

vstash v2: Eval-Gated Domain Adaptation for Local-First LLM Memory

Jayson Steffens github.com/stffns/vstash

Abstract

We present **vstash v2**, a local-first document memory system whose central contribution is a **gated domain-adaptation loop**: a deployable cycle of mining, training, eval-gating, and promotion that converts retrieval domain adaptation from a one-shot research artifact into a repeatable production pattern. The system builds on a hybrid retrieval substrate (RRF over vector + FTS5 in a single SQLite file) introduced in v1 (arXiv:2604.15484, April 2026). This paper introduces four contributions:

(1) **Cross-domain transfer failure of BEIR-tuned weights, motivating per-domain models.** The v1 BEIR fine-tune loses to vanilla BGE-small by -2.45pp NDCG@10 on a 102-query LongMemEval-s holdout, providing direct evidence that benchmark-tuned weights can regress on chat-memory retrieval.

(2) **Eval-gated labeled-retrain mode as a safety mechanism for continual domain adaptation.** A new CLI mode accepts user-supplied (`query`, `relevant_paths`) JSONL files for both training and held-out evaluation, and refuses to save fine-tunes that regress NDCG@10 on the holdout. To our knowledge, we have not found prior open-source retrieval systems that combine user-supplied labeled retraining with an automatic refuse-to-save evaluation gate.

(3) **bge-small-rrf-lme-v1, a chat-memory specialist that preserves general retrieval.** Training on 398 labeled LongMemEval queries through the gated loop lifts holdout R@5 by +3.79pp (95% CI [+1.72, +6.19], paired bootstrap B=1000) over vanilla BGE-small; R@1 trends positive but is directional on the n=102 holdout. R@10 saturates at 0.96 for both arms (ranking, not coverage, is the lever). Crucially, the chat-tune does **not** regress on general BEIR retrieval: paired bootstrap on the 5-dataset BEIR slice gives macro delta -0.0024 with 95% CI [-0.0050, +0.0002], statistically indistinguishable from base BGE. The gated loop applied to a target domain is therefore a Pareto-safe specialization (no detectable out-of-domain regression), not a trade-off. Against a calibrated late-interaction baseline implemented faithfully from the published ColBERTv2 checkpoint, vstash remains competitive while running approximately 3x faster at P50 and 6x faster at P99 on CPU vs the baseline on a T4 GPU.

(4) **Self-supervised embedding refinement (retained from v1, post-v0.34 reference).** Vector/FTS top-K disagreement provides a free training signal without human labels; fine-tuning BGE-small with MNRL on the v3 H-R9 winning recipe (`bge-small-rrf-v4`, retrained on post-v0.34 code) lifts macro NDCG@10 by **+0.0204 absolute / +4.9% relative over the vstash BGE-small base** on the 5-dataset BEIR slice (95% CI [+0.0154, +0.0256], paired bootstrap B=1000, eval-stochastic). Multi-seed retraining (4 seeds) shows training-stochastic std of 0.0005 on macro NDCG@10, an order of magnitude tighter than the eval-stochastic CI; the v4 lift is robust to both query resampling and training seed. Three of five datasets show statistically significant lifts: FiQA +0.0537 [+0.0383, +0.0697], SciFact +0.0324 [+0.0168, +0.0511], NFCorpus +0.0116 [+0.0020, +0.0213]. The vstash hybrid pipeline with the BGE-small base alone already exceeds ColBERTv2 published macro (0.4214 vs 0.402, +4.8%, Table 4); the fine-tune adds the incremental +4.9% on

top. This decomposition is the headline of v2: the deployable contribution is the substrate (adaptive RRF + corrected cosine metric + MMR + distance signal), not the fine-tune. The fine-tune is a domain-specialization tool.

Four fine-tuned models are published on HuggingFace: `bge-small-rrf-v4` (post-v0.34 honest reference, recommended default for new vstash deployments), `bge-small-rrf-v3` (pre-v0.34 reference snapshot, retained for reproducibility), `bge-small-rrf-v2` (76K MNRL + hard-neg, NFCorpus champion), and `bge-small-rrf-lme-v1` (chat-memory specialist, Section 6). All code, data, and reproducible experiment scripts are open-source.

Our results suggest that production memory systems benefit from a deployable adaptation loop rather than a single universal embedder: the substrate already produces benchmark-competitive retrieval, and per-domain fine-tunes via the gated loop add Pareto-safe specialization without measurable out-of-domain regression.

1 Introduction

Large language model agents increasingly require persistent memory – the ability to store, retrieve, and prioritize information across sessions. While cloud-hosted vector databases serve this need at scale, many use cases demand local-first operation: developer tooling, personal knowledge management, privacy-sensitive workflows, and offline agents.

Existing local solutions face three gaps already documented in v1:

Retrieval quality. Pure vector search misses exact keywords (error codes, proper names); pure keyword search misses semantic paraphrases. Hybrid fusion helps, but combining scores from incompatible distributions (cosine distance vs. BM25 rank) is non-trivial.

Temporal awareness. Documents accessed yesterday should rank differently from documents untouched for months. Most RAG systems treat all chunks equally regardless of usage history.

Confidence estimation. When every query returns results with uniformly high scores, the system cannot distinguish “I found something relevant” from “I returned the least irrelevant thing I have.”

We introduced `vstash` in v1 as a single-file system built on SQLite that addresses all three gaps. The key v1 insight was that adaptive RRF fusion – adjusting vector and keyword weights per query using IDF analysis – combined with MMR deduplication and distance-based relevance signaling, produces retrieval quality competitive with published baselines on standard benchmarks.

v2 adds a fourth, sharper gap. Existing retrieval systems optimize for benchmark performance, implicitly assuming a single embedding space generalizes across domains. Our results challenge this assumption.

Domain mismatch. A model that wins on BEIR (general-purpose retrieval) does not necessarily win on chat memory. In Section 6 we show that the v1 fine-tune (`Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v2`), which beats vanilla BGE-small on every BEIR dataset, *loses* to vanilla on the LongMemEval chat-memory benchmark (-0.0245 NDCG@10 on a 102-query stratified holdout). The fix – training a *domain-specific* fine-tune via real (question, gold-session) labels rather than chunk-prefix pseudo-queries – becomes the v2 headline result and motivates the new gated domain-adaptation loop exposed via the labeled-query retrain CLI (Section 5.6).

A cross-cutting observation. Across both BEIR and LongMemEval evaluations, the retrieval improvements we measure consistently concentrate at low K (R@1 through R@5), while R@50 saturates near 1.0 across all variants. This pattern suggests that modern embedding pipelines combined with hybrid retrieval already solve the coverage problem – the gold passage almost always appears within the top-50 candidates – and that the remaining headroom is rank precision, not retrieval breadth. We return to this observation in Sections 6.3 and 8.5.

Contributions

We organize our contributions around the v2 thesis. The v1 contributions are retained as the retrieval substrate on which v2 builds (enumerated below), but the central claim of this paper is that benchmark-quality retrieval does not transfer across domains, and that the deployable answer is a gated adaptation loop, not a single universal embedder.

Primary contributions (v2):

- (1) **Domain mismatch evidence.** Direct evidence that BEIR-tuned weights regress on chat-memory retrieval, motivating per-domain models rather than universal embedders.
- (2) **Eval-gated labeled-retrain mode.** A safety mechanism for continual domain adaptation: training accepts user-supplied (`query`, `gold`) JSONL labels, and the eval gate refuses to save candidates that regress on a held-out slice. We are not aware of prior open-source retrieval CLIs that combine these two properties.
- (3) **bge-small-rrf-lme-v1, a chat-memory specialist** validated against a calibrated late-interaction baseline.

The v1 contributions (self-supervised refinement, adaptive RRF, negative result on post-RRF scoring, and a deployable substrate with integrity checking, schema versioning, and observability) form the retrieval substrate; this paper develops the v2 loop on top of that substrate.

Secondary contributions include intra-document MMR deduplication, context expansion, distance-based relevance signaling, hybrid code-aware chunking, and the `vstash retrain` CLI command that wraps the full domain-tune pipeline.

2 Related Work

Memory for LLM agents. MemGPT (Packer et al. 2023) introduced virtual context management with explicit memory tiers. Mem0 (Chhikara et al. 2025) and Memoria (Sarin et al. 2025) provide production memory layers with cloud backends. A-MEM (Xu et al. 2025) uses agentic self-organization. Unlike these systems, `vstash` operates entirely locally with zero cloud dependencies.

Local-first agent memory. Several concurrent projects share `vstash`’s SQLite + hybrid search architecture: `palinode` (git-native markdown + sqlite-vec + RRF), `cpersona` (MCP server with 3-strategy RRF), `agentmem` (FTS5 + vector with adaptive ranking), and `sqlite-memory` (FTS5 + vector with offline sync). None publish formal NDCG evaluations on standard benchmarks. `neo4j-labs/agent-memory` takes an orthogonal approach with graph-native entity extraction and temporal knowledge graphs, targeting relational queries rather than dense retrieval.

Hybrid retrieval. Reciprocal Rank Fusion (Cormack et al. 2009) merges ranked lists without requiring comparable scores. Ma et al. (2024) showed RRF outperforms learned re-rankers on out-of-

domain data. Our contribution is adaptive per-query weight adjustment using IDF analysis, not explored in prior RRF work.

Hard negative mining for dense retrieval. The quality of dense retrieval models depends critically on the training signal. DPR (Karpukhin et al. 2020) established BM25 negatives for training dense retrievers. ANCE (Xiong et al. 2020) introduced asynchronous hard-negative mining from the model’s own approximate nearest neighbors. STAR (Zhan et al. 2021) refined this with a two-stage approach using relevance labels. More recently, NV-Retriever (Lee et al. 2024) and BGE-M3 (Chen et al. 2024) demonstrated that carefully curated hard negatives at scale produce state-of-the-art results on MTEB and BEIR. Our approach (Section 5) differs from this lineage in two respects: the training signal comes from disagreement between two retrieval modalities (dense and sparse) within the same system rather than from external relevance labels or model-internal mining, and the triples are generated at zero cost as a byproduct of normal hybrid retrieval. The closest precedent is BM25 negatives in DPR, but our signal is bidirectional, capturing both dense blind spots (chunks found by FTS but missed by vector) and lexical blind spots (the reverse), whereas DPR mines only in one direction.

Temporal decay in memory. The Ebbinghaus forgetting curve (1885) inspires exponential decay models. Zep (2025) uses temporal knowledge graphs; MaRS (2025) models cognitive forgetting. We explored decay directly in the scoring formula but found it did not improve retrieval quality on benchmarks (Section 7).

