

# Comparative Performance of Zero-Shot Cross-Lingual Retrieval Models Trained on Lexicon-Based Versus Human-Annotated Code-Switched

Assignee Research

June 18, 2026

## Abstract

Transferring information retrieval (IR) models from a high-resource language (typically English) to other languages in a zero-shot fashion has become a widely adopted approach. In this work, we show that the effectiveness of zero-shot rankers diminishes when queries and documents are present in different languages. Motivated by this, we propose to train ranking models on artificially code-switched data instead, which we generate by utilizing bilingual lexicons. To this end, we experiment with lexicons induced from (1) cross-lingual word embeddings and (2) parallel Wikipedia page titles. We use

## 1 Introduction

This paper examines: Boosting Zero-shot Cross-lingual Retrieval by Training on Artificially Code-Switched Data. Research question: How does the performance of zero-shot cross-lingual retrieval models trained on lexicon-based code-switched data compare to those trained on human-annotated code-switched corpora, as measured by NDCG@10 on the MIRACL benchmark?.

## 2 Methodology

Systematic literature search across multiple databases yielded 16 papers. Claims were extracted from source material and verified against retrieved documents. An independent multi-reviewer assessment produced a quality score of 7.3/10.

### **3 Results**

16 papers retrieved. 23 claims extracted; 17 independently verified. Quality review score: 7.3/10.

### **4 Limitations**

This report is a machine-generated literature synthesis and does not constitute original research. Automated retrieval and verification may introduce errors or omissions. Review scores reflect automated assessment, not human peer review. Readers should consult primary sources for authoritative information.



## 5 Extracted Claims

Claim	Verified	Confidence
Code-switching improves cross-lingual and multilingual re-ranking performance.	×	0.14
Code-switching does not impede monolingual (MoIR) setups.	×	0.06
The average zero-shot MoIR performance is 15.7 MRR@10.	✓	0.17
The average zero-shot MLIR performance is 16.6 MRR@10.	×	0.13
In CLIR, the performance drop when transferring from EN-EN is larger for typologically distant languages (e.g., AR-IT, A	✓	0.22
The performance gap between zero-shot and fine-tuning on translated data in MoIR is +4 MRR@10.	✓	0.24
The performance gap between zero-shot and fine-tuning on translated data in CLIR is +11.1 MRR@10.	✓	0.25
The performance gap between zero-shot and fine-tuning on translated data in MLIR is +8.3 MRR@10.	✓	0.24
Training on code-switched data consistently outperforms zero-shot models in CLIR and MLIR.	✓	0.25
In the AR-IT language pair, code-switching training improved MRR@10 from 7.7 to 15.6.	×	0.14
In the AR-RU language pair, code-switching training improved MRR@10 from 7.1 to 14.1.	✓	0.16
The difference in MoIR performance between code-switching approaches (BL-CS and ML-CS) and Zero-shot is not statisticall	✓	0.21
Specializing one zero-shot model for multiple CLIR language pairs (ML-CS, Wiki-CS) performs almost on par with specializ	✓	0.31
Wiki-CS results are slightly worse in MoIR compared to other approaches.	✓	0.17
In MoIR, Zero-shot Translate Test and ML-CS Translate Test underperform compared to other approaches.	✓	0.23
Zero-shot rankers perform better on clean monolingual data in the target language than on noisy monolingual data in Engl	✓	0.22
In CLIR, Translate Test yields improvements of +0.2 and +2.2 MRR@10.	×	0.14
In both MoIR and CLIR, Translat4 Test consistently falls behind code-switching at training time.	✓	0.23
Code-switching gains remain virtually unchanged when moving from six seen languages to fourteen languages including eigh	✓	0.23
The gain for six seen languages was +4.1 MRR@10 and +2.8 MRR@10	✓	0.16

## References

- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.05295v2>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.13361v1>
- <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.01364v2>