

Variance-Bounded Evaluation without Ground Truth: VB-Score

Kaihua Ding
Department of Statistics and Data Science
University of Pennsylvania
dkaihua@upenn.edu

September 30, 2025

Abstract

Reliable evaluation is a central challenge in machine learning when tasks lack ground truth labels or involve ambiguity and noise. Conventional frameworks—rooted in the Cranfield paradigm and label-based metrics—fail in such cases: they cannot assess how robustly a system performs under uncertain interpretations.

We introduce VB-Score, a variance-bounded evaluation framework that measures both effectiveness and robustness without requiring ground truth. Given a query or input, VB-Score enumerates plausible interpretations, assigns probabilities, and evaluates output by expected success penalized by variance, rewarding consistent performance across intents. We provide a formal analysis of VB-Score, establishing range, monotonicity, and stability properties, and relate it to risk-sensitive measures such as mean-variance utility.

Experiments on ambiguous queries and entity-centric retrieval tasks show that VB-Score surfaces robustness differences hidden by conventional metrics. By enabling reproducible, label-free evaluation, VB-Score offers a principled foundation for benchmarking ML systems in ambiguous or label-scarce domains. marking entity-centric retrieval in real-world, label-scarce conditions.

1 Introduction

Named entity linking in information retrieval remains a pervasive challenge in both industry and academia. In enterprise contexts, organizations frequently integrate data acquired from multiple vendors—for instance, pseudonymized or anonymized entity records with personally identifiable information (PII) removed, spanning consumer transactions, browsing histories, and operational logs. Reconciling such heterogeneous sources is complicated by ambiguous and inconsistent collection practices: vendors may employ divergent schemas or distinct pseudonymization/anonymization techniques, and analysts may adopt varying criteria for linkage, often yielding incomplete or partially inaccurate matches. Verification of the resulting data products is frequently infeasible, even after extensive linking efforts.

In academic contexts, I recently supervised a project that sought to link Federal Statistical Research Data Center (FSRDC) research abstracts to openly available publications based on reported data usage. This effort exposed several difficulties: author names may be shared by multiple individuals; dataset references may correspond to different versions (restricted vs. unrestricted) or even to entirely unrelated datasets maintained by other organizations such as National Institutes of Health, Kaggle, or Uber; and research outputs may be published under substantially different titles or topical domains. Most critically, unless validated through surveys or manual verification, the accuracy of such linkages remains uncertain. To assess reliability, we consulted FSRDC domain experts for a subset of samples, as well as the original authors and researchers.

These examples illustrate that named entity linking (NEL) is both common and crucial, yet often lacks a reliable ground truth for evaluation. Users typically express their information needs in terms of *named entities* (people, organizations, locations). When queries are ambiguous (e.g., “Jordan achievements”) or contain partially incorrect details (e.g., wrong employer or year), conventional evaluation—which assumes a single correct answer—becomes ill-posed. In practice, assessors may be unable to specify a unique ground truth, and even users may be uncertain of the intended entity. Existing NEL and named entity recognition (NER) benchmarks focus on supervised evaluation with gold-standard labels per mention (e.g., ACE, TAC KBP, CoNLL) [7, 8, 13] and evaluate precision/recall/F1 under strict matching. While these resources have driven progress, they leave a critical gap in evaluating *real-world* tasks where criteria are incomplete, ambiguous, or incorrect, and no ground truth exists. The classic Cranfield paradigm [5], which underpins modern IR evaluation, provides a systematic framework using relevance judgments, but it requires expert-labeled test collections that are financially costly and impractical in domains needing specialized or proprietary knowledge. For entity-centric retrieval, such annotation is even less feasible: many datasets are restricted (e.g., government or enterprise data) and lack public relevance labels. Recent work has explored automating evaluation with large language models (LLMs) [6, 15], but these methods remain fragile: LLMs may fail on tasks without ground truth and may never have seen restricted or rare datasets during training. This underscores the need for alternative frameworks, such as our proposed variance-bounded approach, that avoid dependence on complete expert judgments while still providing rigorous and reproducible evaluation.

This paper introduces a **Variance-Bounded** evaluation framework for named entity linking in IR (**VB-NEL-IR**). Instead of assuming one ground truth, we enumerate a set of plausible entity interpretations $\mathcal{E}(Q) = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ for a query Q , assign probabilities $P(E_i | Q)$ reflecting plausibility, and evaluate a system’s ranked list S by the expected success across interpretations. We further quantify *robustness* through a variance term that penalizes systems that satisfy only a narrow subset of plausible intents.

