

Bias Robustness of Genetic Multi-Criteria Sorting versus Learned Rankers under Proxy Skew and Label Contamination

Vladyslav Shevchuk¹, Carlos Uziel Pérez Malla², and Philipp Wissgott¹

¹ *danube.ai solutions GmbH, 1040 Vienna, Austria and*

² *mypaperwork.ai, 1020 Vienna, Austria*

Learning-to-rank (LTR) systems often absorb undesirable signals that leak into training labels or appear as cheap structural proxies among features. We study whether *label-free* genetic multi-criteria sorting, which reranks fixed candidate pools by an explicit criteria vector C , occupies a more favourable bias–utility operating point than label-trained LTR. We run two listwise studies on the Synthetic, MSLR-WEB10K, Baidu-ULTR, WANDS, and Expedia datasets. The proxy-skew study keeps labels clean but exposes a calibrated proxy P : Genetic AI algorithms show substantially lower rank–proxy correlation (Spearman correlation between ranks and P) than LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM (e.g. ≈ 0.15 – 0.16 vs. 0.59 – 0.87 on WANDS). A supporting label-contamination study contaminates training labels with a contaminant B ; Genetic AI algorithms are label-free and thus remain unaffected by label contamination (bias curves stay flat), while LightGBM and XGBoost bias curves rise (OLS slope of rank– B correlation vs. contamination, `bias_slope`, reaches 0.58 – 0.65 on WANDS/Baidu). Every bias claim is paired with clean-label nDCG@10 on a bias–utility frontier. Genetic sorting is best read as an architectural alternative that optimizes declared attributes on a fixed pool, rather than as a universal replacement for LTR on raw relevance.




FIG. 1. (a) Proxy skew: clean-label nDCG@10 against rank–proxy correlation (Spearman correlation between ranks and proxy P). Pikaia strategies occupy the preferred upper-right region (high utility with low proxy alignment), while LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM sit lower with stronger proxy alignment. (b) Label contamination: rank–contaminant correlation (Spearman correlation between ranks and undesigned signal B) as training labels are increasingly mixed with B . Open pikaia strategies stay flat because they never refit on contaminated labels; LTR absorbs B as contamination rises. Methods: Pikaia (DOM-BAL), Pikaia (REWARD-HARD), Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND), and Pikaia (SELL-BUY) are open Pikaia strategy configurations; LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM are the learned LTR peers.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ranking pipelines fail in two common ways that are easy to miss if evaluation tracks only retrieval utility. First, *proxy skew*: even with clean labels, tree and linear models overweight cheap structural correlates of relevance (document length, review count, brand flags, click counts) instead of the attributes the task is meant to optimize [1–3]. Second, *label contamination*: popularity, clicks, or presentation position leak into training grades, and label-trained LTR absorbs the contaminant because it is rewarded for predicting contaminated labels [4, 5].

Genetic multi-criteria sorting algorithms (open **pikaia** strategy variants) do not train on relevance labels. They rerank a fixed candidate pool by an explicit criteria vector C (attributes, polarity, optional weights), following the Genetic AI / Evolutionary Data Theory line of work in which candidates and features are treated as organisms and genes in an evolutionary game [6–8]. That architectural difference is the scientific object of this work: *does refusing to fit proxy features or biased labels buy a better bias–utility trade-off?*

Prior work on bias in ranking spans unbiased LTR under position bias [4, 9, 10], societal bias in neural rankers [11, 12], and fair exposure allocation [13–15]. Evolutionary methods have long been used to discover ranking functions [16, 17], but they are rarely evaluated as *bias-robust* alternatives to label-trained LTR under controlled proxy and contamination protocols. We fill that gap with a two-study design that shares candidate lists and metrics but separates failure modes, with proxy refusal as the main claim.

a. Contributions.

1. Proxy-skew study: clean-label proxy experiments showing default Genetic AI algorithm configurations remain far less proxy-aligned than LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM, with ablation utility loss when P is removed reported for Genetic AI algorithms vs. LightGBM on key domains.
2. Label-contamination study (supporting): contamination sweeps that confirm the architectural claim. Genetic AI algorithm rank– B correlation stays flat because these methods do not use labels; LTR bias and clean-utility curves degrade as contamination rises.
3. A controlled comparison against primary LTR peers (LightGBM, XGBoost, RankSVM) and secondary controls (coordinate ascent, linear weighted sum, Reciprocal Rank Fusion) on five listwise benchmarks.
4. A reporting discipline: every bias claim is paired with clean-label nDCG@10 on a bias–utility frontier.

A. Defining bias versus signal

There is no single statistical test that separates “bias” from “signal” without a prior about what the system is

TABLE I. Per-benchmark designations. Undesignated B/P are refused by default C ; full proxy-skew weights/polarities are in Table IX.