Chat-memory benchmarks (NEW in v2). LongMemEval (Wu et al. 2024) evaluates long-term memory in chat assistants across 500 questions in six categories: single-session-user / -assistant / -preference, multi-session, temporal-reasoning, and knowledge-update. Each question has a ~115K-token haystack of ~50 sessions and one or more gold session labels. Unlike conversational memory benchmarks that use synthetic distractors (e.g., DialFact-style perturbations), LongMemEval haystacks are real assistant conversations with controlled gold-session placement. We use it as the chat-memory testbed in Section 6.

Late-interaction retrievers. ColBERTv2 (Santhanam et al. 2022) and PLAID (Santhanam et al. 2022b) introduced a multi-vector retriever where each token gets its own embedding and similarity is computed via MaxSim. Section 8.8 evaluates ColBERTv2 against vstash on LongMemEval and BEIR. Because the official Stanford codebase has dependency requirements that conflicted with our target evaluation environment, we use a faithful HuggingFace re-implementation (raw `BertModel` + 768->128 linear projection + MaxSim einsum) and disclose a calibration band of ~0.04 NDCG@10 derived from BEIR (Appendix D).

Domain-specific dense retrievers. Prior work on domain adaptation for retrievers (GPL, Wang et al. 2022; PROMPTAGATOR, Dai et al. 2022) typically synthesizes queries via an LLM. Our labeled-retrain mode (Section 5.6) accepts real labels rather than synthetic queries, and refuses to save candidates that regress on a held-out slice – a stronger guarantee than synthesis-based methods which lack honest evaluation gates by construction.

3 System Architecture

vstash stores all data in a single SQLite database using WAL mode for concurrent read safety. The database contains five core tables: *documents* (metadata, hierarchical tags, source type), *chunks* (text segments with sequence numbers and access counters), *vec_chunks* (sqlite-vec virtual table for

ANN search, 384-dim float vectors), *fts_chunks* (FTS5 virtual table with Porter stemming), and *journal_entries* (append-only cross-session memory for agents). An auxiliary *profiles* table supports multi-DB profile resolution but does not participate in the retrieval flow (see Figure 2).




Figure 2: *vstash* architecture. Ingestion produces 384-dim embeddings and FTS5 indices into a single SQLite file; retrieval fuses both via RRF, then applies optional recency boost, MMR dedup, distance-based relevance signaling, and context expansion before exposing results through any of four client interfaces. (Carried over from v1.)

3.1 Ingestion

Documents are parsed via MarkItDown (PDF, DOCX, HTML, URLs) or read directly (code files). Text is split into chunks using semantic chunking or code-aware chunking (Appendix B) depending on source type. Chunks are embedded using FastEmbed (ONNX Runtime, BAAI/bge-small-en-v1.5) at approximately 700 chunks per second on CPU. Batch ingestion via `add_documents_batch()` amortizes transaction overhead for bulk loading.

3.2 Hybrid Search with RRF

Given a query q , we retrieve candidates from both indexes and fuse via Reciprocal Rank Fusion:

$$\text{RRF}(c) = w_v / (k + r_v(c)) + w_f / (k + r_f(c))$$

where $r_v(c)$ and $r_f(c)$ are the ranks of chunk c in vector and FTS5 results respectively, $k = 60$, and default weights $w_v = 0.6$, $w_f = 0.4$. These weights are overridden by adaptive IDF weighting (Section 4). Each query word is individually double-quoted and joined with OR, preventing FTS5 Boolean operator injection.

3.3 Intra-Document MMR Deduplication

After RRF ranking, multiple chunks from the same document often cluster in the top- k . We apply intra-document Maximal Marginal Relevance:

$$\text{MMR}(c) = L * \text{norm_score}(c) - (1 - L) * \max_{\{s \in S_d\}} \text{cos_sim}(\text{emb}(c), \text{emb}(s))$$

where S_d is the set of already-selected chunks from the same document d , and $L = 0.5$. Chunks from different documents compete purely on score. When the best remaining candidate has negative MMR, selection stops. This improves diversity from approximately 3.2 to 5.0 unique documents per top-5 while improving NDCG@5 from 0.814 to 0.829 (+1.8%).

3.4 Context Expansion

A single chunk (approximately 250 tokens) provides insufficient context for LLM answer generation. We expand each search result by fetching adjacent chunks (+/-1 by sequence number within the same document). Default window $w = 1$ yields 2.64x more text per result at +0.12 ms overhead.

3.5 Relevance Signal via Vector Distance

A retrieval system that always returns results – even for off-topic queries – must provide a confidence signal. We evaluated score spread (max - min of top- k scores) and the cosine distance of the best vector match. Score spread requires scoring warm-up and produces complete class overlap (F1 = 0.667); vector distance works from the first search with zero class overlap (F1 = 0.952). The signal was validated on 50,425 queries across the 5 BEIR datasets, with F1 ranging from 0.472 (intra- domain NFCorpus) to 0.996 (cross-domain ArguAna), establishing it as an effective off-topic detector rather than a universal relevance classifier. We implement a three-tier system: distance ≤ 0.95 (high confidence), 0.95-0.98 (medium, with uncertainty indicator), and > 0.98 (low, with explicit warning).

3.6 Production Substrate

The system includes integrity checking with five invariants and idempotent re-ingest, explicit schema versioning with forward- compatible config, and operational observability via a metrics registry, slow query log, and ranking `miss_analysis` API. Full details in Appendix A.

4 Adaptive RRF with IDF Weighting

Fixed RRF weights (0.6 vector, 0.4 FTS) assume all queries benefit equally from keyword matching. Evaluation on BEIR revealed this assumption fails on long, semantically-rich queries: on ArguAna (average 194 words), fixed weights score NDCG@10 = 0.3599 vs 0.4370 for adaptive IDF – a +21.4% relative gain for adaptive (Table 1) and the largest improvement of any of the 5 benchmarks, which is what motivates adaptive weighting.

4.1 Method

Adaptive RRF computes per-query weights using the mean IDF of Porter-stemmed query terms via a sigmoid function. High IDF (rare or technical terms) boosts FTS weight, directing the system toward exact keyword matching. Low IDF (common vocabulary) boosts vector weight, relying on

semantic similarity. The IDF vocabulary is built lazily from SQLite’s fts5vocab virtual table on first search and cached for the lifetime of the process; subsequent lookups are dictionary accesses with negligible overhead compared to the embedding call. The cache is invalidated on writes (see `VstashStore._invalidate_idf_cache` in `vstash/store.py`).

Additionally, long queries (>50 words) relax the distance cutoff from 1.15x to 5.0x the best match distance. This prevents the elimination of relevant results when embeddings are diffuse – long queries produce compressed distance distributions where the default cutoff is too aggressive.

4.2 Results

Table 1: Adaptive vs fixed RRF weights on 5 BEIR datasets (NDCG@10)

Dataset	Docs	Fixed (0.6/0.4)	Adaptive IDF	Delta
SciFact	5K	0.7255	0.7263	+0.1%
NFCorpus	3.6K	0.3525	0.3590	+1.8%
SciDocs	25K	0.1911	0.1943	+1.7%
FiQA	57K	0.3789	0.3917	+3.4%
ArguAna	8.7K	0.3599	0.4370	+21.4%*

* *ArguAna improvement is primarily from adaptive distance cutoff (5.0x vs 1.15x for 194-word queries).*

Adaptive RRF improves all 5 datasets with zero regression. The IDF-based sigmoid correctly identifies query regimes: technical terminology boosts FTS, common vocabulary defers to vector search. The distance cutoff was the primary bottleneck on ArguAna – long queries produce diffuse embeddings where distances compress into a narrow range, and the default cutoff eliminates relevant results.

5 Self-Supervised Embedding Refinement via Hybrid Retrieval Disagreement

5.1 Motivation

The hybrid retrieval pipeline produces a natural training signal: when vector search and FTS5 disagree on which chunks are relevant, the disagreement identifies cases where the dense encoder fails. We exploit this signal to fine-tune the embedding model without human labels.

5.2 Signal Analysis

Across 753 queries on 3 BEIR datasets (SciFact, NFCorpus, FiQA), 74.5% of queries produce top-10 disagreement between vector-heavy ($\text{vec}=0.95$, $\text{fts}=0.05$) and FTS-heavy ($\text{vec}=0.05$, $\text{fts}=0.95$) search (mean across the 3 datasets; the experiment is `experiments/rrf_training_pairs.py` with `TOP_K=10`, output in `experiments/results/rrf_training_pairs.stats.json`). The rate varies by corpus, consistent with each dataset’s query-vocabulary heterogeneity:

Dataset	Queries with gold	Queries with disagreement	Rate
SciFact (biomedical claims)	295	187	63.4%
NFCorpus (health/nutrition)	323	237	73.4%
FiQA (financial QA)	135	117	86.7%
Total (pooled)	753	541	71.8%
Mean of per-dataset rates			74.5%

The spread (63% to 87%) is itself informative: SciFact has the most homogeneous query vocabulary (scientific claim statements), so vector and FTS mostly agree; FiQA has the most heterogeneous (user questions phrased in many ways), so the modalities disagree far more often. This per-dataset variation motivates the model-specific triple generation used in Section 5.5 (a different embedding model has different blind spots). Hard negatives are balanced: 51% are chunks ranked high by vector but absent from FTS top-5 (dense blind spots), and 49% are the reverse (lexical blind spots). This yields 75,981 (query, positive, hard_negative) triples at zero labeling cost.

5.3 Training

BGE-small-en-v1.5 (33M params, 384d) was fine-tuned using MultipleNegativesRankingLoss (MNRL) for 2 epochs at lr=3e-6 with batch size 64. TripletLoss was evaluated first (lr=2e-5, 3 epochs) but caused severe degradation (-91.5% NDCG: 0.6464 -> 0.0550, Table 2). We note that the TripletLoss experiment used a higher learning rate (2e-5 vs 3e-6); however, we attribute the failure primarily to the loss function’s per-triplet gradient rather than the learning rate, as TripletLoss pushes individual negatives away while MNRL adjusts relationships across 64 documents simultaneously per batch, preserving global structure. MNRL with the same disagreement data and lower learning rate preserves the base model’s knowledge while learning from in-batch negatives.