Our contributions are:

- A new problem formulation for evaluating entity-centric IR when retrieval criteria are incomplete/incorrect and ground truth is unavailable.
- *VB-Score*: an unsupervised, normalized metric that computes expected success across entity interpretations and can include a variance penalty to favor robustness.
- A candidate generation procedure combining entity linking with KB-backed constraint relaxation to capture plausible interpretations under ambiguity and error.
- Analysis and simulated case studies demonstrating behavior relative to traditional (ground truth) metrics and diversified IR measures.

2 The Case for Variance-Based Evaluation

2.1 What We Always Have in NEL-IR Tasks

In named entity linking and retrieval (NEL-IR), two fundamental components are always present. On the *input side*, we have the user query: text, requirements, and contextual information. On the *output side*, we have the system’s response: retrieved documents, linked entities, or task-specific results. Even when a definitive ground truth label is unavailable, unreliable, or impractical to obtain, these two components still provide valuable data distributions.

For the input side, we can characterize the variability of queries using descriptive statistics such as mean confidence, distribution of intent probabilities, or measures of ambiguity. For the output side, we can similarly quantify the distribution of retrieved entities and their associated confidence levels. Although

strict supervised evaluation (comparing outputs against gold labels) is not possible, we can still measure the statistical properties of both sides. This forms the basis for variance-based evaluation.

2.2 What We Lack in Practice

As discussed in Section 1, in practice we often lack precise ground truth labels or reliable expert judgments. Conventional evaluation metrics therefore cannot be applied directly. However, the availability of input and output distributions makes it possible to construct an alternative framework that evaluates system behavior without requiring explicit ground truth.

2.3 Desired Outcome

The practical goal of NEL-IR evaluation is to provide decision support under uncertainty. Practitioners typically want two outcomes: (i) to assess system performance sufficiently to make informed choices between candidate approaches, and (ii) to gain insight into how systems behave across different levels of ambiguity and error. Variance-aware measures serve both purposes: they provide a bounded range of performance that guides decision making and help characterize how robustly a system performs across uncertain scenarios.

2.4 Statistical Inspiration

In statistics, even without ground truth labels, one can describe populations by repeatedly sampling and analyzing the resulting distributions. Similarly, in NEL-IR we can treat queries as one population (inputs) and system outputs as another. By varying the input distribution (e.g., across plausible interpretations of ambiguous queries), we obtain corresponding variations in the output distribution. Repeated trials of this process, ideally randomized to avoid systematic bias, allow us to estimate how stable the system’s performance is. This motivates our variance-based approach: performance is evaluated not by comparing against a fixed gold label, but by characterizing the relationship between input variability and output robustness.

3 Framework

We call this the *variance-bounded evaluation framework* because it evaluates system performance under intent uncertainty using both the expected success (mean) and its variability (variance). The VB-score measures the average probability of satisfying a user intent, while the variance penalty bounds this score by robustness across all plausible interpretations.

3.1 Problem Setup and Notation

Let Q denote a user query for an entity-oriented IR task. Because Q may be ambiguous, underspecified, or partially incorrect, we assume there is a *set of plausible interpretations* (candidate entities) $\mathcal{E}(Q) = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ with a probability vector $\pi(Q) = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$, $\pi_i \equiv P(E_i | Q)$, $\sum_i \pi_i = 1$. A retrieval system returns a ranked list $S@k = [d_1, \dots, d_k]$. We write $\text{rel}(d, E) \in \{0, 1\}$ for whether result d is relevant to entity E (e.g., the page *about* E , or a document primarily describing E).

We conceive of two *observable populations*: (i) the **input population** of queries and their intent distributions $\pi(Q)$; and (ii) the **output population** of ranked results and their entity assignments $\phi(d) \in \mathcal{E}(Q)$ (obtained via entity linking on snippets or landing pages). Even without gold labels, these two populations admit stable descriptive and inferential statistics.

3.2 Input-Side: Candidate Intents and Probabilities

Input-side (query interpretation). This stage refines the query into a distribution over plausible entities—i.e., “which entity or entities could the user mean?” We construct the candidate set $\mathcal{E}(Q)$ and its probability distribution $\pi(Q)$ in three steps:

(1) Linking & Scoring to Generate Candidates. Apply an entity linker or KB-backed candidate generator to Q to produce candidates $\{(E_i, s_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where each E_i is a candidate entity and each s_i is a score produced by the linker. For example, linker produce a s_i score between s_i and E_i . Then, we record the candidate E_i as (E_i, s_i) . Convert scores $\{s_i\}$ to a probability vector π using a calibrated mapping (e.g., temperature-scaled softmax), $\pi_i \propto \exp(s_i/T)$, $\sum_i \pi_i = 1$, or other monotone calibration when development data is available. This provides a relative plausibility distribution over candidate entities. While temperature scaling or other calibration methods can be used when labeled development data is available, in this work we fix $T = 1$ to avoid introducing an additional hyperparameter and to remain consistent with our label-free evaluation setting.

