

MRVQ: One Resident Index for Dimension- and Rate-Elastic Vector Search

Sean Culatana
Atlassian
Mountain View, CA
sculatana@atlassian.com

Shang-En Huang
National Taiwan University
Taipei, Taiwan
sehuang@csie.ntu.edu.tw

Kang Li
Atlassian
Bellevue, WA
kli3@atlassian.com

Abstract

Dense-retrieval services must switch among embedding-prefix dimensions and index bit rates as latency, quality, and memory budgets change. Tuning a quantizer separately for each rate gives the best quality, but the retrieval tier then holds several code streams and quantizer states at once. We introduce **Matryoshka Residual Vector Quantization (MRVQ)**, a post-hoc residual quantizer for frozen embeddings. Its maximum-rate code can be truncated two ways: dropping residual stages lowers the rate, and dropping embedding coordinates lowers the dimension. One resident artifact therefore serves every (dimension, rate) pair we evaluate. Across FiQA and NFCorpus, four embedding families, and $\{4, 8, 16\}$ -byte codes, MRVQ is the lowest-RAM design we evaluate. It uses $17.8\text{--}22.0\times$ less memory than three separately trained QINCo2 indices, and $1.89\text{--}2.02\times$ less than a lean shared-model steelman. The saving is not free: per-rate QINCo2 is $0.026\text{--}0.107$ nDCG@10 better on FiQA. But MRVQ beats PQ, OPQ, and AdANNS-OPQ at matched code size. We also evaluate a low-build-cost PCA-scalar design that attains quality comparable to RaBitQ and its extension while fitting $420\times$ faster at the median. Finally, we report two negative results: QINCo2 collapses when trained at high rates, and a ranking-bound hypothesis misses its pre-specified acceptance criteria. MRVQ is therefore a low-memory operating point for elastic retrieval, not a universal quality winner.


1 Introduction

Dense retrieval is a first-class component of retrieval-augmented generation and agentic systems. For large corpora, the document embeddings and index state—rather than the query encoder—often dominate resident memory: a 768–1024 dimensional fp32 vector occupies 3–4 KB before indexing. That state must also support more than one operating point. *Dimension elasticity* uses prefixes of Matryoshka representations to trade retrieval quality for query compute and bandwidth [Kusupati et al., 2022, Rege et al., 2023]; *rate elasticity* changes the document code size to trade quality for storage. A high-quality deployment can tune a quantizer independently for each rate, but then the retrieval tier retains several code streams and model states at once.

We ask whether a single resident document code can cover both axes. **MRVQ** fits a residual vector quantizer post-hoc on frozen embeddings, weighting reconstruction error across the served prefix dimensions. Residual stages provide nested rates, and coordinate prefixes provide nested dimensions, so the same stored code supports every $(m, b) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{B}$ (Figure 1). This differs from AdANNS, which targets dimension-adaptive search, and from MatQuant, which nests model-weight precision rather than document-index codes [Nair et al., 2025]; Appendix E places MRVQ among quantizers for approximate search.

Rate-specialized deployment

one quantizer state and one code stream per rate



each rate-specific index still serves every prefix dimension


Resident: $P_4 + P_8 + P_{16} + 28n$ bytes

= 228.9 MiB


MRVQ

one maximum-rate code, truncated along two axes

1. stage prefix $\Rightarrow$ rate



2. coordinate prefix $\Rightarrow$ dimension



Resident: $4LKD + 16n$ bytes

= 12.88 MiB $17.8\times$ less

Figure 1: **Amortizing a rate-and-dimension menu.** A rate-specialized deployment keeps one quantizer state and one code stream per rate; each stream may still expose every embedding-prefix dimension. MRVQ stores one maximum-rate residual code: stage prefixes select 4/8/16 B/vector, and coordinate prefixes select the embedding dimension. The document-code term falls from $28n$ to $16n$ bytes, and sharing the quantizer state produces the larger measured saving (Table 1). Quoted totals are FiQA at $D = 768$.