5.4 Results

Table 2: Embedding fine-tune evolution (pre-v0.34 historical snapshots)

Approach	Loss	NDCG@10 SciFact	Result
BGE-small base	–	0.6464	baseline
TripletLoss (76K, 3ep)	Triplet	0.0550	-91.5% (destroyed)
MNRL batch-only (v1)	MNRL	0.6829	+5.6%
MNRL + hard neg (v2)	MNRL	0.6945	+7.4%

Historical snapshots showing the evolutionary path from base to v2. These numbers are pre-v0.34, before the cosine metric fix (#271/#272/#286) recalibrated `distance_cutoff` and `relevance_tier` thresholds. Current-code numbers for the published models (`bge-small-rrf-v2`, `bge-small-rrf-v3`, `bge-small-rrf-v4`) are in Table 4 (Section 8.3). The +7.4% SciFact lift cited in this table reflects the pre-fix pipeline; on post-v0.34 code the v2 lift over base is +2.6% on SciFact and +2.8% macro (Table 4). All numbers evaluated under identical conditions: sentence-transformers embedding backend, full vstash pipeline (adaptive RRF + FTS5 + MMR dedup), same BEIR SciFact corpus and queries. The progression shows that loss function choice is the critical variable, and explicit hard negatives from signal disagreement compound with the right loss function.

The complete comparison across all 5 BEIR datasets with published baselines is presented in Table 4 (Section 8.3).

Per-dataset specialization: v2 vs v3 vs v4. On post-v0.34 code, the three published vstash fine-tunes have meaningfully different per-dataset profiles (Table 4 reports the full numbers). v2 (76K disagreement triples dominated by SciFact/NFCorpus) leads on **NFCorpus (+13.9%, 95% CI [+0.0326, +0.0685])** – the dataset closest to its training distribution – but **statistically significantly regresses on FiQA (-3.8%, 95% CI [-0.0274, -0.0031])**, where its chunk-prefix synthetic queries do not resemble user-authored multi-sentence questions like “I’m 25, starting a job, should I open a Roth IRA?”. v3 (60K H-R9 multi-corpus, `temperature=0.5` sampling) trades some NFCorpus advantage for a strong **FiQA gain (+18.7%)** and the highest macro lift (+6.2%); v3’s training mix includes ~65% FiQA triples vs v2’s ~2%. v4 retrains the v3 recipe on post-v0.34 code (the corrected cosine metric); macro lift over base is **+4.9%** (95% CI [+3.7%, +6.1%], paired bootstrap, see Section 8.3 Table 4) with the largest gains on FiQA (+13.7%) and SciFact (+4.5%). Compared to v3, v4 has slightly higher point estimates on the held-out datasets (SciDocs +0.0017, ArguAna +0.0068), but those held-out lifts are individually within the bootstrap noise band: the v4-vs-base CIs on SciDocs and ArguAna cross zero, so the v4-vs-v3 directional advantage on held-out should be read as preliminary, not a significance claim.

ArguAna remains hard. All three fine-tunes deliver roughly neutral lifts on ArguAna (-1.1% to +0.8%) and stay below published ColBERTv2 (-5.3% to -8.4%). ArguAna queries are full-paragraph counter-arguments from debate – not keyword-like bag-of-words – and not represented in any vstash training distribution to date. We read this as a scope claim, not a failure: disagreement-mined data generalizes within claim/QA-style retrieval but does not cover argumentative-paraphrase retrieval. Matching ArguAna would require adding paragraph-style triples or labeled adversarial pairs. In v2 the labeled-query retrain mode (Section 5.6) lets users supply real queries from any target distribution and is the deployable route for distribution-specific tuning.

5.5 Key Findings

Loss function is the critical design choice. TripletLoss with any configuration destroyed the model or left it unchanged. MNRL with identical data produced consistent improvement. TripletLoss pushes individual negatives away with brute force, distorting the embedding space; MNRL adjusts relationships across 64 documents simultaneously per batch, preserving global structure.

Explicit hard negatives improve over batch-only negatives. When the disagreement signal provides a specific chunk that one search modality ranked high but the other ignored, passing it as an explicit negative yields +1-2% NDCG over relying solely on in-batch negatives.

The training signal transfers to near-in-domain evaluation, with caveats. Triples were generated from 3 datasets (SciFact, NFCorpus, FiQA) and the tuned models were evaluated on two held-out BEIR benchmarks: SciDocs (CS-paper citation recommendation) and ArguAna (paragraph-length counter-arguments). On post-v0.34 code, v4 (the recommended general default) gains +1.3% over BGE-small base on SciDocs and +0.4% on ArguAna; v3 gains +0.4% and -1.1% respectively (Table 4). Neither benchmark is a true stress test of cross-domain transfer: SciDocs is scientific papers, adjacent to SciFact’s biomedical abstracts; ArguAna is the only genuinely out-of-distribution benchmark in the set, and it is also where the smallest gains appear. We interpret this as evidence that the disagreement signal generalizes across nearby scientific and QA distributions, not as evidence of universal transfer. The v2-paper LongMemEval result (Section 6) is direct evidence in the opposite direction: the BEIR-tuned model regresses 2.45pp NDCG@10 on chat memory. This

motivates the labeled-retrain mode below.

Smart training data compensates for model size on most BEIR datasets. BGE-small tuned (v4, 33M params) matches or surpasses untrained BGE-base (110M params) on SciFact (+9.8%), NFCorpus (+7.1%), FiQA (+28.6%), and ArguAna (+3.9%); it ties on SciDocs (+0.2%). The v4 fine-tune at 3x fewer parameters and 3x lower memory than BGE-base wins on 5 of 5 datasets (versus v2 which won on 3 of 5 due to FiQA over-specialization). The disagreement signal is also model-specific: BGE-base produces only 1,371 triples (vs 76K for BGE-small in the v2 mining run), reflecting that the larger model already has fewer blind spots. Targeted training data selection can outweigh raw model capacity for hybrid retrieval, provided the training and evaluation distributions are reasonably aligned.

The improvement is free. No human labeling, no external LLM calls, no additional data. Any vstash user can generate triples from their own corpus via `vstash retrain`, which automates the full pipeline: pseudo-query generation, disagreement detection, triple extraction, and MNRL fine-tuning. Three BEIR-tuned models in the family are published on HuggingFace: `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v2` (76K MNRL + hard-neg, NFCorpus champion), `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v3` (60K H-R9 multi-corpus, pre-v0.34 reference snapshot), and `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v4` (post-v0.34 retrain of the v3 recipe, recommended default). A fourth model `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-lme-v1`, the chat-memory specialist trained via the labeled-retrain mode, is described in Section 6.

5.6 Labeled-Query Retrain: A Gated Domain-Adaptation Loop (NEW in v2)

We frame this mode as a *deployment-time safeguard for continual retraining*, distinct from training-time validation heuristics. Standard practice in dense retrieval – early stopping on a held-out split, model selection by best epoch – protects against overfitting *during* training. Our gate operates at a different layer: it protects the *deployed* model from being silently overwritten by a regressing candidate during repeated domain-adaptation cycles. In long-lived local-first systems where the embedder is retrained on user-supplied labels over months, silent regressions accumulate as catastrophic forgetting (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017) without the user noticing. The gate makes such regressions impossible to silently promote: a candidate that does not improve held-out NDCG@10 by at least `--min-gain` is retained for inspection but never replaces the active model.

Comparable adaptation tools differ on this axis. GPL (Wang et al. 2022) and Promptagator (Dai et al. 2022) generate synthetic queries via LLM but lack a promotion guard, leaving deployment decisions to the user. The contribution here is not the gate algorithm itself – which is a held-out NDCG comparison – but its integration as a default in a retrieval system’s adaptation loop.

We refer to the resulting cycle – *retrain -> evaluate on held-out labels -> gate on delta -> promote or discard* – as a **gated domain-adaptation loop**. Throughout the rest of the paper we use “the loop” as shorthand for this cycle. It converts domain adaptation from a one-shot research artifact into a repeatable, automatically-guarded production cycle.

Motivation. The chunk-prefix pseudo-query path (Section 5.2) generalizes to claim/QA-style retrieval but underperforms on distributions where queries do not resemble the first 200 characters of relevant documents (FiQA conversational queries, ArguAna paragraph counter-arguments, *and* chat-memory questions where the question and the gold session share entity references but not surface form). The fix is to train on real (`query`, `gold_doc_paths`) labels where the user supplies the labels rather than synthesizing them from chunks.

API. `vstash retrain v2` accepts two new flags:




Figure 1: Eval-gated labeled-retrain pipeline (Section 5.6). The held-out eval JSONL feeds `evaluate_model` directly; the candidate is promoted only if its NDCG@10 delta vs. the active model is at least `--min-gain` (default 0.0). Failed candidates are preserved at `.candidate/` for inspection but never overwrite the deployed model.

```

vstash retrain \
  --training-queries train.jsonl \
  --eval-queries     eval.jsonl   \
  --base-model       BAAI/bge-small-en-v1.5 \
  --output           ~/.vstash/models/my-domain-fine-tune
  
```

Each JSONL line is `{"query": str, "relevant_paths": [str, ...]}`. Training routes through `generate_labeled_triples_batched` (the v5 recipe): for each labeled query, the gold doc’s first chunk is the positive, and hard negatives are mined from vector-heavy / FTS-heavy top-K disagreement against non-gold docs in the corpus (see Appendix E.1 for the full mining procedure).

Eval gate. The held-out `--eval-queries` set drives a refuse-to-save policy: NDCG@10 is measured on the holdout for the base model and the fine-tuned candidate, and the candidate is promoted to `output_path` only if `delta_ndcg >= --min-gain` (default 0.0). Failed candidates are retained at `output_path.candidate/` for inspection but never replace the user’s active model. To our knowledge, we have not found prior open-source retrieval systems that combine user-supplied labeled retraining with an automatic refuse-to-save evaluation gate; existing domain adaptation tools (GPL, Promptagator) lack a comparable promotion guard.

Figure 1: Eval-gated labeled-retrain pipeline (Section 5.6). The held-out eval JSONL feeds

evaluate_model directly; the candidate is promoted only if its NDCG@10 delta vs the active model is at least `--min-gain` (default 0.0). Failed candidates are preserved at `.candidate/` for inspection but never overwrite the deployed model.

The labeled-query retrain mode is implemented as a CLI flag in `vstash/cli.py` with input validation, store-side path checks, and forwarding tests; full implementation details and test inventory are in Appendix E.

This labeled mode enables the case study in Section 6.

5.7 Cross-domain transfer failure of BEIR-tuned weights

Before describing the chat-memory case study, we report the result that motivated it. On the 102-query LongMemEval-s stratified holdout (Section 6.2), the BEIR-tuned fine-tune `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v2` achieves NDCG@10 = 0.5898, **lower** than vanilla BGE-small at 0.6143. The same v2 model surpasses vanilla on every BEIR dataset (Section 8.3) but actively *regresses* 2.8pp R@5 on LongMemEval temporal-reasoning specifically, the category where queries reference cross-session dates.

This is direct evidence that “best on BEIR” does not transfer to “best on chat memory” – at least within the cross-domain pair examined here – and that a universal fine-tune is suboptimal for memory systems hosting heterogeneous corpora. The remedy is per-domain models, fed by the labeled retrain mode.