(2) Constraint Relaxation. When Q specifies attributes (e.g., affiliation, year, role) that may not all be exactly matched in the KB, we evaluate entities by the *maximally satisfiable subset* of constraints. Let $C = \{c_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be the set of query constraints with nonnegative weights $w_j \geq 0$. For each candidate entity E , define a violation indicator

$$\mathbf{1}[\neg c_j(E)] = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } E \text{ violates constraint } c_j, \\ 0, & \text{if } E \text{ satisfies } c_j. \end{cases}$$

The total violation penalty is

$$\Delta(E) = \sum_{j=1}^m w_j \mathbf{1}[\neg c_j(E)].$$

A lower $\Delta(E)$ indicates that E satisfies a larger and more reliable subset of query constraints. Each weight w_j reflects the importance of the constraint; by default $w_j = 1$, but higher values can be assigned to more reliable attributes (e.g., identifiers over keywords). If no prior knowledge is available, uniform weights suffice.

We then normalize across the candidate set $\mathcal{E}(Q)$ to obtain a probability distribution:

$$\pi(E) = \frac{\exp(-\Delta(E))}{\sum_{E' \in \mathcal{E}(Q)} \exp(-\Delta(E'))}.$$

This ensures $\sum_{E \in \mathcal{E}(Q)} \pi(E) = 1$, assigning higher probability mass to entities that satisfy more constraints while still retaining partially matched candidates under uncertainty.

(3) Ambiguity Coverage & Deduplication. We preserve multiple plausible interpretations but remove negligible and duplicate candidates using explicit, reproducible rules.

(a) Truncation (negligible-mass removal). Let $\{\pi(E_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be the normalized probabilities over candidates. We keep candidates using one of the following equivalent criteria (report which you use):

1. *Fixed threshold:* retain E_i if $\pi(E_i) \geq \tau$ (e.g., $\tau = 0.05$).
2. *Top- K :* retain the K highest-probability candidates (e.g., $K \in \{3, 5\}$).
3. *Cumulative-mass cutoff:* sort by π descending and retain the smallest prefix whose cumulative mass $\geq \rho$ (e.g., $\rho = 0.95$).

After truncation, renormalize over the retained set so $\sum \pi(E_i) = 1$.

(b) Deduplication (canonicalization). To merge surface variants that refer to the same entity, we canonicalize candidates in three steps:

1. *KB identifier canonicalization:* map candidates to stable IDs (e.g., Wikidata QIDs) via alias tables and redirects; merge by summing probability mass, $\pi_{\text{merged}}(E) = \sum_{i: \text{id}(E_i)=\text{id}(E)} \pi(E_i)$.
2. *String normalization:* if no ID is available, normalize surface forms (casefolding, Unicode NFC, punctuation removal) and apply alias dictionaries.
3. *Semantic clustering:* if neither ID nor alias resolution applies, compare candidates by semantic similarity. We merge only under high-confidence agreement (cosine similarity ≥ 0.95 between embeddings, or LLM-estimated confidence $\geq 95\%$), then renormalize the distribution.

This yields a clean probability distribution over distinct entities, preserving genuine ambiguity while eliminating duplicates and noise.

3.3 Output-Side: Tagging and Per-Intent Gains

Output-side (retrieval evaluation). This stage assesses whether the retrieved results cover the plausible entity interpretations identified on the input side. Each retrieved item d_j is re-linked to an entity $\phi(d_j) \in \mathcal{E}(Q)$ (using snippet, title, landing page, etc.) so that system outputs are expressed in the same entity space as the query interpretations.

Define a per-intent *gain* at cutoff k as

$$g_i(S@k) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \mathbf{1}\{\phi(d_j) = E_i\},$$

which equals 1 if at least one of the top- k retrieved items matches entity E_i , and 0 otherwise. Thus $g_i(S@k)$ measures simple intent coverage.

A rank-sensitive variant weights matches by their rank position using discounted cumulative gain (DCG):

$$g_i^{\text{DCG}}(S@k) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\mathbf{1}\{\phi(d_j) = E_i\}}{\log_2(j+1)}.$$

After normalizing by the per-intent ideal DCG, this score lies in $[0, 1]$ and rewards systems that place relevant entities earlier in the ranking.

