

ReinPool: Reinforcement Learning Pooling Multi-Vector Embeddings for Retrieval System

Sungguk Cha
LG Uplus
Seoul, South Korea
sungguk@lguplus.co.kr

DongWook Kim
LG Uplus
Seoul, South Korea
dongwook92@lguplus.co.kr

Mintae Kim
LG Uplus
Seoul, South Korea
iammt@lguplus.co.kr

Youngsub Han
LG Uplus
Seoul, South Korea
yshan042@lguplus.co.kr

Byoung-Ki Jeon
LG Uplus
Seoul, South Korea
bkjeon@lguplus.co.kr

Sangyeob Lee
LG Uplus
Seoul, South Korea
sangyeob@lguplus.co.kr

Abstract

Multi-vector embedding models have emerged as a powerful paradigm for document retrieval, preserving fine-grained visual and textual details through token-level representations. However, this expressiveness comes at a staggering cost: storing embeddings for every token inflates index sizes by over 1000 \times compared to single-vector approaches, severely limiting scalability. We introduce **ReinPool**, a reinforcement learning framework that learns to dynamically filter and pool multi-vector embeddings into compact, retrieval-optimized representations. By training with an inverse retrieval objective and NDCG-based rewards, ReinPool identifies and retains only the most discriminative vectors without requiring manual importance annotations. On the Vidore V2 benchmark across three vision-language embedding models, ReinPool compresses multi-vector representations by 746–1249 \times into single vectors while recovering 76–81% of full multi-vector retrieval performance. Compared to static mean pooling baselines, ReinPool achieves 22–33% absolute NDCG@3 improvement, demonstrating that learned selection significantly outperforms heuristic aggregation.

1 Introduction

Information retrieval is a cornerstone of modern AI systems, enabling applications from search engines to retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) pipelines [13]. As these systems evolve toward multimodal capabilities, they must move beyond text-only analysis to understand diverse document formats—slide decks, technical reports, and visually rich PDFs—where layout and visual elements carry significant semantic meaning.

Recent multi-vector embedding models [3, 6] address this challenge by representing documents as sets of token- or patch-level embeddings, preserving fine-grained visual and textual details through late interaction mechanisms [11]. However, this expressiveness comes at a prohibitive cost: a single document may require over 1,000 embedding vectors, inflating storage and search complexity by orders of magnitude compared to traditional single-vector approaches [9, 27]. For instance, the *Tomoro-ColQwen-4b* model produces an average of 1249×320 dimensional embeddings per document—a 1249 \times increase over single-vector storage.

The fundamental inefficiency lies in a lack of selectivity: not all tokens are equally informative for retrieval. Many embeddings correspond to whitespace, decorative elements, or generic content that dilutes the discriminative signal. Existing approaches occupy two




Figure 1: Retrieval Performance vs. Cost. Comparison of ReinPool against Full Multi-Vector and Static Mean Pooling baselines. The x-axis represents the total embedding cost (token length), and the y-axis shows the average NDCG@3 on Vidore V2. Horizontal arrows indicate the massive reduction in retrieval cost; vertical arrows depict the performance gain of ReinPool over static mean pooling.

extremes: storing all vectors preserves detail but is computationally prohibitive, while static pooling (e.g., mean or max) collapses the rich multi-vector representation into a single vector, destroying the fine-grained information that enables precise matching.

We propose **ReinPool**, a reinforcement learning framework that learns to dynamically filter and pool multi-vector embeddings. Rather than applying fixed heuristics, ReinPool trains a lightweight policy network to identify and retain only the most retrieval-relevant vectors before aggregation. The key insight is to frame vector selection as a sequential decision problem, optimizing

directly for retrieval performance via an inverse retrieval objective with NDCG-based rewards [25].