Symmetric direction (Pareto-safe specialization). We tested whether the chat-tuned `bge-small-rrf-lme-v1` catastrophically regresses on BEIR. Paired bootstrap (B=1000, seed=42, paired by qid) of per-query NDCG@10 over the 5 BEIR datasets gives macro delta -0.0024 with 95% CI [-0.0050, +0.0002]; per-dataset CIs cross zero on all 5 datasets. Chat-tuning produces no detectable regression on general BEIR retrieval at this evaluation power – the gated loop applied to the target domain is a **Pareto-safe specialization** (gain in target, no measurable cost out-of-domain), not a one-way trade. The asymmetry is therefore in pattern as well as magnitude: BEIR-tune **hurts** chat memory by a measurable margin, but chat-tune does **not** measurably hurt general retrieval. Decision rule and bootstrap artifacts are in `experiments/results/asymmetry_decision_2026_04_28.md` and `experiments/paired_bootstrap_beir.py`.

6 Domain-Specific Fine-Tuning for Chat Memory: The LongMemEval Case Study (NEW in v2)

6.1 Setup

Benchmark. LongMemEval-s (Wu et al. 2024) v1: 500 questions x six question types (single-session-user, single-session-assistant, single-session-preference, multi-session, knowledge-update, temporal-reasoning), each with a ~50-session haystack averaging ~115K tokens. Gold session ids are provided per question (`answer_session_ids`). Some types have multiple gold sessions (multi-session: 2-5; knowledge-update: always 2; temporal-reasoning: 85% multi-gold), capping macro R@1 at a structural ceiling of 0.75.

Stratified split. Deterministic 80/20 split by `question_type` (seed 42, `experiments/lme_prepare_retrain.py:s` 398 train + 102 holdout, disjoint by construction. All headline claims rest only on the 102-query

holdout. Full N=500 numbers include 398 training questions and are reported as appendix data only (see Section 8.7 caveat).

Ingest. Each haystack session becomes one vstash document with path `{question_id}:{session_id}` (4,300 LongMemEval session_ids recur across multiple questions; without the namespace they would dedupe in the store and lose per-question gold semantics). Total corpus: 23,869 docs / 67,036 chunks.

Training. `vstash retrain --training-queries lme_train.jsonl --eval-queries lme_eval.jsonl --base-model BAAI/bge-small-en-v1.5 --bulk-mine --bulk-mine-device cuda` on a Colab T4 GPU. 398 labeled queries -> 5,000 (capped) labeled triples via `generate_labeled_triples_batched`. Two epochs at `lr=3e-6`, `batch=64`, AMP enabled, `seed=42`. Wall time ~12 minutes on T4.

What changed and what did not. All four arms in the LongMemEval evaluation use identical corpus, identical chunking, identical RRF weights, identical FTS5 configuration, and identical retrieval pipeline. The only variable across arms is the embedder weights. This isolates the embedding contribution from confounds in the retrieval substrate and rules out the common “improvement-by-pipeline-change” failure mode in retrieval benchmarking.

6.2 Eval-gated result

The labeled holdout drives the refuse-to-save policy. Two seeded runs produced effectively identical numbers (NDCG@10 0.6872 vs 0.6878, delta 0.0006), confirming reproducibility.

Model	NDCG@10	Delta vs vanilla
BAAI/bge-small-en-v1.5 (vanilla)	0.6143	–
Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v2 (BEIR-tuned, v1)	0.5898	-0.0245
bge-small-rrf-lme-v1 (chat-tuned, NEW)	0.6878	+0.0735
bge-small-rrf-lme-v1-from-v3	0.6766	+0.0623

The chat fine-tune lifts NDCG@10 by 11.85% relative (+7.35pp absolute) over vanilla. The gate correctly auto-promotes both candidates over the `min_gain=0.0` threshold and rejects the BEIR-tuned v2 (which would have regressed by -2.45pp had it been the candidate).

6.3 Holdout R@K breakdown

The headline claims of Section 6 rest on the holdout-clean 102-query slice. Train-set numbers are reported in Section 8.7 to show the contamination delta but are explicitly *not* used for abstract claims.

K	base BGE	v3 (BEIR)	lme-v1 (chat)	delta lme-v1 vs base
1	0.5209	0.5214	0.5552	+0.0343
3	0.8418	0.8505	0.8716	+0.0297
5	0.8905	0.9025	0.9284	+0.0379 (peak)
10	0.9634	0.9516	0.9658	+0.0025 (saturated)
20	0.9779	0.9833	0.9804	+0.0025 (saturated)
50	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0

Bootstrap confidence intervals (1000 paired resamples with replacement, seed 42):

K	Delta lme-v1 vs base	95% CI
1	+0.0343	[-0.0049, +0.0784]
3	+0.0297	[+0.0085, +0.0529]
5	+0.0379	[+0.0172, +0.0619]
10	+0.0025	[-0.0123, +0.0172]

R@3 and R@5 lifts are statistically significant at the 95% level on the n=102 holdout: their CIs lie strictly above zero. R@1 trends positive at +3.43pp but the 95% CI [-0.0049, +0.0784] narrowly crosses zero, so we report it as directional rather than significant – consistent with the structural ceiling (macro R@1 \leq 0.75, Section 6.5) leaving little room for a significance-grade lift on a 102-query slice. R@10’s CI crosses zero as expected (saturation: both arms already retrieve the gold session in the top-10 on ~96% of queries). Code in `experiments/lme_holdout_bootstrap.py`.

Pattern. The clean lift concentrates at low/mid K (R@1, R@3, R@5), with R@5 the largest and most robust delta. R@10 was already saturated for both arms (0.96+ vanilla); the chat fine-tune does not move it. This validates the failure-analysis hypothesis that motivated the work: ranking, not coverage, is the lever. R@50 = 1.000 across all four arms confirms the embedder always retrieves the gold session somewhere in the top-50; the chat fine-tune only lifts where it ranks within those.

6.4 Per question-type R@5 analysis

The macro R@5 +3.8pp lift is not uniform. Per `question_type` on the same holdout (n = holdout count per type):

Type	n	base	v3	lme-v1	lme-v1-from-v3
single-session-user	14	0.929	1.000 (+7.1pp)	0.929 (0.0pp)	1.000 (+7.1pp)
single-session-assistant	12	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
single-session-preference	6	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
multi-session	27	0.869	0.886 (+1.7pp)	0.938 (+6.9pp)	0.927 (+5.8pp)
knowledge-update	16	0.969	1.000 (+3.1pp)	1.000 (+3.1pp)	1.000 (+3.1pp)
temporal-reasoning	27	0.774	0.746 (-2.8pp)	0.829 (+5.6pp)	0.811 (+3.7pp)

The chat fine-tune does its work where the failure analysis predicted: multi-session (multiple gold sessions per question, lots of room to lift one ranking position) and temporal-reasoning (cross-session date references where surface form misleads). Single-session types are mostly already saturated at R@5 even on vanilla, leaving no headroom. The negative cell – v3 -2.8pp on temporal-reasoning – is the BEIR-tuned model’s largest regression on the holdout and is the per-type instance of the broader “BEIR doesn’t transfer” finding.

6.5 Methodology disclosure

We anticipate four reviewer questions and pre-empt them:

1. **Is the holdout disjoint from training?** Yes, by construction. 398 train + 102 holdout, no overlap. Code in `experiments/lme_prepare_retrain.py:stratified_split`.
2. **Is the macro R@1 of 0.55 unusually low?** No, given the structural ceiling. Three of six question types have multi-gold structure (multi-session 2-5, knowledge-update always 2, temporal-reasoning 85% multi-gold), capping macro R@1 at 0.75. The 0.55 holdout R@1 is 73% of that ceiling. Closing the remaining gap is future work (cross-encoder reranker over top-10, Section 10).
3. **Is the training data really label-only, no synthesis?** Yes. `--training-queries` consumes real (`question`, `answer_session_ids`) pairs; no LLM was called for query generation. The miner mines hard negatives from the haystack via vector / FTS disagreement (Section 5.6).
4. **What does the N=500 number prove vs the holdout?** The full-set numbers (Section 8.7) include 398 training questions and are partially memorisation. We disclose them in the appendix but the headline claims rest only on the 102-query holdout.

6.6 Reproducibility

Three commands reproduce the case study end-to-end: corpus preparation (~9 min on a 2024 Apple Silicon Mac), labeled retrain on a Colab T4 GPU (~12 min wall), and full-set scoring (~9 min local). The exact commands and the JSONL schemas are in Appendix E. Per-question result JSONs and the corpus database are committed under `experiments/results/`.

7 Negative Result: Post-RRF Scoring Does Not Improve Retrieval

We explored three strategies for post-RRF enhancement, all of which failed to improve NDCG on BEIR datasets. We document these negative results to prevent others from pursuing similar dead ends.

7.1 Frequency+Decay Reranking

After RRF retrieval, we applied a two-stage reranking combining normalized RRF scores with a frequency-decay signal:

$$\text{score}(c) = a * s_rrf(c) + b * \min(1, \log(1 + f(c)) / \log(1 + S))$$

where $f(c) = (1 + \text{access_count}(c)) * e^{(-L * \text{days_ago}(c))}$, a and b^* are semantic and memory weights, L is the decay rate, and $S = 100$ is a saturation constant. We evaluated 16 parameter configurations across 5 simulated access patterns.

Result: On BEIR SciFact (5K documents, 300 queries, 30 rounds of simulated Zipf-weighted usage, `experiments/scoring_lifecycle.py` with output in `experiments/results/scoring_lifecycle_scifact.json`) frequency+decay scoring degraded NDCG@10 relative to pure RRF (baseline NDCG@10 = 0.7263) on every configuration evaluated. The adaptive maturity gate (gamma activates at round 6 once the access-count max/mean ratio exceeds 8.0, peaks at gamma=0.48) limits the damage but still underperforms pure RRF: final NDCG@10 = 0.7150, a -1.6% delta (0.7150/0.7263 - 1). Fixed $b=0.5$ without the gate is far worse: final NDCG@10 = 0.661, a -9.0% delta. The fundamental problem is that access frequency is orthogonal to query-specific relevance – a frequently accessed chunk is not necessarily relevant to the current query. The full grid search and cold-start analysis are in Appendix C.

7.2 Cross-Encoder Reranking

Off-the-shelf cross-encoders (ms-marco-MiniLM, BGE-reranker-base) degraded NDCG by -0.3% to -3.1% while adding 560-2100 ms latency. The cross-encoders were trained on web search distributions that do not transfer well to the technical and scientific corpora evaluated. v2 future work (Section 10) revisits this finding for chat-memory specifically – the LongMemEval R@1 ceiling analysis suggests a domain-tuned cross-encoder over top-10 may yet pay off, but a generic cross-encoder did not on BEIR.

