


Deterministic Candidate evaluation with RAG

OMAR ABOELFETOUH



Core Solution

LLM IS NOT DETERMINISTIC BY NATURE - THAT'S HOW WE GONING TO TACKLE IT

- Context
 - Candidate CV
 - Job Requirements
 - System Prompt
 - Evaluation metrics
 - Reasoning system prompt
 - Best practices
 - LLM configuration
 - model: openAI's gpt-o4-mini
 - temprature: 0
 - top_p: 0
 - seed: 42 (fixed seed)
- 

RAG - Candidate Matching to a Job

01

PARSE JOBS

extract jobs only from the data, parse each json on an appropriate string, ensuring comprehension, and no context loss

02

VECTORIZE JOBS

Save the parsed jobs into a vector database (FIASS)

03

CHOOSE RANDOM CANDIDATE

From the data, fetch a random candidate, parse it into an appropriate string, embed the string with the same embedding model

03

RETRIEVAL

using FIASS similarity search to fetch the top 3-5 jobs matches this candidate

Parsing Techniques

01

TECHNIQUE SELECTION (CUSTOM TEXT-CLEANING AND JSON PARSING APPROACH)

designed to reliably extract machine-readable JSON from free-form LLM output.

02

WHY WE CHOSE THE CURRENT PARSING TECHNIQUE?

Because it's simple, deterministic, and fast, ensuring consistent JSON extraction under fixed model conditions. It avoids unnecessary complexity since our LLM already outputs well-structured JSON at temperature 0.

This makes the pipeline stable, transparent, and easy to debug for large-scale evaluations.

Similarity Search

WHAT IS THE THRESHOLD ?

The threshold defines the minimum cosine similarity score (e.g., 0.75 or 0.90) required for a job to be considered a relevant match in FAISS retrieval.

In this project, 0.90 marks excellent semantic alignment, ensuring only strong, contextually similar jobs are passed to the LLM evaluator.

WHY ?

We set it empirically to balance recall and precision — high enough to filter weak matches but not so strict that it excludes valid ones.

LLM Block

EXPERIMENTATION AND RATIONALE OVERVIEW

The problem was that LLMs are inherently non-deterministic — the same input can yield slightly different outputs due to probabilistic token sampling.

- To ensure consistent and repeatable scoring, we enforced a deterministic setup:
- Temperature = 0 to remove randomness in generation.
- Top-p = 0.5 to limit sampling diversity.
- Chosen models: we tested GPT-4o-mini and Gemini 2.0 Flash, selecting the one with the lowest output variance.
- System prompt: we broke down the evaluation into clear, step-by-step criteria (skills, experience, location, culture) and enforced strict JSON formatting, minimizing hallucinations and making the model's reasoning stable and explainable.

LLM Block

THE PROBLEM WAS THAT LLMS ARE INHERENTLY NON-DETERMINISTIC, THE SAME INPUT CAN YIELD SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT OUTPUTS DUE TO PROBABILISTIC TOKEN SAMPLING. TO ENSURE CONSISTENT AND REPEATABLE SCORING, WE ENFORCED A DETERMINISTIC SETUP:

01

TEMPERATURE

= 0 to remove randomness in generation.

02

TOP-P

= 0.5 to limit sampling diversity.

03

CHOSEN MODELS

we tested GPT-4o-mini and Gemini 2.0 Flash, selecting the one with the lowest output variance.

04

SYSTEM PROMPT

we broke down the evaluation into clear, step-by-step criteria (skills, experience, location, culture) and enforced strict JSON formatting, minimizing hallucinations and making the model's reasoning stable and explainable.

Results - LLM consistency test

🤖 Initializing OpenAI LLM...

🔄 Running 10 evaluations...

Run 1/10... Score: 71.4
Run 2/10... Score: 71.4
Run 3/10... Score: 71.4
Run 4/10... Score: 71.4
Run 5/10... Score: 71.4
Run 6/10... Score: 71.4
Run 7/10... Score: 71.4
Run 8/10... Score: 71.4
Run 9/10... Score: 71.4
Run 10/10... Score: 71.4

INDIVIDUAL RESULTS:

Run 1: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 2: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 3: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 4: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 5: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 6: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 7: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 8: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 9: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None
Run 10: Score = 71.4, Recommendation = None

DETAILED CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

📊 SCORE STATISTICS:

Runs: 10/10 successful
Score Range: 71.4% - 71.4%
Average: 71.40%
Median: 71.4%
Mode: 71.4% (10 times)
Std Deviation: 0.00
Consistency Score: 100/100

Results - LLM consistency test

🏆 Rank 1: Similarity Score: 0.7759
Job ID: JOB-000184
Title: QA Engineer
Company: Orlion Analytics
Location: Alexandria, Egypt
Sector: Software Engineering
Requirements: Proficiency in Spring Boot...

🏆 Rank 2: Similarity Score: 0.7661
Job ID: JOB-000368
Title: QA Engineer
Company: Arcadia Systems
Location: Cairo, Egypt
Sector: Software Engineering
Requirements: Proficiency in MongoDB...

🏆 Rank 3: Similarity Score: 0.7475
Job ID: JOB-000417
Title: QA Engineer
Company: Crestel Technologies
Location: Alexandria, Egypt
Sector: Software Engineering
Requirements: Proficiency in MongoDB...

🏆 Rank 4: Similarity Score: 0.6695
Job ID: JOB-000060
Title: QA Engineer
Company: Velora Technologies
Location: Remote – EMEA
Sector: Software Engineering
Requirements: Proficiency in TypeScript...

🏆 Rank 5: Similarity Score: 0.6659
Job ID: JOB-000059
Title: QA Engineer
Company: Orlion Solutions
Location: Remote – EMEA
Sector: Software Engineering
Requirements: Proficiency in CI/CD...

Notes

- The solution mainly focuses on achieving deterministic behavior and maintaining a very narrow margin of error without relying on caching.
 - We can experiment with different LLMs to observe and compare their behaviors.
 - Fine-tuning can further improve the solution by training the model to calculate evaluation metrics more accurately.
 - The solution does not emphasize any evaluation metrics or the accuracy of job matching; its main focus is to achieve consistent results across different LLM calls.
 - Once deterministic behavior is achieved, we can align and fine-tune the metrics to reflect the actual business evaluation criteria.
- 