Bench.	Undesignated	Default C (summary)
Synthetic	Explicit constructed B ; P vs. quality/price	quality, price (COST)
MSLR [20]	B : PageRank; P : url_clickcount	Contam.: BM25/LM/TF/coverage (body). Proxy: BM25/LM/TF/stream length (body)
Baidu [21]	B : BM25-mixed grades; P : doc. length	Contam.: BM25, QL-Dirichlet. Proxy: BM25 (title+body), QL variants, IDF
WANDS [22]	review_count as B and as P	Contam.: rating, size, height, class match. Proxy: class/name/desc/token match
Expedia [23]	B : inverted position; P : brand	Contam. / proxy: price, stars, review, location, destination distance (no position/brand)

for [18]. Closely related literature fix that prior differently: Geirhos et al. call *shortcuts* the decision rules that succeed on a benchmark without capturing the intended concept, even when those rules remain predictive [1]; ranking and recommender work treats over-reliance on popularity-like or structural correlates as bias relative to a stated goal [2, 3]; unbiased LTR treats clicks and presentation as *biased feedback* when they systematically distort intended relevance [4, 5]; and LTR practice further distinguishes the same behavioral quantity used as a contaminated *label* versus as a ranking *feature* [19].

We use that same idea directly. The *allowed signal* is the declared criteria vector C ; the clean label is used only to score utility. *Bias* is dependence of the produced ranking on an undesignated field relative to that task definition: contaminant B (label-contamination study) or proxy P (proxy-skew study). Here P is a *shortcut* [1]: it can correlate with the clean label and still be outside the declared target C (e.g. review count or brand when C is rating, match, and price). Moderate label correlation makes the contrast sharp, relevance alone induces some rank– P alignment, while locking onto P as a ranking feature pushes correlation well above that baseline.

Both B and P remain recorded for evaluation even when they are not inputs to a method. We report the rank–signal correlation of the produced ordering with B or P together with clean nDCG@10. Under the same pools and metrics, Genetic AI methods stay near the relevance-driven baseline for rank– P correlation, while LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM align with P far more strongly.

Table I states, for each benchmark, which raw field is undesignated and which attributes enter default C . The label-contamination and proxy-skew studies use different datasets and different criteria vectors C even when the domain name matches; full proxy-skew weights appear in Appendix B.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Bias in learning to rank

Click and presentation biases systematically distort relevance feedback [5]. Unbiased LTR corrects for position bias via inverse propensity scoring and related estimators [4, 9, 10]. Separately, popularity bias in recommenders and ranking amplifies head items [2, 3]. Our label-contamination study is closer to *training-label* contamination than to online propensity correction: we mix a measurable contaminant B into grades and ask whether label-free ranking avoids absorbing B .

B. Societal bias and fair ranking

Neural rankers can intensify gender and other societal biases relative to classical retrieval [11, 12]. Fair ranking literature constrains exposure across providers or protected groups [13–15, 24, 25]. We do not claim demographic fairness here; we study *dependence on undesigned signals* (contaminants and proxies) that the task definition excludes from the optimization target. The methodological parallel is the insistence on trade-offs: fairness or bias metrics without utility are incomplete [15, 18].

C. Evolutionary and multi-criteria ranking

Genetic programming has been used to discover information retrieval (IR) ranking functions [16]. Fair ranking methods impose group-fairness constraints on ranked lists [17]. Classical evolutionary multi-objective optimization (e.g. NSGA-II) and evolutionary game theory provide the broader algorithmic background [26–28]. A more recent line, Genetic AI, casts discrete multi-objective decisions as evolutionary games over genes and organisms, without external preference weights or labelled training [6]. Evolutionary Data Theory develops the corresponding formalism (replicator dynamics, evolutionary strategies, convergence) for matrix-form data problems [7], and related analysis establishes global convergence of feature-weighting dynamics on the simplex [8]. We instantiate that paradigm for list-wise reranking with the open-source *pikaia* package [6], comparing four Pikaia strategies: Dominant–Balanced (DOM-BAL: DOMINANT gene strategy with BALANCED organism strategy), REWARD-HARD, VALUATION-BLEND, and SELL-BUY. Unlike classical GP rankers that *learn* a scoring formula from labels, these Genetic AI methods optimize the importance weights for attributes in a *declared* criteria vector C at inference time on a fixed pool. Linear weighted sum and RRF [29] serve as non-learned multi-criteria controls so that gains are not automatically attributed to the evolutionary search.

D. Shortcut learning and proxies

Supervised models often exploit spurious correlates of the training objective [1]. The proxy-skew study demonstrates this phenomenon for LTR methods: a calibrated proxy P with moderate label correlation is available as a feature; we measure how much rankings behave like “sort by P .”

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Problem setting and evaluation splits

Each evaluation unit is a *query*: an information need paired with a fixed candidate *pool* of roughly 20–100 documents. The pool is never split into train/test documents; every method only reorders the same full pool for that query. Utility is always scored against *clean* relevance labels using nDCG@10 [30]. Bias metrics measure dependence of the ranking on a proxy P (proxy-skew study) or an undesigned signal B (label-contamination study), as defined in Section I A.