7.3 Recency Boost (Alternative)

Based on these negative results, we replaced the scoring pipeline with a simpler opt-in recency boost applied post-RRF: $boosted_score(c) = rrf_score(c) \times (1 + B \times e^{(-0.05 \times days_ago(c))})$. The boost is multiplicative (amplifies existing relevance rather than competing with it), opt-in ($B=0.0$ by default), and requires no maturity gate. This is available for agentic memory use cases where temporal proximity matters.

7.4 Lesson

The hybrid RRF pipeline with adaptive IDF weighting appears to be at its ceiling for the BGE-small embedding model. Gains come from improving the embedding (Sections 5 and 6), not from post-hoc reranking. We recommend investing in better embeddings – and, per the v2 evidence, *domain-specific* embeddings – over more complex scoring.

8 Experiments

8.1 Setup

Corpora. We evaluate on five corpora of increasing scale: (1) an LLM memory corpus of 24 arXiv papers (786 chunks), (2) a Wikipedia corpus of 17 mixed-domain articles (2,602 chunks), (3) 1,000 ArXiv ML papers from CShorten/ML-ArXiv-Papers (approximately 3,500 chunks), (4) BEIR SciFact with 5,183 biomedical documents and 300 human-annotated queries, and (5) a synthetic scale test reaching 50,000 chunks.

Metrics. NDCG@k, Precision@k, MRR, and search latency. For the relevance signal: F1 and Accuracy.

8.2 Ablation: RRF vs. Vector vs. FTS

Table 3a: Ablation – LLM memory corpus (24 papers, 786 chunks)

Mode	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	P@3	Latency
Vector-only	0.809	0.832	0.933	4.51 ms
FTS keyword	0.631	0.621	0.767	0.81 ms
Hybrid RRF	0.814	0.803	1.000	1.61 ms

Table 3b: Ablation – Wikipedia corpus (17 articles, 2,602 chunks)

Mode	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	P@3	Latency
Vector-only	0.742	0.742	0.667	21.0 ms
FTS keyword	0.699	0.699	0.583	1.94 ms
Hybrid RRF	0.758	0.758	0.633	4.78 ms

Relevance labels obtained via LLM judge (Qwen 3.5:9B) with partial human validation (27/30 agreement). An LLM judge was used here because the LLM memory corpus is a domain-specific collection (agent memory papers) structurally distinct from any BEIR dataset, and no standard relevance labels exist for it. These results are directional; the principal claims of this paper rest on BEIR benchmarks with human ground truth (Section 8.3) and the LongMemEval case study with provided gold labels (Section 6).

Hybrid RRF is the strongest modality on both corpora, achieving the highest NDCG@5 and perfect P@3 on the domain-specific corpus. The advantage is consistent across homogeneous and diverse corpora.

8.3 BEIR Baseline Comparison

Table 4: vstash vs published baselines on BEIR (NDCG@10, post-v0.34 code)

System	SciFact	NFCorpus	FiQA	SciDocs	ArguAna	Macro
BM25 / Elasticsearch	0.665	0.325	0.236	0.158	0.315	0.340
ColBERTv2 (published)	0.693	0.344	0.356	0.154	0.463	0.402
BGE-base untrained (110M, 768d)	0.6899	0.3462	0.3465	0.1968	0.4220	0.4203
vstash hybrid RRF (BGE-small base)	0.7251	0.3591	0.3917	0.1945	0.4367	0.4214
vstash hybrid RRF (bge-small-rrf-v2)	0.7438	0.4090	0.3767	0.1969	0.4400	0.4333
vstash hybrid RRF (bge-small-rrf-v3)	0.7705	0.3755	0.4648	0.1954	0.4318	0.4476
vstash hybrid RRF (bge-small-rrf-v4, post-v0.34 reference)	0.7575	0.3707	0.4455	0.1971	0.4386	0.4419
vs BGE-small base (v4 lift)	+4.5%	+3.2%	+ 13.7%	+1.3%	+0.4%	+ 4.9%
vs BGE-base untrained (v4)	+ 9.8%	+ 7.1%	+ 28.6%	+0.2%	+3.9%	+ 5.1%
vs ColBERTv2 published (v4)	+ 9.3%	+ 7.8%	+ 25.1%	+ 28.0%	-5.3%	+ 9.9%

Published baselines from the BEIR paper (Thakur et al., 2021). ColBERTv2 from Santhanam et al. (2022). All vstash rows use sentence-transformers as the embedding backend with the full vstash pipeline (adaptive RRF + FTS5 + MMR dedup), evaluated on the standard BEIR queries and relevance judgments on vstash 0.35 (post-v0.34 cosine fix). Three fine-tuned variants are reported: **bge-small-rrf-v2** (76K MNRL + hard-neg, Section 5.4), **bge-small-rrf-v3** (60K H-R9 multi-corpus, pre-v0.34 trained), and **bge-small-rrf-v4** (same recipe as v3 but retrained on post-v0.34 code; see Section 5.7 and the model card on HuggingFace for the validation experiment). v3 was trained against disagreement triples mined under pre-v0.34 cosine-metric assumptions (the

buggy L2-as-cosine threshold); v_4 retrains the same recipe under post- $v0.34$ conditions where the mining runs through the corrected cosine pipeline, and is the honest post-fix reference. Multi-seed v_4 retraining (seeds $\{0, 1, 42, 100\}$, recipe held identical, training-stochastic std on macro NDCG@10 = 0.0005) shows the v_3 vs v_4 macro gap (-0.0057) is **11 sigma above seed noise**, not within it; the gap is a real training-side effect of the cosine fix. Per-dataset, v_3 wins significantly on the three training-mix datasets (SciFact +9 sigma, NFCorpus +14 sigma, FiQA +27 sigma), v_4 wins significantly on held-out ArguAna (+13 sigma), and SciDocs is essentially tied (1.4 sigma). Reading: v_3 over-specialized to its training-mix distribution under the buggy mining pipeline; v_4 generalized slightly better to held-out distributions but at a small macro cost. Both models are published; users who want their training pipeline to match inference (post- $v0.34$) prefer v_4 , users who want peak macro on BEIR-mix datasets prefer v_3 . Per-domain specialization wins: v_2 leads on NFCorpus, v_3 leads on FiQA, v_4 is the recommended general default. Even the BGE-small base row already exceeds ColBERTv2 published macro (0.4214 vs 0.402, +4.8%), confirming that the pipeline contribution dominates the fine-tune contribution; the fine-tunes add a modest incremental edge for domain-specific use cases.

Bootstrap confidence intervals (paired by qid, B=1000, seed=42). The deltas in the v_4 lift rows are validated with paired bootstrap on per-query NDCG@10:

Dataset	v_4 vs base delta	95% CI	Significant?
SciFact	+0.0324	[+0.0168, +0.0511]	yes
NFCorpus	+0.0116	[+0.0020, +0.0213]	yes
FiQA	+0.0537	[+0.0383, +0.0697]	yes
SciDocs	+0.0025	[-0.0025, +0.0075]	no (CI crosses 0)
ArguAna	+0.0019	[-0.0042, +0.0087]	no (CI crosses 0)
macro	+0.0204	[+0.0154, +0.0256]	yes

Three of five per-dataset lifts are statistically significant at the 95% level; SciDocs and ArguAna are within noise. Macro lift is robustly positive (CI strictly above zero) at +4.9% relative to base. Bootstrap script and pre-committed decision rule are in `experiments/paired_bootstrap_beir.py` and `experiments/results/asymmetry_decision_2026_04_28.md`.

Comparison conditions. The ColBERTv2 NDCG@10 = 0.693 is from Santhanam et al. (2022) under the standard BEIR evaluation protocol. Our v_1 evaluation used the same queries and relevance judgments but differed in document preprocessing: vstash chunks documents using its semantic chunking pipeline (1024 tokens, 128 overlap) and embeds with BGE-small-en-v1.5 (or the fine-tuned variant), while ColBERTv2 operates on full documents with its own tokenization and late interaction mechanism. This Table 4 comparison remains indicative of pipeline-level performance, not a controlled head-to-head under identical preprocessing. Section 8.8 / 8.10 add the controlled same-machine head-to-head we promised as future work in v_1 , with the full minimal-HF calibration disclosure in Appendix D.

8.4 At-Scale Validation: 1,000 ArXiv Papers

Table 5: Hybrid RRF at scale – 1,000 ML papers, 35 topic-based queries

Model	Mode	P@5	NDCG@5	NDCG@10	MRR	Latency
BGE-base-EN (768d)	hybrid	0.703	0.728	0.702	0.895	9.1 ms
BGE-small-EN (384d)	hybrid	0.663	0.685	0.658	0.865	4.0 ms
BGE-small-EN (384d)	vector	0.614	0.619	0.568	0.822	2.3 ms
Multilingual-MiniLM (384d)	hybrid	0.606	0.638	0.611	0.868	4.3 ms
Multilingual-MiniLM (384d)	vector	0.600	0.588	0.508	0.820	2.6 ms

8.5 Latency at Scale

Table 6: Search latency across corpus sizes

Corpus	Chunks	Mean	Median	P95	P99
LLM memory (24 papers)	786	3.4 ms	3.4 ms	4.0 ms	4.1 ms
Real user corpus (209 docs)	1,087	5.0 ms	4.8 ms	8.1 ms	8.1 ms
BEIR SciFact (5,183 docs)	5,183	13.0 ms	11.1 ms	24.9 ms	47.8 ms
Synthetic scale test	10,000	11.6 ms	10.9 ms	19.0 ms	24.2 ms
SciFact + synthetic (50K)	50,000	22.1 ms	20.9 ms	30.6 ms	35.2 ms

The rightmost column reports the 99th percentile, not the maximum observation (an earlier draft mislabeled it as “Max”). Rows at 5K, 10K, and 50K chunks are pulled from the same at-scale run committed to `experiments/results/scale_benchmark.json`, so Tables 6 and 7 report consistent numbers for overlapping scales. The 786-chunk and 1,087-chunk rows come from separate smaller-corpus measurements and are reproduced here for qualitative comparison.

Table 7: NDCG@10 stability across scale

Scale	Total chunks	NDCG@10	Latency p50	Latency p95
1K	5,183	0.6891	11.1 ms	24.9 ms
5K	5,183	0.6891	10.2 ms	19.2 ms
10K	10,000	0.6849	10.9 ms	19.0 ms
50K	50,000	0.6897	20.9 ms	30.6 ms

Latency scales sub-linearly. NDCG@10 remains stable at 0.69 across all scales from 1K to 50K chunks.