Our contributions are:

- A novel RL-based pooling framework that optimizes vector selection directly for retrieval effectiveness, rather than reconstruction objectives.
- A self-supervised training strategy using synthetic queries and inverse retrieval, eliminating the need for manual importance annotations.
- Extensive experiments on Vidore V2 demonstrating that ReinPool achieves 1249× compression while recovering 76% of full multi-vector performance (37.65 vs. 49.48 NDCG@3), outperforming static mean pooling by 22% absolute.

2 Related Works

2.1 Neural Information Retrieval

The field of neural information retrieval has evolved significantly from traditional lexical methods like BM25 [19] to neural dense retrieval models. The introduction of BERT [1] and the Transformer architecture [24] enabled powerful contextualized representations for retrieval. Early works like Sentence-BERT [18] established efficient sentence embeddings using siamese networks, while Dense Passage Retrieval (DPR) [10] demonstrated strong performance on open-domain question answering by encoding queries and documents into single vectors for Maximum Inner Product Search (MIPS). Contriever [7] further advanced unsupervised dense retrieval through contrastive pre-training, achieving competitive performance without labeled data. However, compressing an entire document into a single vector often results in an information bottleneck, leading to the loss of fine-grained details.

To address this, late interaction models like ColBERT [11] proposed representing documents as bags of token embeddings, delaying the interaction until query time to preserve term-level nuances. ColBERTv2 [20] improved upon this with residual compression and denoised supervision, achieving state-of-the-art retrieval while reducing index size. Scaling efforts such as GTR [14] demonstrated that large dual encoders can be effective generalizable retrievers across diverse domains. More recently, this paradigm has extended to multimodal domains; models like ColPali [3] and Tomoro ColQwen3 [6] leverage Vision Language Models (VLMs) to embed document images directly, capturing visual layout and textual content simultaneously. CLIP [17] has also influenced multimodal retrieval by learning aligned visual-textual representations.

2.2 Efficient Indexing for Multi-Vector Models

While multi-vector models offer superior accuracy, they incur substantial storage and computational costs. ColBERT, for instance, increases index size by orders of magnitude compared to single-vector models. Efficient similarity search systems like FAISS [9] are essential for scaling retrieval to large corpora. Approaches like PLAID [21] mitigate the multi-vector overhead by employing aggressive quantization and centroid-based pruning to accelerate retrieval. BGE [26] and similar embedding models have explored efficient representations for multilingual and domain-specific retrieval. Despite these optimizations, the fundamental issue remains: storing embeddings for every token—including non-informative

ones like stopwords or background image patches—is inherently inefficient. ReinPool complements these systems by learning to discard such redundant vectors *before* indexing or quantization, offering a complementary reduction in storage footprint.

2.3 Learned Pooling and Selection

Traditional pooling methods (e.g., mean or max pooling) are static and agnostic to downstream retrieval tasks. Recent works [5, 12] have explored learned pooling mechanisms to bridge the gap between fixed-size and multi-vector representations. Matryoshka Representation Learning [12] enables flexible dimensionality by training nested representations, allowing trade-offs between efficiency and expressiveness at inference time. However, most existing methods rely on reconstruction objectives or simple attention mechanisms that may not align with retrieval performance. Our work introduces a reinforcement learning-based approach, optimizing the selection and pooling process directly for retrieval effectiveness (NDCG) via an inverse retrieval formulation.

3 Methodology

We propose **ReinPool**, a framework that learns to dynamically filter and pool multi-vector embeddings. In this section, we first formulate the document representation problem, then introduce the ReinPool agent, and finally describe the training strategy based on inverse retrieval.

3.1 Problem Formulation

Let a document d be projected into a sequence of N embedding vectors $V_d = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N\}$, where $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{model}}$. While storing V_d fully preserves fine-grained details, it incurs high storage and retrieval costs. Our goal is to learn a mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_{model}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_{model}}$ that compresses the multi-vector sequence into a single vector \mathbf{v}_{pool} , while maximizing retrieval performance. ReinPool achieves this by selectively filtering vectors via a reinforcement learning policy before aggregating the retained set.