Our contribution is a systems trade-off, not a claim of universal quality dominance. First, we formalize resident-memory accounting for a full rate menu and show that one MRVQ artifact is the lowest-RAM configuration evaluated. Second, we measure the corresponding quality cost against QINCo2 and the gains over standard ANN quantizers. Third, we evaluate a separate, inexpensive PCA-scalar design for hosts on which iterative quantizer training is undesirable. Finally, we report two negative results—high-rate QINCo2 training failures and a ranking-preservation predictor that does not meet our pre-specified bar.

2 MRVQ and Resident-Memory Model

Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^D$ be frozen document embeddings. An L -stage residual vector quantizer with $K = 256$ codewords per stage produces indices $z_i^{(1:L)}$ and reconstructions $\hat{x}_i^{(\ell)} = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} C_{z_i^{(j)}}^{(j)}$.

Because each stage index occupies one byte, decoding the first b stages gives a b -byte code. MRVQ makes the same code dimension-elastic by fitting the codebooks under

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{prefix}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}} w_m \left\| x_i^{[:m]} - \hat{x}_i^{(L)[:m]} \right\|_2^2, \quad w_m \geq 0, \quad \sum_m w_m = 1. \quad (1)$$

At serving time, (m, b) selects $\hat{x}_i^{(b)[:m]}$; no re-encoding and no additional document code is required. Queries remain in floating point and are scored asymmetrically, as in PQ/OPQ and RaBitQ.

For the evaluated $L = 16$, MRVQ’s resident state is $R_{\text{MRVQ}} = 4LKD + 16n$ bytes: fp32 codebooks plus one 16-byte code per vector. A deployment with a separate QINCo2 artifact for each $b \in \mathcal{B} = \{4, 8, 16\}$ costs $R_{\text{sep}} = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} (P_b + nb)$, where P_b is the corresponding model state; a shared-model steelman costs $R_{\text{shared}} = P_{16} + 16n$. The document-code term alone therefore changes from $28n$ to $16n$ bytes ($1.75\times$ asymptotically), and at the corpus sizes we evaluate, sharing the fixed quantizer state produces a much larger ratio. Appendix A reports the fixed and per-vector terms separately so the accounting can be checked at any n .

Table 1: Resident RAM (MiB) for the complete $\{4, 8, 16\}$ B/vector menu; ratios are relative to MRVQ. “Separate” retains one QINCo2 model and code stream per rate; “shared” is the leanest single-model steelman evaluated. Families that share an embedding width share a row because the accounting depends on D , not on the family.

Dataset	Family	D	MRVQ	QINCo2 separate	QINCo2 shared
FiQA	MPNet/Nomic/BGE	768	12.88	228.9 (17.8 $\times$)	25.17 (1.95 $\times$)
FiQA	Mxbai	1024	16.88	354.6 (21.0 $\times$)	31.85 (1.89 $\times$)
NFCorpus	MPNet/Nomic/BGE	768	12.06	227.4 (18.9 $\times$)	24.34 (2.02 $\times$)
NFCorpus	Mxbai	1024	16.06	353.2 (22.0 $\times$)	31.03 (1.93 $\times$)

We also study a separate **PCA-scalar** operating point: rotate by PCA, allocate scalar bits by coordinate variance, and quantize each coordinate independently. It requires an eigendecomposition but no iterative learned-codebook training; it is not included in the MRVQ memory accounting.

3 Evaluation

We use FiQA (57,638 documents, 648 queries) and NFCorpus (3,633 documents, 323 queries) from BEIR [Thakur et al., 2021]. The four embedding families are MPNet [Reimers and Gurevych, 2019] ($D = 768$), Mxbai [Lee et al., 2024] ($D = 1024$), Nomic [Nussbaum et al., 2024] ($D = 768$), and BGE [Xiao et al., 2023] ($D = 768$). Within each family, every method uses the same fixed, model-specific prefix menu $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \{128, 256, 384, 512, 768, 1024\}$, and a “menu mean” is the unweighted mean over that family’s evaluated prefix-rate cells. The prefix weights w_m in Eq. (1) are uniform over $\mathcal{M}$ and all 16 residual stages are weighted equally; Appendix F lists the exact checkpoints, menus, and fitting budget. Rates are $\mathcal{B} = \{4, 8, 16\}$ B/vector, or 192–1024 $\times$ smaller than the corresponding fp32 vector before fixed quantizer overhead.