8.6 End-to-End Answer Relevance

Table 8: Answer relevance – vstash full pipeline vs Chroma dense-only

Dataset	vstash mean	Chroma mean	Delta	Head-to- head	vstash score=0	Chroma score=0
SciFact (30q)	2.60/3.0	2.40/3.0	+8.3%	4-1 (25 ties)	1	3
NFCorpus (30q)	2.50/3.0	2.37/3.0	+5.6%	5-5 (20 ties)	3	4

*LLM judge: Qwen 3.5 9B (local). **The sample size ($N=30$ per dataset) is too small to draw statistical conclusions;** the +8.3% and +5.6% point estimates are directional only, not significance-tested. We include the table for reader context because the retrieval-level improvements in Table 4 predict that a better retrieval pipeline should produce better end-to-end answers, and the directional result is consistent with that prediction. The high tie rate (25/30 on SciFact, 20/30 on NFCorpus) indicates that the LLM judge rarely distinguishes the two systems at the answer level, limiting the sensitivity of this evaluation further. The zero-score columns are arguably the most informative row of the table: the tuned pipeline produced fewer catastrophic score=0 failures on both datasets (1 vs 3 on SciFact; 3 vs 4 on NFCorpus), which is the failure mode most likely to matter in a deployed memory layer. A properly powered end-to-end study ($N \geq 300$ per dataset, with bootstrapped confidence intervals) is left to future work.*

8.7 LongMemEval-s full $N=500$ (appendix)

The full 500-question set including the 398 training questions:

Model	R@1	R@3	R@5	R@10	R@20	R@50
base BGE (vstash hybrid)	0.5479	0.8619	0.9201	0.9657	0.9827	1.0000
v3 (BEIR-tuned, vstash hybrid)	0.5380	0.8602	0.9175	0.9620	0.9854	1.0000
lme-v1 (chat-tuned, vstash hybrid)	0.5762	0.9075	0.9551	0.9815	0.9887	1.0000
lme-v1-from-v3 (chat-tuned from v3)	0.5768	0.9056	0.9574	0.9780	0.9913	1.0000

The full-set R@10 lift of +1.58pp (lme-v1 vs base BGE) is **partially memorisation**: the 398 training questions are present in the test set. Restricting to the 102-query disjoint holdout (Section 6.3) yields a clean R@10 delta of only +0.0025 – R@10 saturates for both arms. The clean wins are at R@1 / R@3 / R@5 (Section 6.3, 6.4). Reporting both numbers transparently is the honest position.

8.8 Same-machine comparison against a calibrated late-interaction baseline

This section presents the controlled head-to-head against a late-interaction baseline that the v1 paper deferred to future work.

Setup. vstash hybrid (4 encoder arms) and ColBERTv2 evaluated on identical inputs: same haystack, same chunking (`chunk_text(1024, 128)`), same top-200 chunk pool, same session-level Recall@K dedup. ColBERTv2 inference goes through a faithful HuggingFace re-implementation (`experiments/colbert_minimal.py`, ~80 LOC: raw `BertModel` + 768->128 linear projection + manual MaxSim einsum + L2-normalize per token + [Q]/[D] marker token insertion at position 1 after [CLS]). Calibration on BEIR (Appendix D, Table D1) shows a systematic ~0.04 NDCG@10

implementation gap (mean across 4 datasets, ArguAna outlier excluded) vs Stanford published values.

We apply this gap as a one-sided calibration band when interpreting LongMemEval claims. Three claim categories:

SURVIVES the calibration band (reported as wins):

- LongMemEval R@1: **lme-v1 0.576 vs ColBERT-calibrated $\sim 0.559 = +1.6\text{pp}$** . Below the band, the raw delta is $+5.68\text{pp}$.
- Per-type R@10 single-session-user: lme-v1 1.000 vs ColBERT-calibrated $\sim 0.954 = +4.6\text{pp}$ (raw $+8.6\text{pp}$).
- Per-type R@10 single-session-preference: lme-v1 0.967 vs ColBERT-calibrated $\sim 0.907 = +6.0\text{pp}$ (raw $+10.0\text{pp}$).

MARGINAL post-calibration (reported neutrally, no “wins” language):

- R@5 macro: raw $+4.79\text{pp}$ \rightarrow calibrated $\sim +0.8\text{pp}$.

WITHIN the calibration band (NOT claimed as wins):

- R@10 macro: raw $+2.64\text{pp}$ \rightarrow calibrated $\sim -0.85\text{pp}$.
- “vanilla BGE > ColBERTv2 at R@10”: raw $+1.06\text{pp}$ \rightarrow calibrated $\sim -2.94\text{pp}$. This claim is intentionally absent from the abstract.
- Per-type R@10 multi-session ($+1.7\text{pp}$ raw) and temporal-reasoning ($+0.7\text{pp}$ raw): no-decision after calibration.

INDEPENDENT of implementation:

- **Latency** (Section 8.9 below): hardware-driven asymmetry, not affected by ColBERT re-implementation choice.
- **Domain mismatch** (Section 6.1): involves only vstash arms (vanilla and v3), no ColBERT comparison.

Our conclusions do not rely on outperforming ColBERTv2. The v2 thesis – that BEIR-tuned weights regress on chat memory and that domain-adapted models recover the loss – rests on (a) the domain-mismatch evidence in Section 5.7, which compares only vstash arms (vanilla and v3) against each other; and (b) the controlled improvements over a fixed BGE-small embedding baseline in Sections 6.3 and 6.4, with bootstrap CIs. The ColBERTv2 comparison provides a competitive reference point under explicit calibration disclosure but is not the load-bearing argument of the paper.

This stratification ensures that downstream interpretation of the LongMemEval comparison rests only on claims that exceed the empirically-derived calibration band by a defensible margin; the remaining claims are reported in the appendix as raw measurements without being asserted as wins.

8.9 Per-query search latency

vstash measured on a 2024 Mac (Apple Silicon, FastEmbed CPU embedder on a per-question 50-doc store). ColBERTv2 measured on a Colab T4 GPU. **Hardware is intentionally asymmetric in vstash’s favor:** a local-first claim must show CPU-only vstash beats GPU-only ColBERT to be useful in deployment.

Engine	P50	P99	mean
vstash base BGE	21	52	28
vstash v3 (BEIR-tuned)	26	223	33
vstash lme-v1 (chat-tuned)	27	70	30
vstash lme-v1-from-v3	26	105	30
ColBERTv2 (T4 GPU, minimal HF)	87	432	107

vstash hybrid is 3-4x faster at P50 and 4-8x faster at P99 than ColBERTv2 *despite running on CPU rather than GPU*. The chat fine-tune does not regress latency (lme-v1 P50 = 27 ms vs vanilla BGE 21 ms; the +6 ms is within run-to-run noise). The v3 P99 = 223 ms outlier is one long query where adaptive RRF expanded the FTS5 pool; it does not affect the median operating point.

8.10 BEIR controlled head-to-head (5 datasets)

Same-machine vstash hybrid vs minimal-HF ColBERTv2 on the 5 BEIR datasets, Mac Apple Silicon for vstash and Colab T4 for ColBERTv2:

Dataset	vstash NDCG@10	ColBERTv2 NDCG@10 (minimal HF)	ColBERTv2 (Stanford published)
SciFact	0.7286	0.6554	0.693
NFCorpus	0.3597	0.3251	0.344
FiQA	0.3919	0.3177	0.356
SciDocs	0.1960	0.1546	0.154
ArguAna	0.4357	0.3319	0.463

*Backend and code-version note. The vstash column uses the default FastEmbed (ONNX) embedding backend, the runtime used in production deployment. Table 4 (Section 8.3) reports sentence-transformers numbers for direct comparability with the BGE-base and ColBERTv2 references reported by their authors. Two effects compound across the two tables. (1) **v0.34 cosine metric fix.** vstash 0.34.0 (#271 / #272 / #286) rescaled `distance_cutoff` (1.15 to 1.3225) and `relevance_tier` thresholds (0.95/0.98 to 0.4513/0.4802) to match the actual cosine distance returned by `vec_chunks`; pre-v0.34 measurements ran the cutoff against L2-treated-as-cosine values, and the fix raises BGE-small NDCG@10 by roughly +0.02 to +0.08 per BEIR dataset retroactively on the same model weights. Earlier vstash measurements (Table 4 vstash rows) reflect the pre-fix pipeline; Table 8 in this section reflects post-fix code (v0.35). (2) **Residual ST-vs-FastEmbed numerical gap.** On post-v0.34 code the gap between sentence-transformers (PyTorch) and FastEmbed (ONNX) is $\sim +0.003$ NDCG@10 – an order of magnitude smaller than the cosine fix effect. Each table is internally controlled (single backend, single code version across all rows); within-table head-to-head conclusions are unaffected.*

In same-machine same-corpus evaluation against the minimal-HF re-implementation, vstash hybrid (with vanilla BGE-small as the embedder, *not* the BEIR-tuned variant from Section 5.4 / 8.3) outperforms ColBERTv2 on 5 of 5 BEIR datasets. Against the Stanford published reference numbers (which reflect the optimized pylate / PLAID inference path and not the minimal-HF re-implementation), the same vanilla-embedder vstash hybrid wins on 4 of 5 (SciFact +5.1%, NFCorpus +4.6%, FiQA +10.1%, SciDocs +27.3%) and loses on ArguAna (-5.9%). ArguAna is

a known outlier in cross-implementation comparisons (Wachsmuth et al. 2018 on near-duplicate query/corpus structure; Thakur et al. 2021 on BEIR variance across implementations); we report both comparisons transparently rather than picking the friendlier one.

9 Limitations

LLM judge for ablation labels, relevance signal domain dependence, scale beyond 50K, code chunking sample size, and multi-modal coverage. These limitations are inherited from v1 and discussed in v1 Section 8; they remain unchanged in v2.

ColBERTv2 reproduction. Section 8.8 / 8.10’s ColBERTv2 numbers come from a HuggingFace re-implementation, not the official Stanford codebase. Calibration on BEIR shows a ~ 0.04 NDCG@10 systematic gap (Appendix D). The headline LongMemEval R@1 win (+1.6pp post-calibration) survives this band; the R@10 macro and “vanilla BGE > ColBERT R@10” claims do not, and are not claimed. A re-evaluation through the official Stanford codebase or a maintained `pylate` release is left to future work; we expect it to close the BEIR calibration gap and either confirm or refine the LongMemEval claims.

LongMemEval scope. All chat-memory results are on LongMemEval-s. We do not claim that `bge-small-rrf-lme-v1` generalizes to other chat-memory benchmarks (e.g., LoCoMo, MultiSession-Chat). The labeled-retrain mode (Section 5.6) is the deployable artifact; users with a different chat-memory corpus should run their own retrain rather than reusing `bge-small-rrf-lme-v1` blindly.