3.4 Variance-Bounded Metric

Given $(\mathcal{E}(Q), \pi(Q))$ and gains $\{g_i\}$, let $S = [d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k]$ denote the ranked list of the top- k documents returned by the system. We first define the *expected success* at cutoff k :

$$\text{ES}(Q, S@k) = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i(Q) g_i(S@k) \in [0, 1]. \quad (1)$$

In the binary-gain case $g_i \in \{0, 1\}$, this equals the probability that a randomly drawn intent $E_i \sim \pi(Q)$ finds at least one relevant item in the top- k .

Variance-Bounded Score. To incorporate robustness across intents, let X be the Bernoulli success indicator with $\mathbb{E}[X] = \text{ES}(Q, S@k)$. Its variance is

$$\text{Var}(X) = \text{ES}(Q, S@k)(1 - \text{ES}(Q, S@k)).$$

We then define the **Variance-Bounded Score (VB-Score)**:

$$\text{VB}_\alpha(Q, S@k) = \text{ES}(Q, S@k) - \alpha \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}, \quad \alpha \geq 0,$$

which lies in $[0, 1]$ and favors systems that perform consistently across plausible intents. In this work we set $\alpha = 1$ for simplicity, keeping the robustness penalty on the same scale as expected success. More generally, α serves as a tradeoff parameter: larger values emphasize stability across intents. In practice, reporting results for a small set (e.g., $\alpha \in \{0, 0.5, 1\}$) provides insight into robustness without ground truth tuning.

3.5 Estimating VB and Uncertainty in Practice

In the absence of ground truth, two main sources of uncertainty must be addressed: (i) estimation of the intent distribution $\pi(Q)$, and (ii) variability induced by paraphrasing, constraint relaxation, and stochasticity in entity linking. To quantify these, we adopt a Monte Carlo procedure with B replicas (Algorithm 1). Each replica perturbs the input side (query interpretations) and re-tags the system output, yielding a distribution of variance-bounded scores.

Formally, the expected success for query Q is estimated as

$$\widehat{\text{ES}}(Q, S@k) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \sum_{i=1}^{n_b} \pi_i^{(b)}(Q) g_i^{(b)}(S@k),$$

where replica b produces a candidate set $\mathcal{E}^{(b)}(Q)$, intent probabilities $\pi^{(b)}(Q)$, and re-tagged gains $g_i^{(b)}(S@k)$.

A nonparametric bootstrap across the B replica scores provides confidence intervals:

$$\text{CI}_{1-\delta} = \left[\widehat{\text{ES}} - z_{1-\delta/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{B}}, \widehat{\text{ES}} + z_{1-\delta/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{B}} \right],$$

where $\hat{\sigma}^2$ is the sample variance of replica scores and $\text{CI}_{1-\delta}$ is the confidence interval.

At the *collection level*, with query set \mathcal{Q} , we report macro-averaged results:

$$\text{VB@k}(S) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \widehat{\text{VB}}(Q, S@k),$$

with CIs obtained by resampling queries. If a small development set with partial labels exists, $\pi(Q)$ can be calibrated (e.g., Platt scaling, isotonic regression), and tagger precision for $\phi(d)$ validated. Otherwise, parameters such as the temperature T or constraint weights should be treated as sensitivity knobs, and results reported across a small range of values.

Algorithm 1: Monte Carlo estimation of variance-bounded evaluation for a single query.

Input: Query Q , retrieval system \mathcal{S} , cutoff k , number of replicas B **Output:** Estimated VB-score $\widehat{\text{VB}}(Q, S@k)$ with confidence intervals**for** $b \leftarrow 1$ **to** B **do**

// Input-side: candidate generation

 Generate $\mathcal{E}^{(b)}(Q)$ via linking, constraint relaxation, and ambiguity coverage; Compute probability distribution $\pi^{(b)}(Q)$;

// System run and output tagging

 Run system \mathcal{S} on Q to obtain $S@k$; Tag each $d_j \in S@k$ with entity $\phi^{(b)}(d_j) \in \mathcal{E}^{(b)}(Q)$;

// Replica scoring

 Compute per-intent gains $g_i^{(b)}(S@k)$; Compute replica score $\text{VB}^{(b)}(Q, S@k)$;**end****Aggregation:** average replica scores and compute bootstrap confidence intervals;

$$\widehat{\text{VB}}(Q, S@k) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \text{VB}^{(b)}(Q, S@k).$$

The algorithm above formalizes how replicas are generated and aggregated. It emphasizes that robustness is not inferred from a single run but from a distribution of perturbed interpretations. In this way, VB evaluation parallels established resampling methods in statistics, ensuring stability even without ground truth labels.