All train/test splits are at the *query* level (disjoint sets of queries). Learned LTR methods are fit on the training queries and evaluated on held-out queries; Genetic AI / linear / RRF do not fit on labels, they apply a fixed ranking rule to each held-out pool at evaluation time. How the criteria vector C is chosen is separate from this split and is detailed in Section III C 0 b.

a. Proxy-skew study (main claim). We reserve a *selection* slice of 50 queries and a disjoint *evaluation* slice of the next 50 queries. LTR is trained on the selection queries and scored on the evaluation queries. The same evaluation queries are used to score Genetic AI and the other non-learned methods. The selection slice is also where C is declared (Section III C 0 b); reported metrics use only the evaluation slice.

b. Label-contamination study (supporting). We use a query-level train/test split of the sampled queries: LTR is trained on the train queries (with contaminated labels) and all methods are scored on the held-out queries.

c. Core reporting rule. Bias is never interpreted in isolation. A preferred method sits better on the frontier of clean nDCG@10 (horizontal) vs. bias/skew (vertical): lower bias at matched utility, or higher utility at matched bias.

B. Rankers and controls

Table II lists the shared registry. Primary learned peers for the paper claims are LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM. Secondary controls are input order, sort-by- B/P , linear weighted sum on C , RRF on C , and coordinate ascent. Linear tests explicit criteria without the Genetic AI search [6, 28].

TABLE II. Shared method registry.

Method	Role
Input order	Unsorted pool baseline
Sort by B or P	Upper bound on bias / skew
Linear weighted sum on C	Explicit-criteria control
RRF on C [29]	Non-learned multi-criteria peer
Pikaia (DOM-BAL / REWARD-HARD / VALUATION-BLEND / SELL-BUY) [6, 7]	Open Genetic AI framework, strategy variants
LightGBM [31, 32]	Primary tree listwise LTR peer
XGBoost [32, 33]	Primary tree listwise LTR peer
RankSVM [34]	Primary pairwise LTR peer
Coord. ascent [35]	Secondary non-boosting learned control

a. Pikaia as a strategy framework. We treat Pikaia as an open Genetic AI *framework*, not a single fixed sorter [6]. Candidates in a pool are organisms and declared criteria are genes. A run combines one or more gene-level strategies with one or more organism-level strategies, then runs the same iterative replicator updates for every strategy pair to obtain organism fitness scores used for ranking. All Genetic AI algorithm arms below share the same criteria vector C , preprocessing (pool-local scaling with COST polarity inverted), and evaluation protocol; only the strategy pair changes.

b. Strategies compared.

- **Pikaia (DOM-BAL):** gene DOMINANT with organism BALANCED (Dominant–Balanced).
- **Pikaia (REWARD-HARD):** gene REWARD_HARD with BALANCED. Rewards rarely expressed (“hard”) criteria.
- **Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND):** gene VALUATION_BLEND (preference=0.3) with BALANCED. Blends hard and easy valuation.
- **Pikaia (SELL-BUY):** organism strategy SELL then BUY gene strategy.

Proxy ablations for the four Pikaia strategies are reported as diagnostics alongside the main results.

C. Proxy-skew protocol

We use dedicated proxy-skew datasets with clean relevance labels (separate from the label-contamination datasets); designations of P and C are in Table I. All methods rerank the same pools under the shared evaluation protocol of Section III. Learned LTR peers (LightGBM, XGBoost, RankSVM, coordinate ascent) are trained on clean labels; Genetic AI algorithms, linear, and RRF apply their ranking rules at evaluation time. Ablations vary whether P enters the ranking inputs and are reported as ΔnDCG (full minus no- P) together with rank-proxy correlation.

TABLE III. Effect of the criteria-selection protocol on the evaluation slice: hand-specified $C \rightarrow$ protocol-selected C (Pikaia). Expedia kept the hand-specified C .

Bench.	ΔnDCG	$\text{corr}(P)$
Baidu-PS	+0.133	0.45 $\rightarrow$ 0.21
WANDS-PS	+0.054	0.17 $\rightarrow$ 0.16
MSLR-PS	+0.006	0.13 $\rightarrow$ 0.15
Expedia	± 0.000	0.20 $\rightarrow$ 0.20

a. Keeping C distinct from P . If attributes in C are nearly collinear with P , then ranking by C alone can look like ranking by P . We therefore choose structural or popularity proxies with moderate label correlation ($|\text{corr}(P, \text{label})| \approx 0.45$, target band 0.3–0.6) and build a criteria vector C whose members have low pairwise correlation with P .