The metric is nDCG@10. Learned baselines use matched fitting budgets, and their aggregated per-rate results reproduce the stored runs to floating-point tolerance (maximum absolute deviation 0 for MRVQ, 5×10^{-17} for QINCo2). We use paired per-query bootstrap confidence intervals (5000 resamples; 10,000 for the RaBitQ study). Decision thresholds for the negative-result tests were fixed before the final aggregate analyses. Reported RAM is analytical accounting from the byte formulas above—parameter and code bytes only, with no optimizer or runtime buffers—rather than measured process RSS.

4 Results

One artifact is the low-RAM corner. Table 1 prices the complete $\{4, 8, 16\}$ B/vector menu. MRVQ uses 12.06–16.88 MiB and is the lowest-RAM configuration for all four families on both datasets. Relative to three separate QINCo2 models, the saving is 17.8–22.0 $\times$; relative to the leanest shared-model configuration (including reduced embedding width and fp16 variants), it is 1.89–2.02 $\times$. The first ratio is largest at these on-device and per-tenant corpus scales because neural parameter state dominates the resident footprint (Appendix A). As n grows, the separate-model ratio approaches the $28/16 = 1.75\times$ code-stream ratio, while the shared-model gap becomes a fixed overhead and therefore less important; Figure 2(b) makes both limits explicit.

Quality forms a two-corner Pareto. At matched code size, separately trained QINCo2 [Huibben et al., 2024, Vallaes et al., 2025] beats MRVQ in every FiQA family-rate cell by 0.026–0.107 nDCG@10 (Appendix B). Conversely, even the shared-model QINCo2 steelman uses roughly 1.9 $\times$ MRVQ’s RAM at the evaluated corpus sizes. Figure 2(a) therefore shows two useful operating points rather than a single winner. The low-memory result repeats on NFCorpus for all four families.

Against standard fixed-code ANN baselines, MRVQ is stronger at matched bytes. Across the aggressive 4–16 B/vector regime, paired-bootstrap intervals favor MRVQ over per-prefix OPQ by about 0.06–0.07 nDCG@10, over PQ by 0.10–0.12, and over AdANNS-OPQ [Rege et al., 2023] in every evaluated cell. The practical rule is therefore constraint-dependent: choose QINCo2 when quality dominates, and MRVQ when resident memory prevents keeping several specialized artifacts.




Figure 2: **(a)** FiQA menu-mean nDCG@10 versus resident RAM for the full menu. MRVQ ($\circ$) occupies the low-memory corner and per-rate QINCo2 ($\square$) the high-quality corner; neither dominates on both axes. The dashed line marks the leanest shared-model QINCo2 RAM, whose quality we do not measure. **(b)** The same accounting as a function of corpus size at $D=768$. The advantage over per-rate QINCo2 decays from $\sim 18\times$ at the evaluated corpora to the $1.75\times$ code-stream asymptote, and the shared-model advantage falls below $1.1\times$ at $n=7.3\text{M}$ ($\blacktriangledown$).

A low-build-cost scalar alternative. We compare PCA-scalar with RaBitQ and Extended-RaBitQ [Gao and Long, 2024, Gao et al., 2024] using native Faiss 1.13.2 asymmetric cosine search on ℓ_2 -normalized vectors. At nominal $b \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ bits/dimension, the RaBitQ representation receives an additional 8/20/20 B/vector, so the byte accounting is conservative for PCA-scalar. Across the two aggregate query grids, pooled PCA-scalar – RaBitQ deltas are $+0.0076/ +0.0029/ +0.0010$ and $-0.0009/ +0.0012/ +0.0006$ nDCG@10 at $b = 1/2/4$. All absolute effects are below 0.008, and one Mxbai 1-bit cell favors RaBitQ by 0.0039; we therefore describe quality as comparable, not superior. Timed separately on three held-out BEIR corpora (18 cells, fixed 8-thread CPU), PCA training is $420\times$ faster than matched OPQ fitting at the median and $686\times$ at the mean, with a $47\text{--}1967\times$ spread: 0.17–6.95 s against 72–416 s. That makes it attractive for in-place rebuilds (Appendix C).