3.2 ReinPool Framework

The ReinPool process consists of two stages: **Filtering** and **Pooling**.

3.2.1 Filtering Policy. We employ a policy network π_θ to identify a subset of informative vectors. For each vector $v_t \in V_d$, the agent outputs a binary action $a_t \in \{0, 1\}$:

- If $a_t = 1$: Keep vector v_t .
- If $a_t = 0$: Discard vector v_t .

The set of retained vectors is denoted as $V_{keep} = \{v_t \mid a_t = 1\}$.

The policy model π_θ is implemented as a Transformer-based architecture [24] comprising a multi-head attention layer (8 heads) followed by a linear classification head. Crucially, the number of parameters in π_θ is $O(d_{model}^2)$, which is negligible compared to the underlying embedding model. The objective of π_θ is not to transform the embedding space, but rather to eliminate redundant or non-informative vectors.

3.2.2 Pooling. The filtered subset of vectors is aggregated into a single representation $\mathbf{v}_{pool} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{model}}$ using a standard pooling

function (e.g., Mean or Max pooling):

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{pool}} = \text{Pool}(V_{\text{keep}}) \quad (1)$$

This results in a standard dense embedding that fits into existing single-vector search indices.

3.3 Training Strategy

To effectively train the filtering policy π_θ without requiring annotated relevance labels, we propose a self-supervised training framework based on *inverse retrieval*. Unlike standard retrieval where a query is used to search for documents, our training objective inverts this relationship: the agent learns to pool a document such that the resulting vector provides high similarity to its corresponding synthetic queries.

3.3.1 Synthetic Query Generation. We construct a training dataset by generating synthetic queries for each document in our corpus \mathcal{D} . For each document $d \in \mathcal{D}$, we utilize a Large Language Model (LLM) [16] to generate a set of k distinct queries $\mathcal{Q}_d = \{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$ relevant to d . This process yields a set of positive pairs (d, q^+) where $q^+ \in \mathcal{Q}_d$.

3.3.2 Pre-computation and Setup. To enable efficient RL training, we treat the underlying embedding space as fixed. We pre-compute the multi-vector embeddings for all documents and the single-vector embeddings for all generated queries using the base embedding model \mathcal{M} :

$$V_d = \mathcal{M}(d) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_{\text{model}}} \quad (2)$$

$$V_q = \mathcal{M}(q) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d_{\text{model}}} \quad (3)$$

These pre-computed embeddings serve as the environment state for the RL agent.

3.3.3 Optimization via Inverse Retrieval Rank. The training process iterates through the following steps to optimize the policy π_θ :

- (1) **Policy Rollout:** Given a document embedding V_d , the policy samples a mask $a \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | V_d)$ to select a subset of vectors V_{keep} .
- (2) **Pooling:** The retained vectors are aggregated into a single document representation:

$$\mathbf{v}_{\text{pool}} = \text{Pool}(V_{\text{keep}}) \quad (4)$$

- (3) **Inverse Retrieval Simulation:** We treat \mathbf{v}_{pool} as a query vector to search against the synthetic queries \mathcal{Q} . The objective is to retrieve the ground-truth query V_{q^+} associated with document d from \mathcal{Q} . Similarity scores are computed between \mathbf{v}_{pool} and all queries in \mathcal{Q} :

$$s(d, \mathcal{Q}) = \mathbf{v}_{\text{pool}}^\top \text{Pool}(V_q) \quad (5)$$

- (4) **Rank-Based Reward:** We align the training objective with retrieval performance by using Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) [8] as the reward signal. NDCG is a standard information retrieval metric that evaluating ranking quality not only by the presence of relevant items, but also by their position in the list. For a given document d and its ground-truth query q^+ , we rank the set of synthetic

queries \mathcal{Q} based on their computed similarity scores. The reward is defined as:

$$r = \text{NDCG}(q^+, \mathcal{Q}) \quad (6)$$

This formulation applies a logarithmic discount to the rank of the positive query, effectively penalizing the agent more for missing the top spots than for ordering errors deeper in the list. This encourages the model to prioritize features that are highly discriminative for the specific query.