R@1 ceiling. Macro holdout R@1 = 0.55 is 73% of the structural ceiling 0.75 imposed by multi-gold question types. Closing the remaining gap likely requires a cross-encoder reranker over top-10 (Section 10 future work), not further embedding refinement.

10 Conclusion

We presented vstash v2. The central contribution is evidence that benchmark-tuned retrievers regress on chat memory, together with a gated domain-adaptation loop that lets users produce per-domain fine-tunes without compromising deployed quality. The v1 contributions retained here – self-supervised disagreement training, adaptive RRF – form the substrate on which the v2 loop operates, and improve general retrieval quality on standard benchmarks; v2 demonstrates that such improvements do not transfer across domains, motivating the loop as the deployable artifact.

10.1 Contributions retained from v1

Self-supervised embedding refinement. Hybrid retrieval disagreement provides a free training signal. Mining disagreement triples from BEIR and fine-tuning BGE-small with MNRL yields the `bge-small-rrf-{v2, v3, v4}` family on HuggingFace, with v4 the recommended general default (post-v0.34 honest reference) lifting macro NDCG@10 by +4.9% over the BGE-small base on all 5 BEIR datasets. The hybrid pipeline with the BGE-small base alone already exceeds ColBERTv2 published macro (0.4214 vs 0.402, +4.8%); the fine-tune adds an incremental +4.9% on top. The substrate dominates the model contribution.

Adaptive RRF. IDF-based per-query weight adjustment improves NDCG@10 on all 5 BEIR datasets versus fixed weights, with the largest gain on long, semantically-rich queries (ArguAna +21.4%).

Negative result on post-RRF scoring. Frequency-decay, cross-encoder reranking, and history-augmented recall do not improve NDCG on BEIR. Gains come from improving the embedding, not from post-hoc reranking.

10.2 New contributions in v2

Eval-gated labeled retrain. The retrain CLI accepts user-supplied (`query`, `gold-doc`) JSONL files for both training and held-out evaluation, and refuses to save candidates that regress NDCG@10 on the holdout. This labeled mode underpins the v2 contributions: domain-specific fine-tuning becomes safe by default, and per-domain models become a deployable artifact rather than a research-paper artifact.

Domain matters more than universal model quality. The v1 BEIR fine-tune *loses* to vanilla BGE-small on LongMemEval (-0.0245 NDCG@10 holdout). This provides direct evidence that a single universal embedder is suboptimal for memory systems hosting heterogeneous corpora – at least within the cross-domain pair (BEIR, chat memory) examined here.

bge-small-rrf-lme-v1: chat-memory specialist. 398 labeled LongMemEval queries via the labeled retrain CLI lift holdout R@5 by +3.79pp (95% CI [+1.72, +6.19]) and R@3 by +2.97pp (95% CI [+0.85, +5.29]) over vanilla BGE-small; R@1 trends positive at +3.43pp but the 95% CI [-0.49, +7.84] crosses zero on the n=102 holdout. In a same-machine comparison against a minimal-HF ColBERTv2 re-implementation, the chat-tuned model leads R@1 by +1.6pp post-calibration (+5.68pp raw, with calibration band ~0.04 NDCG@10 derived from BEIR; Appendix D). Search latency is 27 ms median (70 ms P99) on the LongMemEval per-question stores – approximately 3x faster at P50 and 6x faster at P99 than the late-interaction baseline measured on a T4 GPU, despite vstash running on CPU.

Ranking, not coverage, is the lever. Across BEIR (Section 8.3) and LongMemEval (Section 6.3), recall@50 saturates near 1.0 for every variant we evaluate. The improvements we report concentrate at top-K positions (R@1 through R@5). We read this as evidence that the embedding-plus-RRF substrate has already absorbed the coverage problem, and that the remaining opportunity for retrieval research at this size class is rank precision – which is exactly where domain adaptation has the largest measurable impact in our experiments.

Future work. Four concrete next steps: (a) re-evaluate ColBERTv2 via the official Stanford codebase to remove the calibration band; (b) add a cross-encoder reranker over top-10 to close the R@1 gap (currently 73% of the structural ceiling) and push R@1 into significance on the holdout; (c) extend the labeled retrain mode to support LoRA adapters so that domain fine-tunes can be composed with general-purpose encoders without parameter-level forking; (d) investigate the mechanism of the small but training-stochastically- significant macro gap between v3 (pre-v0.34 trained) and v4 (post-v0.34 trained, multi-seed std 0.0005, see Section 5.4 retrain validation). The gap is 11 sigma above seed noise but its mechanism is conjectural – numerical-precision differences in the borderline hard-negative cutoff under L2-as-cosine vs real-cosine ranking. A targeted ablation comparing the actual mined triple sets pre- and post-fix would resolve whether the training data differs in composition (which negatives are admitted) or only in numerical labels (same triples, different metric values).

All code, the four published fine-tuned models (`Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v2`, `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v3`, `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-v4`, `Stffens/bge-small-rrf-lme-v1`), and reproducible experiment scripts are open-source.

More broadly, our results suggest that production memory systems benefit from a deployable adaptation loop rather than a single universal embedder. Three findings support this framing. First, the `vstash` hybrid substrate (adaptive RRF + corrected cosine metric + MMR) with a vanilla BGE-small base already exceeds ColBERTv2 published macro on the 5-dataset BEIR slice, so benchmark-competitive retrieval does not require a fine-tune. Second, BEIR-tuned weights regress on chat memory (-2.45pp NDCG@10 on the LongMemEval-s holdout), so a single embedder optimized for general-purpose benchmarks is suboptimal for the chat-memory distribution. Third, the symmetric direction is Pareto-safe: chat-tuning lifts target-domain R@5 by +3.79pp without measurable out-of-domain regression on BEIR (CI crosses zero on macro and all 5 datasets). The deployable artifact is therefore the gated loop applied to whichever domain the user deposits in their store – the substrate is the foundation, the loop is the specialization tool.

Appendix A: Production Substrate

A.1 Integrity and Recovery

A memory substrate must be honest about what survived a crash. `vstash` provides three mechanisms:

Idempotent ingest. `doc_completeness(path, collection)` classifies a document as *missing*, *partial*, or *complete*. Partial documents are dropped and re-ingested from scratch; complete documents are skipped. Re-running the same ingest command is safe and does not duplicate data.

Integrity check. Five invariants are verified: `chunk_count` parity, `vec/snapvec` parity, FTS5 index integrity (via the built-in FTS5 integrity-check command), orphan chunks, and SQLite `PRAGMA integrity_check`.

Integrity repair. Restores invariants without destroying user data: recomputes `chunk_count`, rebuilds FTS5, and deletes orphan chunks. Exposed via `vstash check [--repair] [--json]`.

A.2 Schema Versioning

A `SCHEMA_VERSION` constant is stamped into the `store_meta` table at database creation. A `KNOWN_SCHEMA_VERSIONS` set declares which on-disk versions the current build can safely open. Unknown future versions raise `SchemaVersionError` rather than silently degrading. Forward-compatible top-level config keys warn on unknown rather than hard-failing.

A.3 Operational Observability

An in-process metrics registry tracks counts and per-stage latency histograms. A slow query log captures searches exceeding a configurable threshold. A `miss_analysis()` API diagnoses why an expected document did not appear in results by tracing pipeline- stage elimination with rule-based suggestions; the same engine backs the v0.33 `vstash why` CLI. A `LimitsConfig` with seven knobs validates inputs at API boundaries, producing typed `LimitError` exceptions.

Appendix B: Code-Aware Chunking

Standard fixed-window chunking splits code mid-function, destroying semantic coherence. `vstash` uses a 3-tier hybrid splitting pipeline that selects the best available backend per language with graceful degradation:

Tier 1: `tree-sitter` (25+ languages) provides exact AST boundary detection. Optional dependency to avoid binary overhead for non-code users.

Tier 2: `parso` (Python only) provides AST-level splitting as a base dependency. Handles decorated functions, nested classes, and `async` definitions.

Tier 3: `regex` (Python, JS/TS, Go, Rust, Java) detects top-level definitions via column-0 patterns. The zero-indentation anchor avoids false positives on nested methods.

In all tiers, decorators and annotations are attached to their following definition. Oversized chunks fall back to paragraph then fixed-window splitting. The primary guarantee is zero boundary violations – no function is split mid-body.

Appendix C: Scoring Grid Search and Cold Start Analysis

C.1 Grid Search

We evaluate 16 parameter configurations across 5 simulated access patterns applied to the same 24-paper agent-memory corpus before retrieval. The patterns (defined in `experiments/scoring_grid.py`) are: (1) *uniform* (no access bias, the ingestion default), (2) *recent-focused* (recently-added papers accessed more), (3) *frequency-skewed* (Zipf-weighted access counts), (4) *mixed* (recent + frequent combined), and (5) *benchmark_focused* (evaluation/benchmarking papers accessed heavily, a power-user pattern). The “Best Scenario” column reports the largest NDCG@10 gain any configuration achieves on any of the 5 scenarios; for the top 5 rows, that peak is always on *benchmark_focused* because that scenario produces the most extreme access-count disparity and is where a frequency+decay score most visibly helps.

Table C1: Top-5 scoring configurations averaged across the 5 access scenarios

Configuration	Avg NDCG@10	Delta Baseline	Best Scenario
a=0.5, b=0.5, L=0.10	0.636	+4.6%	+16.1% (<i>benchmark_focused</i>)
a=0.5, b=0.5, L=0.05	0.634	+4.3%	+15.6% (<i>benchmark_focused</i>)
a=0.7, b=0.3, L=0.03	0.631	+3.8%	+13.2% (<i>benchmark_focused</i>)
a=0.7, b=0.3, L=0.07	0.629	+3.5%	+13.1% (<i>benchmark_focused</i>)
a=0.8, b=0.2, L=0.10	0.632	+3.9%	+7.2% (<i>benchmark_focused</i>)

Baseline NDCG@10 = 0.608. The apparent scoring benefit scales with access differential, but it vanishes on BEIR benchmarks with human-labeled relevance judgments (Section 7.1): the simulated access patterns over-fit to the specific popularity signal we injected rather than reflecting query-specific relevance, which is why we ultimately removed this family of scoring strategies.

C.2 Cold Start

On a corpus of 120 Wikipedia articles (919 chunks) with Zipf-weighted usage simulation over 30 rounds, fixed $b=0.5$ produces -0.4% degradation in early rounds. The adaptive maturity gate remains 0.0 across all 30 rounds because Zipf-weighted usage does not produce a sufficiently extreme outlier (max/mean ratio peaks at 5.0x, below the 8x activation threshold). The gate correctly suppresses scoring when access patterns do not warrant it.

Appendix D: ColBERTv2 Reproduction Calibration (NEW in v2)

This is the calibration data on which Section 8.8’s “+0.04 band” is based. We report all five BEIR datasets including ArguAna (known outlier in dense-retrieval reproduction comparisons).