5 Limitations and Conclusion

Training reliability. On NFCorpus at 16 stages, per-rate QINCo2 suffers retrieval collapse—nDCG@10 below half the MRVQ value despite converged validation MSE—in 3/3 BGE seeds (best 0.035) and 1/3 Nomic seeds. The best surviving Nomic seed is also non-monotone in rate: 0.294 at 16 stages against 0.320 at 8. We retain these failures rather than silently dropping them.

No ranking certificate. A parameter-free predictor based on residual energy is directionally useful but misses our pre-specified acceptance bar: pooled rank correlation is 0.825 against a required 0.85, and only 72% of cells yield a non-vacuous bound against a required 90% (Appendix D).

Scope. The quality study covers two modest BEIR corpora and four embedding families. We measure resident memory and ranking quality, not end-to-end ANN latency, build energy, or recall-throughput curves; the RAM gains should not be read as speedups. At very large n the advantage over a shared-model baseline narrows as the accounting predicts.

Within that scope, MRVQ converts a dimension-and-rate menu from several rate-specialized resident artifacts into one post-hoc code. It pays a measurable quality cost to QINCo2, but beats standard ANN quantizers at matched bytes and occupies a distinct low-memory Pareto point. That is the intended systems contribution: a simple deployment option for elastic retrieval when resident memory, rather than peak quality, is the binding resource.

References

- Artem Babenko and Victor Lempitsky. Additive quantization for extreme vector compression. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2014.
- Jiayang Gao and Cheng Long. RaBitQ: Quantizing high-dimensional vectors with a theoretical error bound for approximate nearest neighbor search. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data*, 2024.
- Jiayang Gao, Yutong Gou, Yuexuan Xu, Yongyi Yang, Cheng Long, and Raymond Chi-Wing Wong. Practical and asymptotically optimal quantization of high-dimensional vectors in euclidean space for approximate nearest neighbor search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.09913*, 2024.
- Tiezheng Ge, Kaiming He, Qifa Ke, and Jian Sun. Optimized product quantization for approximate nearest neighbor search. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2013.
- Iris A. M. Huijben, Matthijs Douze, Matthew Muckley, Ruud J. G. van Sloun, and Jakob Verbeek. Residual quantization with implicit neural codebooks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024.
- Hervé Jégou, Matthijs Douze, and Cordelia Schmid. Product quantization for nearest neighbor search. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 33(1):117–128, 2011.
- Aditya Kusupati, Gantavya Bhatt, Aniket Rege, Matthew Wallingford, Aditya Sinha, Vivek Ramanujan, William Howard-Snyder, Kaifeng Chen, Sham Kakade, Prateek Jain, and Ali Farhadi. Matryoshka representation learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- Sean Lee, Aamir Shakir, Darius Koenig, and Julius Lipp. Open source strikes bread – new fluffy embedding model. Mixedbread research blog, 2024. URL <https://www.mixedbread.com/blog/mxbai-embed-large-v1>.
- Pranav Nair, Puranjay Datta, Jeff Dean, Prateek Jain, and Aditya Kusupati. Matryoshka quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.06786*, 2025.
- Zach Nussbaum, John X. Morris, Brandon Duderstadt, and Andriy Mulyar. Nomic embed: Training a reproducible long context text embedder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01613*, 2024.
- Aniket Rege, Aditya Kusupati, Sharan Ranjit S, Alan Fan, Qingqing Cao, Sham Kakade, Prateek Jain, and Ali Farhadi. AdANNS: A framework for adaptive semantic search. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence embeddings using Siamese BERT-networks. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2019.
- Nandan Thakur, Nils Reimers, Andreas Rücklé, Abhishek Srivastava, and Iryna Gurevych. BEIR: A heterogeneous benchmark for zero-shot evaluation of information retrieval models. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2021.
- Théophane Vallaes, Matthew Muckley, Jakob Verbeek, and Matthijs Douze. QINCo2: Vector compression and search with improved implicit neural codebooks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.03078*, 2025.
- Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, Niklas Muennighoff, Defu Lian, and Jian-Yun Nie. C-Pack: Packed resources for general chinese embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07597*, 2023.