b. How the criteria vector C is declared. Here C is the declared attribute vector used by Genetic AI algorithms, linear, and RRF. We choose C once per domain on the selection slice in four steps, then keep that same C for evaluation. To choose how many attributes enter C without touching the evaluation slice, we further split the selection queries 80/20: fit polarities and weights on 80%, and pick the criteria size k by nDCG on the held-out 20%. (i) *Proxy-hygiene gate:* we discard any candidate attribute with $|\text{corr}(\text{attr}, P)| > 0.35$ on the train split. (ii) *Polarity* (GAIN vs. COST): each attribute is treated as something to maximize or minimize. We default to a semantic guess from the name (e.g. rating = GAIN, price = COST) and override with the empirical train-split sign of $\text{corr}(\text{attr}, \text{label})$ only when that correlation has magnitude at least 0.05. (iii) *Importance* (relative weight in C): we set weights proportional to $|\text{corr}(\text{attr}, \text{label})|$ on the train split (monotone, no free parameters). (iv) *Criteria size:* we rank candidate attributes by importance, evaluate successive top- k prefixes with the open **pikaia** engine on the internal validation split, and keep the k with the best validation nDCG. As an additional candidate we also retain a hand-specified C written before the protocol (same attributes/polarities for that domain). On each domain the protocol picks whichever candidate wins on the internal validation split; on Expedia that hand-specified C wins, so the domain is unchanged. Table III records the evaluation-slice effect of switching from the manually selected C to the protocol-selected one. The selected proxy-skew C is frozen offline into the study configs (and listed in Appendix B) and reused unchanged on the evaluation slice.

D. Label-contamination protocol

We build identical candidate lists and mix the clean grade with min-max-normalized contaminant B at a stated contamination strength (Table I). We train LightGBM, XGBoost, RankSVM, and coordinate ascent on

biased labels with a query-level train/test split. For Genetic AI algorithms, linear, and RRF we use a declared criteria vector C of domain attributes that exclude B ; that criteria vector C is pre-declared per domain in the study and held fixed across all contamination strengths. We then rank with the four Pikaia strategies on that C , linear(C), RRF(C), the biased LTR peers, sort-by- B , and input order, and score clean nDCG@10 and dependence on B . Point estimates use contamination 0.4; sweeps over $[0, 1]$ produce bias and utility curves.

Because Genetic AI algorithms do not train on labels, their rankings cannot change with contamination. The useful empirical contrast is how LTR bias and clean utility change as contamination strength increases; the fixed-strength table is a supporting snapshot of those deltas.

a. How contamination is applied. Training labels in production ranking often mix intended relevance with presentation or popularity signals [2–5]. For each query pool, let $y_i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ be the clean relevance grade of document i (clamped to that range when the benchmark uses a wider scale) and let b_i be the raw undesigned field from Table I (e.g. PageRank, review count, inverted position). We min-max normalize b_i within the pool to $\tilde{b}_i \in [0, 1]$, then form a continuous mix at contamination strength $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$z_i(s) = (1 - s) y_i + s \cdot (2\tilde{b}_i), \quad (1)$$

and map $z_i(s)$ back to a training grade $\hat{y}_i(s) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ by thresholds 1.5 and 0.75 (so $s=0$ recovers the clean grade and $s=1$ is fully contaminant-driven). LTR is trained on $\{\hat{y}_i(s)\}$; evaluation always uses the clean grades y_i . Sweeps use $s \in \{0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0\}$; reported snapshots use $s=0.4$.

E. Metrics

Utility (both studies): nDCG@10 on clean labels (primary), plus MRR / nDCG@5 as secondary diagnostics.

Label-contamination study. *Rank-contaminant correlation:* Spearman correlation between the produced ranking and contaminant B (higher means the ranking behaves more like sort-by- B). *Top- k exposure lift:* fraction of high- B items in the top- k minus the pool base rate. *Bias amplification:* lift relative to the input-order baseline. *Bias slope (bias_slope):* ordinary least-squares slope of rank-contaminant correlation against contamination strength over the sweep $[0, 1]$ (a summary of the bias curve, not a utility score).

Proxy-skew study. *Rank-proxy correlation:* Spearman correlation between the produced ranking and proxy P . *Exposure lift toward high- P items:* top- k high- P fraction minus pool base rate. *Ablation Δ nDCG:* $\text{nDCG}_{\text{full}} - \text{nDCG}_{\text{no } P}$ (larger means more utility depends on P). *Ablation Δ corr:* change in rank-proxy correlation under the same full vs. no- P contrast.

F. Benchmarks

All benchmarks supply listwise candidate pools with per-item attributes; we declare the criteria vector C from those attributes, and take measurable B and/or P as designated in Table I. Fixed-strength label-contamination runs used $n=30$ (synthetic) or $n=50$ queries. Every proxy-skew number uses a disjoint evaluation slice of $n=50$ queries, separate from the 50 used to select C .

On the proxy-skew evaluation slice the realized mean $|\text{corr}(P, \text{label})|$ is 0.462 (Expedia), 0.454 (MSLR), and 0.405 (Baidu), all inside the intended 0.3–0.6 band, but only 0.252 on WANDS (below the band). We report WANDS anyway and flag the shortfall: the proxy carries only weak label information on those queries, yet RankSVM’s ranking still correlates 0.87 with it. Read strictly, WANDS-PS is a weaker test of proxy *calibration* and a stronger illustration of proxy *over-reliance*.

IV. RESULTS

A. Hypotheses

Proxy-skew study. LTR rank-proxy correlation exceeds Genetic AI algorithms under multi-attribute C . Utility is more sensitive to the proxy ablation for LTR than for Genetic AI algorithms.

