1983.
- Jingtao Zhan, Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Jiafeng Guo, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2021. [Optimizing dense retrieval model training with hard negatives](#). In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1503–1512.
- Hang Zhang, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Jiancheng Lv, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [Adversarial retriever-ranker for dense text retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Tiancheng Zhao, Xiaopeng Lu, and Kyusong Lee. 2021. [SPARTA: efficient open-domain question answering via sparse transformer matching retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 565–575.
- Chunting Zhou, Jiatao Gu, and Graham Neubig. 2020. Understanding knowledge distillation in non-autoregressive machine translation. In *ICLR*.
- Wangchunshu Zhou, Canwen Xu, and Julian J. McAuley. 2022. BERT learns to teach: Knowledge distillation with meta learning. In *ACL (1)*, pages 7037–7049.

A Hyper-parameters

The detailed hyper-parameters are shown in Table 11.

		Parameter	NQ	MS-PAS	MS-DOC
Global Setting		Max query length	32	32	32
		Max passage length	128	144	480
		Temperature	4.0	4.0	4.0
		Hard loss weight	0.1	0.1	0.1
		Soft loss weight	0.9	0.9	0.9
		Warmup proportion	0.1	0.1	0.1
		TPD	DE Distillation	Learning rate	5e-5
Batch size	128			128	128
Training step	80000			40000	40000
Negative size	1			1	1
Optimizer	AdamW			AdamW	AdamW
CE Distillation	Learning rate		5e-5	5e-5	5e-5
	Batch size		64	64	64
	Training step		20000	40000	40000
	Negative size		15	15	15
	Optimizer		AdamW	AdamW	AdamW
DPD	CE Distillation	Learning rate	1e-5	1e-5	1e-5
		Batch size	64	64	64
		Training step	200	2000	2000
		Negative size	15	15	15
		Optimizer	AdamW	AdamW	AdamW

Table 11: Hyper-parameters for PROD.