- (5) **Policy Update:** The policy parameters are updated using Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [23] to maximize the expected reward. GRPO estimates advantages by centering rewards within a group of samples, eliminating the need for a separate value network while maintaining stable policy updates similar to PPO [22].

4 Experiments

We evaluate ReinPool on the Vidore V2 benchmark to answer three research questions: (1) What compression ratio does ReinPool achieve versus full multi-vector storage? (2) How much retrieval performance is preserved after compression? (3) Does learned pooling outperform static pooling baselines?

4.1 Experimental Setup

Benchmark. We evaluate on **Vidore V2** [4], a comprehensive benchmark for visual document retrieval spanning four domains: ESG (Environmental, Social, Governance reports), ECO (Economic documents), ESGHL (ESG Highlights), and BIO (Biomedical literature). We report NDCG@3 for each subset and the average across all tasks.

Embedding Models. We apply ReinPool to three state-of-the-art vision-language embedding models with varying architectures:

- **Tomoro-ColQwen-4b** [6]: 4B parameters, hidden dimension 320, average 1249 vectors per document.
- **NeMo-ColEmbed-3b** [15]: 3B parameters, hidden dimension 3072, average 1802 vectors per document.
- **ColQwen2.5-3b** [2]: 3B parameters, compact dimension 128, average 746 vectors per document.

Baselines. We compare against: (1) **Full Multi-Vector:** the uncompressed representation storing all token embeddings; (2) **Static Mean/Max Pooling:** naive aggregation of all vectors into a single representation.

Implementation Details. We implement ReinPool using the PyTorch framework. The filtering policy network is trained using the AdamW optimizer with a weight decay of 0.01. We employ a learning rate scheduler (ReduceLRonPlateau) that halves the learning rate when the validation NDCG@3 score plateaus, ensuring fine-grained convergence. Gradients are clipped at a global norm of 1.0 to stabilize training. The RL training loop follows the Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [23] paradigm. For every training step, inputs are repeated to generate a group of variations (determined by the `group_size` hyperparameter) by sampling masks from the policy. The reward signal is the NDCG@3 score computed against the ground-truth queries associated with the document. Advantages are estimated by centering the rewards within each

Table 1: Information retrieval results on Vidore V2 in NDCG@3. Embedding cost refers to average token length of the embedded corpus.

| Embedding Model | Query Pooling | Corpus Pooling | Embedding Cost | ESG | ECO | ESGHL | BIO | AVG |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| tomoro-colqwen-4b | Mean | - | 1249×320 | 44.59 | 50.28 | 46.77 | 56.28 | 49.48 |
| | | Mean | 1×320 | 16.65 | 50.30 | 13.06 | 43.04 | 30.76 |
| | | ReinPool _{Mean} | 1×320 | 27.80 | 57.60 | 21.80 | 43.41 | 37.65 |
| | Max | - | 1249×320 | 3.19 | 15.24 | 9.10 | 13.87 | 39.40 |
| | | Max | 1×320 | 0 | 4.49 | 1.92 | 2.65 | 2.27 |
| | | ReinPool _{Max} | 1×320 | 4.56 | 20.80 | 4.45 | 3.37 | 8.30 |
| nemo-colembed-3b | Mean | - | 1802×3072 | 44.77 | 49.42 | 43.22 | 53.57 | 47.75 |
| | | Mean | 1×3072 | 3.20 | 0.81 | 11.34 | 19.29 | 8.66 |
| | | ReinPool _{Mean} | 1×3072 | 14.01 | 18.49 | 13.04 | 22.07 | 16.90 |
| | Max | - | 1082×3072 | 27.17 | 36.40 | 23.85 | 45.86 | 33.32 |
| | | Max | 1×3072 | 1.36 | 33.68 | 2.32 | 3.72 | 10.27 |
| | | ReinPool _{Max} | 1×3072 | 5.12 | 34.78 | 5.00 | 3.90 | 12.20 |
| colqwen2.5-3b | Mean | - | 746×128 | 34.05 | 49.65 | 30.72 | 43.16 | 39.40 |
| | | Mean | 1×128 | 13.62 | 49.12 | 11.23 | 23.67 | 24.16 |
| | | ReinPool _{Mean} | 1×128 | 32.98 | 55.38 | 14.68 | 25.40 | 32.11 |
| | Max | - | 746×128 | 1.04 | 16.36 | 0.59 | 2.21 | 5.05 |
| | | Max | 1×128 | 1.75 | 1.62 | 0.57 | 0.72 | 1.17 |
| | | ReinPool _{Max} | 1×128 | 4.64 | 13.28 | 4.63 | 3.46 | 6.50 |