3.6 Flowchart Summary

To complement the algorithmic description, Figure 1 depicts the entire framework as a sequential pipeline. The process begins with query metadata, proceeds through candidate generation and intent probability assignment (A), continues with retrieval and tagging (B), evaluates with ES and VB metrics (C), and concludes with Monte Carlo replicas and bootstrap aggregation (D).

Each stage of the flowchart corresponds directly to a subsection above:

- Block (A) illustrates candidate enumeration, constraint relaxation, and ambiguity handling.
- Block (B) shows how retrieved results are aligned with candidate intents to compute per-intent gains.
- Block (C) captures the transition from gains to ES and VB-scores, highlighting the role of robustness penalties.
- Block (D) illustrates uncertainty quantification and aggregation into collection-level results.

This sequential diagram underscores that the VB-NEL-IR framework is both modular and reproducible: input interpretation, output tagging, metric computation, and uncertainty estimation are cleanly separated yet form a coherent pipeline.




Figure 1: Sequential VB-NEL-IR pipeline. Each stage (A–D) corresponds to query interpretation, output tagging, metric computation, and uncertainty aggregation.

4 Variance-Bounded Evaluation Results

The proposed framework produces three complementary outputs for each query Q : (i) a *point estimate* $\widehat{VB}(Q, S@k)$, which integrates expected success and the variance penalty to capture both effectiveness and robustness under intent uncertainty; (ii) a *robustness diagnostic*, reported as $\text{VarPenalty}(Q, S@k) = \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}$, indicating how evenly performance is distributed across plausible intents; and (iii) *uncertainty quantification*, obtained from Monte Carlo replicas and bootstrap confidence intervals (Algorithm 1).

At the collection level, results are aggregated as

$$VB@k(S) = \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{Q \in Q} \widehat{VB}(Q, S@k),$$

with confidence intervals estimated by resampling queries. This supports principled comparisons across systems and ablations without reliance on ground truth labels.

For interpretability and error analysis, we also report the most probable intent(s) $\arg \max_i \pi_i(Q)$ and their individual coverage in $S@k$. These additional diagnostics highlight whether a system succeeds on the dominant interpretation while remaining robust across lower-probability alternatives.

5 Case Studies

We illustrate the behavior of the proposed metric under two common scenarios.

Ambiguous Query: “Jordan achievements.” Candidate generation yields

$$\mathcal{E}(Q) = \{\text{Michael Jordan (athlete)}, \text{Michael I. Jordan (professor)}\}$$

with probabilities $\{0.8, 0.2\}$. A system that retrieves only athlete documents achieves $\widehat{\text{VB}} = 0.8$ but suffers a high variance penalty, reflecting its fragility for minority intents. By contrast, a diversified system covering both entities achieves $\widehat{\text{VB}} = 1.0$ with zero variance (binary setting), demonstrating that VB rewards robustness across plausible interpretations rather than narrow optimization.

Erroneous Attribute: “Professor John Doe at MIT.” Suppose the intended target is John Doe (Stanford). Candidate generation includes both MIT and Stanford professors, with probabilities $\{0.2, 0.8\}$. A literal system constrained by the incorrect attribute achieves $\widehat{\text{VB}} \approx 0.2$, reflecting failure to hedge against attribute error. A more robust system that retrieves documents about both candidates achieves $\widehat{\text{VB}} \approx 0.9$, showing that VB naturally favors systems resilient to query misspecification.

These examples highlight that the VB framework captures desiderata that conventional accuracy-based metrics miss: robustness to ambiguity and tolerance of noisy or incorrect query details.

Student Projects: FSRDC Research Linking. We applied the variance-bounded evaluation framework to eight student-built pipelines that attempted to link FSRDC project metadata (authors, abstracts, datasets) to open-access research publications. Each pipeline’s output set was treated as a system S , and intents were defined as the (author, abstract, dataset) triples from the provided metadata. Retrieved publications in each pipeline’s `ResearchOutputs_GroupX.xlsx` were re-linked to these intents, enabling computation of per-intent gains $g_i(S@k)$ and corresponding expected success (ES) and variance-bounded scores (VB_α).

Table 1 reports results at cutoff $k=10$ under a uniform prior over intents. The contrast across groups is striking. Group 5, which produced the largest and most consistent set of linked outputs, achieved the highest ES (0.723) and positive VB-scores even under increasing variance penalties, indicating robustness to intent uncertainty. Groups 1 and 2 achieved moderate ES values (0.169 and 0.425, respectively), but their VB-scores quickly degraded when α increased, showing vulnerability to uneven coverage. Groups 3, 6, and 7 scored near zero, reflecting pipelines that either failed to retrieve relevant publications or did so inconsistently. This quantitative summary highlights how VB-scores surface robustness differences across pipelines that raw ES alone would obscure.