Label-contamination study. As contamination rises, LTR rank-contaminant correlation with B rises and clean nDCG tends to fall; Genetic AI algorithms on fixed C stay stable on both axes. At matched clean utility, Genetic AI algorithms show lower top- k exposure of high- B items than biased LTR.

B. Proxy skew and ablation

Table IV contrasts Genetic AI algorithms with clean-label LTR on the primary domains; remaining datasets are in Appendix Table VIII. Fig. 2 plots proxy dependence and Table V the ablation deltas. The corresponding WANDS-PS proxy-utility frontier appears as panel (a) of the graphical abstract.

Headline findings. Clean-label LTR peers show higher rank-proxy correlation than Genetic AI algorithms. On WANDS-PS, proxy corr is 0.59/0.78/0.87 (LightGBM, XGBoost, RankSVM) vs. Genetic AI algorithms ≈ 0.15 –0.16. The same ordering holds on MSLR-PS. On the graphical-abstract frontier (inverted y -axis), Genetic AI algorithms keep the preferred upper-right corner but concede clean nDCG to LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM.

Ablation. Removing P hurts LightGBM more than Pikaia on MSLR (0.370 vs. 0.123) and Baidu (0.162 vs. 0.114); on WANDS the two are effectively tied (0.022 vs. 0.024), because Genetic AI algorithms are already near ceiling. Expedia reverses the ordering outright (0.128 vs.

TABLE IV. Proxy-skew study, primary domains: Genetic AI algorithms vs. clean-label LTR on the held-out query slice disjoint from criteria selection. Full benchmarks are in Table VIII.

Bench.	Method	nDCG	corr(P)
WANDS	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.896	0.164
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.865	0.147
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.872	0.151
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.886	0.146
	LightGBM	0.975	0.586
	XGBoost	0.974	0.785
	RankSVM	0.955	0.867
MSLR	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.350	0.148
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.350	0.138
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.343	0.144
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.320	0.137
	LightGBM	0.965	0.428
	XGBoost	0.941	0.442
	RankSVM	0.762	0.462




FIG. 2. Proxy-skew study: proxy dependence (WANDS, MSLR). Genetic AI algorithms show lower proxy dependence than clean-label LTR.

0.316), so we do not read the pattern as universal: Expedia’s criteria set is the narrowest of the four, so a forced proxy gene supplies proportionally more of the signal there than it does elsewhere. Pikaia proxy ablations likewise show large utility deltas on some domains. Linear tracks Genetic AI algorithms closely, which again points at explicit criteria rather than evolutionary search as the active ingredient. Lower proxy alignment for Genetic AI holds on all four domains; the stronger utility-ablation pattern holds on two.

C. Label contamination

As a supporting check, the label-contamination study confirms that Genetic AI algorithm rankings are invari-

TABLE V. Ablation $\Delta nDCG = nDCG_{full} - nDCG_{no P}$. Larger means more utility depends on P .

Family	Exp.	MSLR	WANDS	Baidu
LightGBM	0.128	0.370	0.022	0.162
Pikaia	0.316	0.123	0.024	0.114
linear	0.462	0.131	0.038	0.160

TABLE VI. Label-contamination study, primary domains (contamination 0.4 snapshot). Higher nDCG@10 is better; lower rank-corr / top- k lift are better on bias.

Bench.	Method	nDCG	corr	lift
WANDS	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.424	0.188	-0.066
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.422	0.185	-0.066
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.419	0.182	-0.072
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.427	0.188	-0.078
	LightGBM	0.446	0.176	-0.006
	XGBoost	0.486	0.179	-0.026
	RankSVM	0.374	0.375	0.176
MSLR	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.771	0.136	-0.020
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.732	0.135	-0.004
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.764	0.131	-0.026
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.718	0.145	-0.014
	LightGBM	0.796	0.296	0.036
	XGBoost	0.803	0.289	0.034
	RankSVM	0.757	0.143	-0.038

ant to contaminated training grades (they never train on labels) and shows how LTR bias and clean utility *change* when B is mixed into labels. Figures 3 and 4 lead with the relative claim (continuous sweep; before/after deltas on WANDS); Table VI is a matched-strength snapshot at




FIG. 3. Label-contamination study: contamination immunity on WANDS (Baidu shows the same flat Genetic AI pattern; Table VI). Genetic AI algorithms stay flat; LTR absorbs the contaminant.




FIG. 4. Label-contamination study: before/after change on WANDS from contamination 0 to 0.4. Left: rank-contaminant correlation; right: clean nDCG@10. Open markers at 0, filled at 0.4; Genetic AI (DOM-BAL) is flat on both axes while LightGBM/XGBoost rise in bias (and lose some utility).

contamination 0.4. Full benchmarks are in Appendix A.