group, effectively normalizing the signal without requiring a separate value network. The policy is updated to maximize the expected advantage-weighted log-likelihood of the selected actions. The base embedding models remain frozen throughout the training of the ReinPool policy to ensure computational efficiency.

4.2 Main Results

Table 1 presents the retrieval results. We report Embedding Cost as the total dimensionality per document (Number of Vectors \times Vector Dimension).

Compression Efficiency. ReinPool achieves dramatic compression ratios across all models. For Tomoro-ColQwen-4b, storage is reduced from 1249×320 to 1×320 —a **1249 \times reduction**—while maintaining 76% of retrieval performance (37.65 vs. 49.48 NDCG@3). Similarly, ColQwen2.5-3b is compressed from 746×128 to 1×128 while recovering 81% of full performance (32.11 vs. 39.40).

Superiority over Static Pooling. ReinPool consistently and substantially outperforms naive pooling. On Tomoro-ColQwen-4b, ReinPool_{Mean} achieves 37.65 NDCG@3, a **22% absolute improvement** over static mean pooling (30.76). For ColQwen2.5-3b, the improvement is even more pronounced: ReinPool_{Mean} achieves 32.11 versus 24.16 for static mean (**+33% relative**). These gains demonstrate that the RL policy successfully identifies and preserves discriminative vectors that static methods dilute with non-informative content.

Effect of Embedding Dimension. Compression effectiveness correlates with embedding dimensionality. For NeMo-ColEmbed-3b (dim 3072), both static pooling (8.66) and ReinPool (16.90) struggle to match full multi-vector performance (47.75), suggesting that

extremely high-dimensional spaces contain fine-grained information difficult to compress into a single vector. However, ReinPool still achieves a **95% relative improvement** over static mean pooling (16.90 vs. 8.66). Conversely, lower-dimensional models like ColQwen2.5-3b (dim 128) are highly amenable to learned pooling.

Mean vs. Max Pooling. ReinPool_{Mean} consistently outperforms ReinPool_{Max} across all models, suggesting that mean aggregation better preserves the distributional properties learned by the embedding models. Nevertheless, ReinPool_{Max} still provides substantial gains over static max pooling (e.g., 8.30 vs. 2.27 on Tomoro-ColQwen-4b).

5 Conclusion

We presented ReinPool, a reinforcement learning framework for compressing multi-vector document embeddings into efficient single-vector representations. By framing vector selection as a sequential decision problem and training with an inverse retrieval objective, ReinPool learns to identify and retain only the most discriminative embeddings without requiring manual annotations.

Our experiments on Vidore V2 demonstrate that ReinPool achieves compression ratios exceeding 1000 \times while preserving up to 81% of full multi-vector retrieval performance. Compared to static pooling baselines, ReinPool provides consistent improvements of 22–33% absolute NDCG, validating that learned selection significantly outperforms heuristic aggregation.

These results establish ReinPool as a practical solution for deploying multi-vector retrieval at scale. By bridging the gap between single-vector efficiency and multi-vector precision, our approach enables document-native retrieval systems that were previously computationally prohibitive.