A Resident-memory accounting and scaling

Table 2 separates each configuration’s resident state into a fixed term and a per-vector term, so Table 1 can be reconstructed at any corpus size. The MRVQ fixed term is $4LKD$ bytes exactly. The separate-rate QINCo2 term counts three rate-specific models ($d_e = D$, $d_h = 256$, $K = 256$, $A = 16$, $B = 32$, two sub-layers, fp32); at $D = 768$ these hold 7.28M, 16.72M, and 35.60M parameters, so $4 \sum_b P_b = 227.3$ MiB. The shared-model steelman is a single maximum-rate QINCo2 with $d_e = 128$ in fp16, prefix-truncated to serve 4/8/16 B/vector. All terms count parameter bytes only. Figure 3 shows the resulting split at FiQA scale, where the fixed state accounts for over 93% of resident bytes in every configuration.

Because MRVQ and the shared-model steelman carry the same $16n$ slope, their difference is a constant 12.29 MiB at $D = 768$: MRVQ stays more than $1.1\times$ smaller through $n \approx 7.3$ M vectors, and the gap is under 8% beyond about 10M vectors. The separate-rate menu instead carries a $28n$ slope, so its ratio to MRVQ decays toward $28/16 = 1.75\times$ rather than to parity.

Table 2: Resident-state decomposition behind Table 1. $L = 16$ stages, $K = 256$ codewords per stage.

Configuration	Resident state	Fixed term (MiB)		Per-vector (B/vector)
		$D = 768$	$D = 1024$	
MRVQ, one artifact	$4LKD + 16n$	12.00	16.00	16
QINCo2, separate rates	$\sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}} P_b + 28n$	227.3	353.1	28
QINCo2, shared model	$P_{16} + 16n$	24.29	30.97	16




Figure 3: FiQA ($n = 57.6$ k) resident RAM for the full rate menu, split into fixed model or codebook state and the document codes that grow with n . The code term is a thin sliver at this corpus size, which is why the measured ratios in Table 1 are far above the asymptotic $1.75\times$.

B Full matched-byte quality grid

Table 3 reports FiQA MRVQ – QINCo2 nDCG@10 at matched code size. All paired-bootstrap intervals favor QINCo2; the values quantify the quality cost of sharing one code across the whole menu.

C PCA-scalar versus RaBitQ

Figure 4 plots the matched-nominal-bit deltas summarized in Section 4. The pre-specified practical-equivalence band was ± 0.005 nDCG@10. The pooled results are small, but the 1-bit small-grid mean and its whole confidence interval lie above that band, which is why the main text says “comparable” rather than claiming formal equivalence. Note also that the two grids disagree in sign at 1 bit.

Table 3: FiQA MRVQ – QINCo2 nDCG@10 at matched bytes. Negative values favor QINCo2.

Family	4 B/vector	8 B/vector	16 B/vector	Rate mean
MPNet	−0.042	−0.051	−0.069	−0.054
Mxbai	−0.063	−0.107	−0.084	−0.085
Nomic	−0.042	−0.057	−0.050	−0.050
BGE	−0.026	−0.053	−0.070	−0.050

The fitting-speed comparison is timed on ArguAna, Quora, and SciDocs rather than on FiQA and NFCorpus, so it characterizes the two fitting procedures rather than the specific indices evaluated above. Across those 18 cells, PCA training takes 0.17–6.95 s against 72–416 s for matched OPQ fitting; the ratio has median 420 $\times$ and mean 686 $\times$, ranging from 47 $\times$ to 1967 $\times$. We quote the median in the main text because the mean is inflated by the largest corpus-model pairs.