Group	ES _{uniform}	VB _{α=0}	VB _{α=0.5}	VB _{α=1.0}
1	0.169	0.169	-0.018	-0.206
2	0.425	0.425	0.178	-0.069
3	0.004	0.004	-0.029	-0.062
4	0.074	0.074	-0.057	-0.188
5	0.723	0.723	0.500	0.276
6	0.025	0.025	-0.053	-0.131
7	0.003	0.003	-0.025	-0.054
8	0.046	0.046	-0.059	-0.163

Table 1: Expected success (ES) and VB-scores at $k = 10$ under uniform priors over intents.

Figure 2 explores sensitivity to ranking depth k . For weaker pipelines (Groups 3, 6, 7), ES remains close to zero regardless of cutoff, and VB-scores decline further once variance penalties are applied. By contrast, Group 5 maintains high ES across cutoffs and retains positive VB-scores even at $k = 10$, indicating robust coverage across intents. The intermediate pipelines (Groups 1, 2, 4, 8) show modest gains at higher k , but their VB-scores often fall below zero once robustness is enforced. This demonstrates that recall alone does not ensure robustness; systems must cover diverse intents early in the ranking.




Figure 2: Expected success (ES) and variance-bounded scores (VB_α) across cutoffs $k \in \{1, 3, 5, 10\}$ for each student pipeline under uniform priors.

Forest plots provide an additional perspective by showing bootstrap confidence intervals around group-level estimates. Figure 3 presents VB-scores with $\alpha = 1$ at $k = 10$. Only Group 5's confidence interval lies strictly above zero, confirming that it is the only pipeline robust under intent uncertainty. Groups 1 and 2 have intervals overlapping zero, reinforcing their fragility, while the remaining groups cluster tightly around zero. Figure 4 shows the same analysis for ES without variance penalties: here Groups 2 and 5 clearly stand out, but the distinction between robust and fragile pipelines is blurred. Together, these plots illustrate that variance-bounded metrics sharpen system comparisons by penalizing instability across intents.




Figure 4: Forest plot of ES at $k=10$ with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals across intents.




Figure 3: Forest plot of VB-scores ($\alpha = 1$) at $k=10$ with 95% bootstrap confidence intervals across intents.

Taken together, the table and figures demonstrate that variance-bounded evaluation yields a more nuanced view than point metrics alone. While ES captures average success, VB-scores reveal which pipelines achieve consistent coverage across intents versus those that succeed only narrowly or unreliably. This richer characterization is essential for benchmarking entity-centric retrieval in noisy, label-scarce domains such as FSRDC research linking.

6 Discussion

- **Advantages.** (i) Requires no manual relevance labels; (ii) directly addresses ambiguity and error in real-world queries; (iii) rewards diversified, robust system behavior that better reflects user satisfaction under uncertainty; (iv) provides interpretable diagnostics, including intent distributions, robustness penalties, and confidence intervals.
- **Limitations.** (i) Dependent on knowledge base coverage and entity linking quality; (ii) assumes a discrete intent set and may not capture fine-grained overlaps; (iii) binary success can understate ranking quality, though rank-aware gains mitigate this; (iv) does not explicitly model presupposition failure (e.g., queries about non-existent entities)—an avenue for future work.

7 Toward a Benchmark

We envision a benchmark where each query Q is paired with (i) a high-recall candidate set $\mathcal{E}(Q)$ obtained via automated linking and constraint relaxation, and (ii) a calibrated intent distribution $P(E_i | Q)$ validated through limited expert annotation or crowd agreement. Systems would be evaluated using $VB@k$, optionally with variance-penalized scores VB_α . This design parallels diversified IR evaluations—e.g., the TREC Web Track’s diversity task and intent-aware metrics such as α -nDCG and related per-intent measures—while addressing entity-centric ambiguity where traditional gold labels are undefined [1, 3, 4, 10]. For practical construction and light-touch validation of $P(E_i | Q)$, limited expert review can be complemented by crowdsourcing protocols shown effective for NLP judgments [11]; KB resources such as Wikidata can support candidate canonicalization and alias resolution [14]. Such a benchmark would provide a principled testbed for systems operating in noisy, label-scarce domains such as enterprise data integration or government statistics.

Future Work and Limitations

While this paper introduces the VB-Score framework and provides theoretical analysis and illustrative case studies, we recognize the importance of benchmarking against existing evaluation metrics such as α -nDCG [4, 10], ERR-IA [2], and traditional NDCG [9] on public datasets including the TREC Web Track [3] and BEIR [12].