References

- [1] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. 4171–4186.
- [2] Manuel Faysse. 2024. colqwen2.5-3b-v0.2. <https://huggingface.co/vidore/colqwen2.5-v0.2>
- [3] Manuel Faysse, Hugues Sibille, Tony Wu, Bilel Omrani, Gautier Viaud, Céline Hudelot, and Pierre Colombo. 2024. ColPali: Efficient Document Retrieval with Vision Language Models. *arXiv:2407.01449* [cs.IR] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01449>
- [4] Manuel Faysse, Hugues Sibille, Tony Wu, Bilel Omrani, Gautier Viaud, Céline Hudelot, and Pierre Colombo. 2024. ViDoRe: A Benchmark for Visual Document Retrieval. *arXiv:2407.01449* [cs.IR]
- [5] Michael Günther, Saba Sturua, Mohammad Kalim Akram, Isabelle Mohr, Andrei Ungureanu, Sedigheh Eslami, Scott Martens, Bo Wang, Nan Wang, and Han Xiao. 2025. jina-embeddings-v4: Universal Embeddings for Multimodal Multilingual Retrieval. *arXiv:2506.18902* [cs.AI]
- [6] Xin Huang and Kye Min Tan. 2025. Beyond Text: Unlocking True Multimodal, End-to-end RAG with Tomoro ColQwen3.
- [7] Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2022. Unsupervised Dense Information Retrieval with Contrastive Learning. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2022).
- [8] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of IR techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 20, 4 (2002), 422–446.
- [9] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2019. Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* 7, 3 (2019), 535–547.
- [10] Vladimir Karpukhin, Barlas Oğuz, Sewon Min, Patrick 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 (EMNLP)*. 6769–6781.
- [11] 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*. 39–48.
- [12] Aditya Kusupati, Gantavya Bhatt, Aniket Rege, Matthew Wallingford, Aditya Sinha, Vivek Ramanujan, William Howard-Snyder, Kaifeng Chen, Sham Kakade, Prateek Jain, and Ali Farhadi. 2024. Matryoshka Representation Learning. *arXiv:2205.13147* [cs.LG]
- [13] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33. 9459–9474.
- [14] Jianmo Ni, Chen Qu, Jing Lu, Zhuyun Dai, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Ji Ma, Vincent Y Zhao, Yi Luan, Keith B Hall, Ming-Wei Chang, and Yinfei Yang. 2022. Large Dual Encoders Are Generalizable Retrievers. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. 9844–9855.
- [15] NVIDIA. 2024. llama-nemoretriever-colembed-3b-v1. <https://huggingface.co/nvidia/llama-nemoretriever-colembed-3b-v1>
- [16] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
- [17] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 8748–8763.
- [18] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 3982–3992.
- [19] Stephen Robertson and Hugo Zaragoza. 2009. The Probabilistic Relevance Framework: BM25 and Beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval* 3, 4 (2009), 333–389.
- [20] 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*. 3715–3734.
- [21] Keshav Santhanam, Omar Khattab, Jon Saad-Falcon, Christopher Potts, and Matei Zaharia. 2022. PLAID: an efficient engine for late interaction retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 1747–1756.
- [22] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal Policy Optimization Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347* (2017).
- [23] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Mingchuan Zhang, Y.K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models. *arXiv:2402.03300* [cs.CL]
- [24] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All You Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 30.
- [25] Ronald J Williams. 1992. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning* 8 (1992), 229–256.
- [26] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, and Niklas Muennighoff. 2024. C-Pack: Packaged Resources To Advance General Chinese Embedding. *arXiv:2309.07597* [cs.CL]
- [27] Yanzhao Zhang, Mingxin Li, Dingkun Long, Xin Zhang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, An Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Junyang Lin, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2025. Qwen3 Embedding: Advancing Text Embedding and Reranking Through Foundation Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05176* (2025).