Relative to clean training labels, LightGBM’s WANDS rank- B correlation rises from 0.126 at contamination 0 to 0.296 at 0.4 and 0.380 at 1.0; XGBoost moves from 0.155 to 0.289 / 0.370 on the same grid (Fig. 4). Clean nDCG@10 for LightGBM falls from 0.802 at 0 to 0.797 at 0.4 and 0.716 at 1.0 (XGBoost 0.851 $\rightarrow$ 0.803 $\rightarrow$ 0.714). Genetic AI algorithm rank- B correlation and clean nDCG@10 stay flat across $[0, 1]$ (Fig. 3; DOM-BAL corr. 0.136, nDCG@10 0.771). OLS bias slopes summarize the curves ($\text{bias_slope} \approx 0.58\text{--}0.65$ for LightGBM/XGBoost on WANDS/Baidu). At the 0.4 snapshot (Table VI), Genetic AI algorithms nearly match biased tree utility on Baidu/WANDS while cutting contaminant correlation roughly in half. Expedia remains the honest trade-off (Appendix Table VII).

V. DISCUSSION

The main claim is that genetic multi-criteria sorting on a declared criteria vector C occupies a more favourable bias-utility operating point than clean-label LTR: substantially lower rank-proxy correlation at competitive clean nDCG. On WANDS/MSLR in the proxy-skew study, Pikaia strategies stay far less proxy-aligned than LightGBM, XGBoost, and RankSVM while remaining competitive on clean nDCG. Supporting label-contamination evidence from WANDS/Baidu shows flat contamination curves for Genetic AI algorithms and rising bias (with falling clean utility) for label-trained LTR. Weaker domains (Expedia utility gap; large proxy-skew nDCG gaps vs. full LTR) are reported in the appendix without being elevated to the main claim.

a. Caveats. (i) When true quality is entangled with B (Expedia position), LTR can win raw nDCG; the question is whether that utility is *allowed*. (ii) Linear weighted sum often sits near Genetic AI algorithms; Genetic AI algorithms add value when non-linear multi-criteria trade-offs beat a fixed linear form. (iii) We do not claim Genetic AI algorithms always win on nDCG; we claim they occupy a better robustness operating point when contaminants or proxies are excluded from the optimization target. (iv) Query counts are moderate ($n \approx 30\text{--}50$); results should be read as controlled evidence, not large-scale online evaluation. (v) Societal protected-attribute fairness [12, 14] is out of scope.

b. Implications. When the goal is to optimize only the declared attributes C and avoid popularity / position / brand shortcuts, genetic multi-criteria sorting does exactly that, with flat contamination response and low proxy alignment—properties label-trained LTR does not share even when labels are clean. Hybrid pipelines (LTR for recall, Genetic AI algorithms for constrained re-ranking) are a natural next step.

VI. CONCLUSION

We compared genetic multi-criteria sorting to label-trained LTR under two failure modes (contaminated training labels and clean-label proxy skew) across five listwise benchmarks. The main result is from the proxy-skew study: default criteria vectors remain far less proxy-aligned than LightGBM, XGBoost, or RankSVM on a bias-utility frontier. Supporting label-contamination evidence shows contamination sweeps leave Genetic AI algorithms unaffected on the bias axis while LTR bias curves rise and clean utility falls. The appropriate claim is robustness under that refusal, not universal dominance on nDCG. Future work includes larger query samples, online evaluation, protected-attribute fairness metrics, and hybrid LTR+Genetic AI pipelines.

DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

Experiment protocols, criteria configs, and evaluation scripts are maintained in the accompanying research repository; proxy-skew criteria vectors are also listed in Appendix B. Benchmark datasets are used under their respective licenses (MSLR-WEB10K, Baidu-ULTR, WANDS, Expedia/ICDM).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Vladyslav Shevchuk: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data curation, Writing — review & editing, Visualization. Carlos Uziel Pérez Malla: Supervision, Writing —

review & editing. Philipp Wissgott: Conceptualization,

Supervision, Writing — review & editing.