We plan to extend this work by implementing such baselines and releasing code to facilitate reproducibility. The current version should be viewed as a methodological contribution establishing the variance-bounded evaluation paradigm, with benchmarking as the next stage of development.

8 Conclusion

We introduced a variance-bounded evaluation framework for entity linking in information retrieval that replaces reliance on single ground truth answers with expectation over automatically inferred entity interpretations. The VB-score combines effectiveness (expected success) with robustness (variance penalty), producing a normalized, unsupervised measure that better reflects real-world conditions. By encouraging systems that hedge across plausible intents, the framework aligns evaluation with the practical challenges of ambiguous and noisy entity-centric queries. We believe this approach lays the groundwork for future benchmarks and will facilitate more faithful progress in entity-oriented IR.

Reproducibility and Ethics. To support adoption, we recommend releasing candidate-generation code, intent distributions, and evaluation scripts. Ethical considerations include transparency about uncertainty, mitigating popularity biases in KB priors, and documenting how robustness metrics may affect downstream decisions.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks his students of the CIT-5900-002 course (Spring 2025, University of Pennsylvania) and the participants in the National Institute of Statistical Sciences (NISS) Federal Statistical Research Data Centers (FSRDC) capstone project on linking restricted-use data to public research publications. Their work directly inspired the development of this alternative evaluation framework for named entity linking in information retrieval under uncertainty without ground truth labels. The author also thanks Mr. Noah Abrahams’ generous support and guidance.

This research was supported in part by the Wharton AI & Analytics Initiative – AI Education Innovation Fund (2025–2026) and by the National Artificial Intelligence Research Resource (NAIRR) Pilot Classroom Allocation (2025–2026), Project ID: NAIRR250223.

Appendix: Short Proofs for VB-Score Properties

Setup. Fix a query Q with candidate entities $\mathcal{E}(Q) = \{E_1, \dots, E_n\}$ and probabilities $\pi(Q) = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$, $\sum_i \pi_i = 1$, and a ranked list $S@k$. Per-intent gains are $g_i(S@k) \in \{0, 1\}$ (or rank-normalized to $[0, 1]$). Define

$$\text{ES} = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i g_i(S@k), \quad \text{VB}_\alpha = \text{ES} - \alpha \sqrt{\text{ES}(1 - \text{ES})}.$$

A. Range, Bernoulli Interpretation, and Basic Bounds

Claim A1 (range and interpretation). $\text{ES} \in [0, 1]$ and $\text{VB}_\alpha \in [0, 1]$ for any $\alpha \geq 0$. If $I \sim \pi$ and $X = \mathbf{1}\{g_I(S@k) = 1\}$, then $X \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{ES})$ and $\text{Var}(X) = \text{ES}(1 - \text{ES})$, hence $\text{VB}_\alpha = \text{ES} - \alpha \sqrt{\text{Var}(X)}$.

Proof. Since $0 \leq g_i \leq 1$ and $\sum_i \pi_i = 1$, $0 \leq \text{ES} \leq 1$. With $I \sim \pi$ we have $\Pr(X=1) = \sum_i \pi_i g_i = \text{ES}$. Thus $\text{Var}(X) = \text{ES}(1 - \text{ES})$. Also $\text{VB}_\alpha \leq \text{ES} \leq 1$ and $\text{VB}_\alpha \geq \text{ES} - \alpha \sqrt{\text{ES}(1 - \text{ES})} \geq \text{ES} - \alpha/2$, using $\sqrt{\text{ES}(1 - \text{ES})} \leq 1/2$. \square

Claim A2 (two-sided bound). For any $\alpha \geq 0$, $\text{ES} - \alpha/2 \leq \text{VB}_\alpha \leq \text{ES} \leq 1$, with the lower bound tight at $\text{ES} = 1/2$. *Proof.* Immediate from Claim A1 and $\max_{p \in [0,1]} \sqrt{p(1-p)} = 1/2$. \square

B. Monotonicity Under Gain Improvements

Claim B1 (componentwise monotonicity). If $g'_i(S'@k) \geq g_i(S@k)$ for all i and some inequality is strict for an i with $\pi_i > 0$, then $\text{ES}(S'@k) > \text{ES}(S@k)$. Since $\text{VB}_\alpha(p) = p - \alpha \sqrt{p(1-p)}$ is nondecreasing in p except possibly in tiny neighborhoods near $p \rightarrow 0, 1$ for large α , VB_α also increases in typical IR regimes.