Table D1: ColBERTv2 minimal HF vs Stanford published (NDCG@10)

Dataset	Stanford (Santhanam 2022)	Our minimal HF	Gap
SciFact	0.693	0.6554	-0.038
NFCorpus	0.344	0.3251	-0.019
FiQA	0.356	0.3177	-0.038
SciDocs	0.154	0.1546	+0.001
ArguAna	0.463	0.3319	-0.131 (out- lier)
Mean (all 5)			-0.045
Mean (excl. ArguAna)			-0.024

ArguAna disclosure. ArguAna is a known outlier in dense-retrieval reproduction. Wachsmuth et al. (2018, the corpus construction paper) note that the corpus contains near-duplicate counter-arguments where the gold passage is a paraphrased version of the query. Thakur et al. (2021, BEIR) report large variance in ArguAna metrics across implementations. We retain it in the calibration table to report all data, but flag it as known- unstable rather than evidence of broader implementation defect. Without ArguAna the four remaining datasets show a tight, uniform gap of -0.024 +/- 0.020 NDCG@10 attributable to tokenizer defaults, marker-token positioning, and padding handling in the minimal HF re-implementation.

Why minimal HF and not pylate / official ColBERT. pylate’s transitive dep fast-plaid hard-pins torch==2.9.0, which broke the Colab T4 cu128 stack across five different install strategies (including --no-deps pylate, --upgrade-strategy only-if-needed, explicit torchvision uninstall, and matched-pair cu128 reinstall). The official Stanford colbert-ai package has its own dependency requirements (faiss, specific sentence-transformers versions) that conflicted with our LongMemEval evaluation environment. Rather than ship a delayed paper while debugging dep cascades, we wrote a faithful re-implementation in ~80 LOC and disclose the calibration band.

We defer the official-codebase re-evaluation to future work. Should reviewers request it during revision, the calibration band can be replaced with direct measurements without altering the paper’s claim structure, since the LongMemEval R@1 win survives the band by a margin of +1.6pp; the marginal claims (R@5 macro, per-type R@10 on multi-session and temporal- reasoning) would either be promoted or formally retired according to what the official run produces.

Appendix E: Implementation Details and Reproduction (NEW in v2)

This appendix consolidates the engineering material that does not belong in the body but is necessary for reproduction.

E.1 Labeled-query retrain CLI

The `--training-queries` and `--eval-queries` flags accept JSONL files where each line is a single query record:

```
{"query": "what is the meaning of life", "relevant_paths": ["/notes/answer.md"]}
{"query": "how do mitochondria work", "relevant_paths": ["/biology/cell.md", "/biology/atp.md"]}
```

A shared loader (`_load_labeled_queries_jsonl` in `vstash/cli.py`) validates that each record has a non-empty `query` string and a non-empty list of non-empty `relevant_paths` strings, with line-numbered errors on failure. The loader is mutually-exclusive with the existing `--no-eval` flag, and emits a warning when `relevant_paths` reference document paths absent from the active store (those queries would otherwise score zero in NDCG silently).

The CLI test suite (`tests/test_cli_retrain.py`) covers the loader and the forwarding path with a monkey-patched `run_retrain` stub: 16 cases including invalid JSON, missing required keys, empty file, blank query strings, non-string relevant paths, a directory path passed instead of a file, and a parse error with line-numbered reporting.

E.2 Reproducing the LongMemEval case study

Three commands reproduce Section 6 end-to-end. Approximate wall- clock times are for a 2024 Apple Silicon Mac (corpus prep, full- set scoring) and a Colab T4 GPU (training):

```
# 1. Data prep (~9 min): ingest haystacks into one VstashStore
#    and emit train.jsonl + eval.jsonl
python -m experiments.lme_prepare_retrain \
    --output-db      experiments/lme_retrain_full.db \
    --output-train   experiments/results/lme_train.jsonl \
    --output-eval    experiments/results/lme_eval.jsonl \
    --output-meta    experiments/results/lme_retrain_meta.json

# 2. Train on Colab T4 (~12 min) with the eval gate active
VSTASH_DB_PATH=experiments/lme_retrain_full.db \
vstash retrain \
    --training-queries experiments/results/lme_train.jsonl \
    --eval-queries     experiments/results/lme_eval.jsonl \
    --base-model       BAAI/bge-small-en-v1.5 \
    --output           ~/.vstash/models/bge-small-rrf-lme-v1 \
    --bulk-mine --bulk-mine-device cuda

# 3. Score on full LongMemEval-s for the appendix table (~9 min)
python -m experiments.longmemeval_retrieval --all \
```

```
--model ~/.vstash/models/bge-small-rrf-lme-v1 \  
--output experiments/results/lme_full_500_lme-v1.json
```

E.3 Path namespacing for chat-memory ingest

LongMemEval session ids recur across questions (4,300 sessions appear in two or more haystacks). Ingesting with `path = session_id` causes the store to deduplicate sessions across questions, losing the per-question gold semantics. The prep script uses `path = "{question_id}:{session_id}"` to preserve cross-question isolation while still allowing direct mapping from labeled-query gold ids to store paths.

E.4 ColBERTv2 minimal HF re-implementation

The minimal HF re-implementation (`experiments/colbert_minimal.py`, ~80 LOC) loads the published `colbert-ir/colbertv2.0` checkpoint via `transformers.AutoModel`, manually loads the 768->128 linear projection from `model.safetensors`, inserts [Q] / [D] marker tokens at position 1 after [CLS], computes per-token L2- normalized embeddings, and scores via batched einsum MaxSim. It needs only `torch` and `transformers` – both pre-shipped on Colab T4 – and avoids the `pylate -> fast-plaid -> torch==2.9.0` dependency cascade that broke five Colab install attempts during development. The chunked-einsum score function avoids a 48 GB allocation on FiQA’s 57k-doc corpus by iterating over docs in slices of 128 with halving-retry on OOM.

The calibration table (Appendix D) is computed by running the same minimal HF on the 5 BEIR datasets and comparing against Santhanam et al. (2022) reference NDCG@10.

References

- [1] Carbonell, J., & Goldstein, J. (1998). The use of MMR, diversity-based reranking for reordering documents and producing summaries. *SIGIR*.
- [2] Chhikara, P., Khant, D., Aryan, S., & Singh, T. (2025). Mem0: Building production-ready AI agents with scalable long-term memory. *arXiv:2504.19413*.
- [3] Cormack, G. V., Clarke, C. L. A., & Butcher, S. (2009). Reciprocal rank fusion outperforms condorcet and individual rank learning methods. *SIGIR*.
- [4] Dai, Z., et al. (2022). Promptagator: Few-shot dense retrieval from 8 examples. *ICLR 2023*.
- [5] Ebbinghaus, H. (1885). *Über das Gedächtnis*. Duncker & Humblot.
- [6] Karpukhin, V., et al. (2020). Dense passage retrieval for open-domain question answering. *EMNLP*.
- [7] Khattab, O., & Zaharia, M. (2020). ColBERT: Efficient and effective passage search via contextualized late interaction over BERT. *SIGIR*.
- [8] Kirkpatrick, J., et al. (2017). Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *PNAS*.
- [9] Lee, M., et al. (2024). NV-Retriever: Improving text embedding models with effective hard-negative mining. *arXiv:2407.15831*.

- [10] Ma, X., Wang, Y., & Lin, J. (2024). Is reciprocal rank fusion all you need for hybrid retrieval? *arXiv preprint*.
- [11] Muennighoff, N., Tazi, N., Magne, L., & Reimers, N. (2023). MTEB: Massive Text Embedding Benchmark. *EACL*.
- [12] Packer, C., et al. (2023). MemGPT: Towards LLMs as operating systems. *arXiv:2310.08560*.
- [13] Reimers, N., & Gurevych, I. (2019). Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. *EMNLP*.
- [14] Rasmussen, P., Paliychuk, P., Beauvais, T., & Ryan, J. (2025). Zep: A temporal knowledge graph architecture for agent memory. *arXiv:2501.13956*.
- [15] Santhanam, K., et al. (2022). ColBERTv2: Effective and efficient retrieval via lightweight late interaction. *NAACL*.
- [16] Santhanam, K., et al. (2022b). PLAID: An efficient engine for late interaction retrieval. *CIKM*.
- [17] Sarin, S., Singh, L., Sarmah, B., & Mehta, D. (2025). Memoria: A scalable agentic memory framework for personalized conversational AI. *arXiv:2512.12686*.
- [18] Alqithami, S. (2025). Forgetful but Faithful: A cognitive memory architecture and benchmark for privacy-aware generative agents (MaRS). *arXiv:2512.12856*.
- [19] Thakur, N., et al. (2021). BEIR: A heterogeneous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks*.
- [20] Wachsmuth, H., et al. (2018). Retrieval of the best counterargument without prior topic knowledge. *ACL*.
- [21] Wang, K., Reimers, N., & Gurevych, I. (2022). GPL: Generative pseudo labeling for unsupervised domain adaptation of dense retrieval. *NAACL*.
- [22] Wu, D., et al. (2024). LongMemEval: Benchmarking chat assistants on long-term interactive memory. *arXiv:2410.10813*.
- [23] Xiong, L., et al. (2020). Approximate nearest neighbor negative contrastive learning for dense text retrieval. *ICLR 2021 (ANCE)*.
- [24] Xu, W., Liang, Z., Mei, K., & Gao, H. (2025). A-MEM: Agentic memory for LLM agents. *arXiv:2502.12110*.
- [25] Zhan, J., et al. (2021). Optimizing dense retrieval model training with hard negatives (STAR). *SIGIR*.
- [26] Chen, J., et al. (2024). BGE-M3: Multi-functionality, multi-linguality, and multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation. *arXiv:2402.03216*.
- [27] Dury, J. (2026). Predictive associative memory: Retrieval beyond similarity through temporal co-occurrence. *arXiv:2602.11322*.

Acknowledgments

vstash is the author’s open-source research project. All ideas, system architecture, retrieval algorithms, training methodology, evaluation design, and conclusions in this paper are original contributions of the author. Implementation work used standard tooling: Python, PyTorch, SQLite, and a large language model assistant (Anthropic Claude) for code generation and manuscript editing, in the same role a developer uses an IDE or compiler. All output was reviewed and edited by the author, who takes full responsibility for the content. vstash is built on sqlite-vec (Alex Garcia), FastEmbed (Qdrant), sentence-transformers, BAAI embedding models, tree-sitter, parso, and SQLite/FTS5. The BEIR evaluation suite (Thakur et al., 2021) provided the primary external benchmark. All experiments are reproducible from scripts in the project’s `experiments/` directory.