- [1] R. Geirhos, J.-H. Jacobsen, C. Michaelis, R. Zemel, W. Brendel, M. Bethge, and F. A. Wichmann, Short-cut learning in deep neural networks, *Nature Machine Intelligence* **2**, 665 (2020).
- [2] J. Chen, H. Dong, X. Wang, F. Feng, M. Wang, and X. He, Bias and debias in recommender system: A survey and future directions, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* **41**, 1 (2023).
- [3] H. Abdollahpouri, M. Mansoury, R. Burke, and B. Mobasher, The unfairness of popularity bias in recommendation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.13286* (2019).
- [4] T. Joachims, A. Swaminathan, and T. Schnabel, Unbiased learning-to-rank with biased feedback, in *Proceedings of the tenth ACM international conference on web search and data mining* (2017) pp. 781–789.
- [5] T. Joachims, L. Granka, B. Pan, H. Hembrooke, F. Radlinski, and G. Gay, Evaluating the accuracy of implicit feedback from clicks and query reformulations in web search, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* **25**, 7 (2007).
- [6] P. Wissgott, [Genetic AI: Evolutionary games for ab initio dynamic multi-objective optimization](#) (2025), foundation of the `pikaia` Genetic AI sorting engine, [arXiv:2501.19113 \[cs.NE\]](#).
- [7] P. Wissgott, [Evolutionary data theory: On the similarities between data problems and evolutionary games](#) (2026), evolutionary Data Theory formalism underlying the `danube` engine, [arXiv:2605.26685 \[cs.NE\]](#).
- [8] A. Daniilidis, A. Domínguez Corella, and P. Wissgott, [Feature weighting for data analysis via evolutionary simulation](#) (2026), convergence analysis of evolutionary feature-weighting dynamics used in genetic sorting, [arXiv:2511.06454 \[math.OC\]](#).
- [9] A. Agarwal, I. Zaitsev, X. Wang, C. Li, M. Najork, and T. Joachims, Estimating position bias without intrusive interventions, in *Proceedings of the twelfth ACM international conference on web search and data mining* (2019) pp. 474–482.
- [10] H. Oosterhuis, Doubly robust estimation for correcting position bias in click feedback for unbiased learning to rank, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* **41**, 1 (2023).
- [11] N. Rekabsaz and M. Schedl, Do neural ranking models intensify gender bias?, in *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2020) pp. 2065–2068.
- [12] N. Rekabsaz, S. Kopeinik, and M. Schedl, Societal biases in retrieved contents: Measurement framework and adversarial mitigation of bert rankers, in *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval* (2021) pp. 306–316.
- [13] A. Singh and T. Joachims, Fairness of exposure in rankings, in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining* (2018) pp. 2219–2228.
- [14] M. Zehlike, T. Sühr, R. Baeza-Yates, F. Bonchi, C. Castillo, and S. Hajian, Fair top-k ranking with multiple protected groups, *Information processing & management* **59**, 102707 (2022).
- [15] M. D. Ekstrand, A. Das, R. Burke, and F. Diaz, Fairness in information access systems, *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* **16**, 1 (2022).
- [16] W. Fan, M. D. Gordon, and P. Pathak, A generic ranking function discovery framework by genetic programming for information retrieval, *Information Processing & Management* **40**, 587 (2004).
- [17] S. Tahery, S. Z. Aftabi, and S. Farzi, A ga-based algorithm meets the fair ranking problem, *Information Processing & Management* **58**, 102711 (2021).
- [18] S. L. Blodgett, S. Barocas, H. Daumé Iii, and H. Wallach, Language (technology) is power: A critical survey of “bias” in nlp, in *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics* (2020) pp. 5454–5476.
- [19] T. Yang, C. Luo, H. Lu, P. Gupta, B. Yin, and Q. Ai, Can clicks be both labels and features? unbiased behavior feature collection and uncertainty-aware learning to rank, in *Proceedings of the 45th international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval* (2022) pp. 6–17.
- [20] T. Qin and T.-Y. Liu, Introducing letor 4.0 datasets, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.2597* (2013).
- [21] L. Zou, S. Zhang, H. Cai, D. Ma, S. Cheng, S. Wang, D. Shi, Z. Cheng, and D. Yin, Pre-trained language model based ranking in baidu search, in *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (2021) pp. 4014–4022.
- [22] Y. Chen, S. Liu, Z. Liu, W. Sun, L. Baltrunas, and B. Schroeder, Wands: Dataset for product search relevance assessment, in *European Conference on Information Retrieval* (Springer, 2022) pp. 128–141.
- [23] Expedia and Kaggle, Personalize Expedia hotel searches — ICDM 2013, Kaggle competition dataset (2013).
- [24] S. C. Geyik, S. Ambler, and K. Kenthapadi, Fairness-aware ranking in search & recommendation systems with application to linkedin talent search, in *Proceedings of the 25th acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining* (2019) pp. 2221–2231.
- [25] M. Morik, A. Singh, J. Hong, and T. Joachims, Controlling fairness and bias in dynamic learning-to-rank, in *Proceedings of the 43rd international ACM SIGIR conference on research and development in information retrieval* (2020) pp. 429–438.
- [26] K. Deb, A. Pratap, S. Agarwal, and T. Meyarivan, A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii, *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation* **6**, 182 (2002).
- [27] J. M. Smith, Evolution and the theory of games, in *Did Darwin get it right? Essays on games, sex and evolution* (Springer, 1982) pp. 202–215.
- [28] J. H. Holland, *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems: an introductory analysis with applications to biology, control, and artificial intelligence* (The MIT press, 1992).

- [29] G. V. Cormack, C. L. Clarke, and S. Buettcher, Reciprocal rank fusion outperforms condorcet and individual rank learning methods, in *Proceedings of the 32nd international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval* (2009) pp. 758–759.
- [30] K. Järvelin and J. Kekäläinen, Cumulated gain-based evaluation of ir techniques, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* **20**, 422 (2002).
- [31] G. Ke, Q. Meng, T. Finley, T. Wang, W. Chen, W. Ma, Q. Ye, and T.-Y. Liu, Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree, *Advances in neural information processing systems* **30** (2017).
- [32] C. J. Burges, From ranknet to lambdarank to lambdamart: An overview, *Learning* **11**, 81 (2010).
- [33] T. Chen and C. Guestrin, Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system, in *Proceedings of the 22nd acm sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining* (2016) pp. 785–794.
- [34] T. Joachims, Optimizing search engines using click-through data, in *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining* (2002) pp. 133–142.
- [35] D. Metzler and W. Bruce Croft, Linear feature-based models for information retrieval, *Information Retrieval* **10**, 257 (2007).