Proof. $\text{ES}' - \text{ES} = \sum_i \pi_i (g'_i - g_i) \geq 0$, strictly $>$ if some improved intent has $\pi_i > 0$. Monotonicity of VB_α follows from the derivative $d \text{VB}_\alpha / dp = 1 - \frac{\alpha(1-2p)}{2\sqrt{p(1-p)}}$. \square

C. Robustness to Probability Perturbations

Claim C1 (stability of ES). If $\|\pi - \pi'\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ then $|\text{ES}' - \text{ES}| \leq \varepsilon$. *Proof.* $|\text{ES}' - \text{ES}| = \left| \sum_i (\pi'_i - \pi_i) g_i \right| \leq \sum_i |\pi'_i - \pi_i| = \varepsilon$. \square

Claim C2 (conditional stability of VB_α). If additionally $ES, ES' \in [\tau, 1 - \tau]$ with $\tau \in (0, 1/2]$, then

$$|VB'_\alpha - VB_\alpha| \leq \varepsilon + \alpha \frac{1 - 2\tau}{2\sqrt{\tau(1 - \tau)}} \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Mean value theorem on $\sqrt{p(1 - p)}$ over $[\tau, 1 - \tau]$ and Claim C1. □

D. Concentration for the Monte Carlo Estimator

Claim D1 (Hoeffding bound). Let $\{\widehat{ES}^{(b)}\}_{b=1}^B$ be i.i.d. replica scores in $[0, 1]$ and $\widehat{ES} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_b \widehat{ES}^{(b)}$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\Pr(|\widehat{ES} - ES| \geq \epsilon) \leq 2 \exp(-2B\epsilon^2).$$

The same bound holds for the averaged \widehat{VB}_α .

Proof. Hoeffding's inequality for bounded i.i.d. variables. □

E. Depth Sensitivity (Cutoff k)

Claim E1 (nondecreasing ES in k). With fixed tagging, $g_i(S@k)$ is nondecreasing in k , hence $ES(Q, S@k)$ is nondecreasing in k by linearity in π . □

References

- [1] Rakesh Agrawal, Sreenivas Gollapudi, Alan Halverson, and Samuel Jeong. Diversifying search results. In *Proceedings of the Second ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '09)*, pages 5–14. ACM, 2009.
- [2] Olivier Chapelle, Donald Metzler, Ya Zhang, and Pierre Grinspan. Expected reciprocal rank for graded relevance. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, pages 621–630. ACM, 2009.
- [3] Charles L. A. Clarke, Nick Craswell, and Ian Soboroff. Overview of the trec 2009 web track. In *Proceedings of TREC 2009*. NIST, 2009.
- [4] Charles L. A. Clarke, Maheedhar Kolla, Gordon V. Cormack, Olga Vechtomova, Azin Ashkan, Stefan Büttcher, and Ian MacKinnon. Novelty and diversity in information retrieval evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 659–666. ACM, 2008.
- [5] Cyril W. Cleverdon. The cranfield tests on index language devices. *Aslib Proceedings*, 19(6):173–192, 1967.
- [6] Alexander Fabbri, Wojciech Kryściński, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, Richard Socher, and Dragomir Radev. Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:391–409, 2021.
- [7] Faegheh Hasibi, Krisztian Balog, and Svein Erik Bratsberg. Entity linking in queries: Tasks and evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '15)*, pages 1715–1718. ACM, 2015.

- [8] Heng Ji and Ralph Grishman. Knowledge base population: Successful approaches and challenges. In *ACL 2011 Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 3–6. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2011.
- [9] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of ir techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 20(4):422–446, 2002.
- [10] Tetsuya Sakai and Rongfei Song. Evaluating diversified search results using per-intent graded relevance. In *Proceedings of the 34th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1043–1052. ACM, 2011.
- [11] Rion Snow, Brendan O’Connor, Daniel Jurafsky, and Andrew Y. Ng. Cheap and fast—but is it good? evaluating non-expert annotations for natural language tasks. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2008)*, pages 254–263. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2008.
- [12] Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. Beir: A heterogeneous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. In *Proceedings of the 43rd European Conference on Information Retrieval (ECIR)*, pages 448–463. Springer, 2021.
- [13] Erik F. Tjong Kim Sang and Fien De Meulder. Introduction to the conll-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *Proceedings of CoNLL-2003*, pages 142–147. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2003.
- [14] Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch. Wikidata: A free collaborative knowledgebase. *Communications of the ACM*, 57(10):78–85, 2014.
- [15] Weizhe Wang et al. Alignbench: Benchmarking chinese alignment of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18743*, 2023.