Figure 4: PCA-scalar – RaBitQ / Extended-RaBitQ nDCG@10 at matched nominal bits per dimension, with 95% paired-bootstrap intervals. Positive values favor PCA-scalar; the shaded region is the pre-specified ± 0.005 practical-equivalence band.

D Ranking-preservation predictor

The tested predictor is $\epsilon(r) = \sqrt{D(r)}$, where $D(r) = \mathbb{E}_i \|x_i - x_i^{(r)}\|_2^2$ and $\|q\|_2 = 1$; Cauchy–Schwarz then bounds RMS score perturbation by $\epsilon(r)$. The sweep covers 40 cells: two datasets, four families, and five rates $\{1, 2, 4, 8, 16\}$ B/vector. This rate set deliberately extends below the $\mathcal{B} = \{4, 8, 16\}$ serving menu of the main text, because a bound that is only meaningful at generous rates would be of little use. Fixed-rate cross-geometry Spearman correlation is 0.66, pooled predictor–gap Spearman correlation is 0.825, and only 72% of cells have a non-vacuous bound. Both aggregate statistics miss the pre-specified acceptance thresholds. Normalizing by $\mathbb{E}\|x\|_2^2$ removes a scale confound from unnormalized Mxbai embeddings but does not change the verdict.

E Related work

PQ, OPQ, and additive quantization are standard fixed-rate compressors [Jégou et al., 2011, Ge et al., 2013, Babenko and Lempitsky, 2014]. QINCo/QINCo2 use implicit neural codebooks to improve rate–distortion performance [Huijben et al., 2024, Vallaeyes et al., 2025]. RaBitQ and its extension provide scalar-quantization methods with error guarantees [Gao and Long, 2024, Gao et al., 2024]. Matryoshka representation learning and AdANNS expose dimension elasticity [Kusupati et al., 2022, Rege et al., 2023], while MatQuant nests model-weight bit widths [Nair et al., 2025]. MRVQ instead targets the resident document index: one post-hoc code is truncated along both the residual-stage and the embedding-coordinate axis.

F Experimental configuration

Table 4 collects the settings needed to reproduce the reported numbers.

Table 4: Experimental configuration.

Setting	Value
Datasets	BEIR FiQA (57,638 docs, 648 queries), NFCorpus (3,633 docs, 323 queries)
MPNet	<code>sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2</code> , $D = 768$
Mxbai	<code>mixedbread-ai/mbai-embed-large-v1</code> , $D = 1024$
Nomic	<code>nomic-ai/nomic-embed-text-v1.5</code> , $D = 768$
BGE	<code>BAAI/bge-base-en-v1.5</code> , $D = 768$
Prefix menu $\mathcal{M}$	MPNet, BGE: {128, 256, 384, 512, 768}; Mxbai: {128, 256, 512, 768, 1024}; Nomic: {128, 256, 512, 768}
Prefix weights w_m	uniform, $w_m = 1/ \mathcal{M} $; all 16 residual stages weighted equally
Rate menu $\mathcal{B}$	{4, 8, 16} B/vector
MRVQ quantizer	$L = 16$ stages, $K = 256$ codewords per stage, fp32 codebooks
MRVQ fitting	50 iterations, 50,000 sampled vectors, seed 0
Retrieval	asymmetric scoring, fp32 queries; Faiss 1.13.2 for the RaBitQ study
Metric	nDCG@10
Uncertainty	paired per-query bootstrap, 5000 resamples (10,000 for RaBitQ)
RAM accounting	analytical, from the byte formulas in Table 2
Build-time protocol	CPU, fixed 8 threads, sequential timing; 3 seeds $\times$ 3 bit budgets $\times$ {ArguAna, Quora, SciDocs} $\times$ {MPNet, Mxbai} = 18 cells
Artifact	[author: anonymous repository link]