Appendix A: Full result tables

Tables VII and VIII report every benchmark we ran, including the domains where Genetic AI sorting pays a visible utility price. They are given here in full so that the primary-domain summaries in Section IV can be checked against the complete picture.

TABLE VII. Label-contamination study, all benchmarks at contamination 0.4. Higher nDCG is better; lower rank-corr and top- k lift are better.

Bench.	Method	nDCG	corr	lift
Baidu	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.424	0.188	−0.066
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.422	0.185	−0.066
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.419	0.182	−0.072
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.427	0.188	− 0.078
	LightGBM	0.446	0.176	−0.006
	XGBoost	0.486	0.179	−0.026
	RankSVM	0.374	0.375	0.176
WANDS	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.771	0.136	−0.020
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.732	0.135	−0.004
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.764	0.131	−0.026
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.718	0.145	−0.014
	LightGBM	0.796	0.296	0.036
	XGBoost	0.803	0.289	0.034
	RankSVM	0.757	0.143	− 0.038
Expedia	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.354	0.334	0.050
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.306	0.296	0.046
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.349	0.296	0.056
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.220	0.255	0.010
	LightGBM	0.667	0.376	0.144
	XGBoost	0.654	0.349	0.138
	RankSVM	0.327	0.306	0.100
MSLR	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.397	0.127	−0.013
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.390	0.120	−0.007
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.390	0.129	−0.011
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.377	0.131	− 0.023
	LightGBM	0.448	0.104	0.013
	XGBoost	0.492	0.109	0.013
	RankSVM	0.380	0.097	−0.019
Synth.	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.910	0.340	0.000
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.877	0.344	0.000
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.872	0.390	0.000
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.909	0.248	0.000
	LightGBM	0.996	0.321	0.000
	XGBoost	0.976	0.313	0.000
	RankSVM	0.932	0.282	0.000

TABLE VIII. Proxy-skew study, all benchmarks: Genetic AI algorithms vs. clean-label LTR.

Bench.	Method	nDCG	corr(P)
Expedia	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.319	0.197
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.309	0.188
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.315	0.203
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.251	0.232
	LightGBM	0.990	0.485
	XGBoost	0.993	0.502
	RankSVM	0.946	0.727
MSLR-PS	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.350	0.148
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.350	0.138
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.343	0.144
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.320	0.137
	LightGBM	0.965	0.428
	XGBoost	0.941	0.442
	RankSVM	0.762	0.462
WANDS-PS	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.896	0.164
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.865	0.147
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.872	0.151
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.886	0.146
	LightGBM	0.975	0.586
	XGBoost	0.974	0.785
	RankSVM	0.955	0.867
Baidu-PS	Pikaia (DOM-BAL)	0.437	0.214
	Pikaia (REWARD-HARD)	0.444	0.230
	Pikaia (VALUATION-BLEND)	0.427	0.204
	Pikaia (SELL-BUY)	0.442	0.217
	LightGBM	0.812	0.697
	XGBoost	0.800	0.659
	RankSVM	0.704	0.651

Appendix B: Declared criteria vectors for the proxy-skew study

Table IX lists the criteria vector C used by every non-LTR method on each proxy-skew domain, as selected by the train-split protocol of Section III C 0 b. No vector contains P . Weights are normalized to sum to one and polarity is GAIN unless marked.

One polarity is worth flagging: WANDS `class_token_match` is selected as a COST. Semantic inference proposes GAIN, but the train-split correlation with the clean grade is negative with magnitude above the override threshold, because the attribute fires on broad category words that match many off-intent products in the same class. We report the selected direction rather than overriding it by hand, and note that it carries the smallest weight in that vector.

TABLE IX. Proxy-skew criteria vectors selected on the train split. Polarity is GAIN unless marked COST.

Bench.	Attribute	Weight
WANDS-PS	<code>product_class_match</code>	0.364
	<code>name_match</code>	0.253
	<code>desc_match</code>	0.241
	<code>class_token_match</code> (COST)	0.142
MSLR-PS	<code>bm25_body</code>	0.289
	<code>lm_dir_body</code>	0.260
	<code>sum_tf_body</code>	0.254
	<code>stream_length_body</code>	0.198
Baidu-PS	<code>bm25_title</code>	0.216
	<code>bm25</code>	0.205
	<code>ql_jelinek_mercer_long</code>	0.196
	<code>ql_dirichlet</code>	0.193
	<code>idf</code>	0.191
Expedia	<code>price_usd</code> (COST)	0.25
	<code>prop_starrating</code>	0.20
	<code>prop_review_score</code>	0.20
	<code>prop_location_score2</code>	0.20
	<code>orig_destination_distance</code> (COST)	0.15