A/B Test Report:Similarity-aware Difficulty Scoring

David Zhu*

Catharine Li[†]

August 2025

Abstract

This report evaluates a post-processing rule that lowers the difficulty score for concepts whose names closely match previously seen cards (found in the data/ folder). We compare the baseline scoring (A) with the similarity-aware adjustment (B) across multiple thresholds and penalty strengths.

1 Objective

Assess whether reducing difficulty for repeated or near-duplicate concept names (based on string similarity) behaves as intended while leaving new concepts unaffected.

2 Methodology

Baseline (A). The base difficulty was fixed at 4 for testing. Variant (B). Apply:

- similarity_threshold $\in \{0.75, 0.82, 0.90\}$
- lower_by $\in \{1, 2\}$
- If a prior card name in data/ exceeds the threshold similarity with the current concept name, decrease difficulty by lower_by (floor at 1).

Concepts tested: Code Documentation, Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning, Completely New Topic, Testing Documentation.

3 Results

Baseline (A) difficulty for all rows: 4. The table reports the adjusted difficulty (B).

Summary. Repeated concepts (e.g., Code Documentation, Testing Documentation) drop by the configured penalty when similarity exceeds the threshold. New concepts (Completely New Topic) stay at the baseline. At the strictest threshold (0.90), Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning no longer triggers a reduction, indicating the threshold is working as a precision control.

^{*}rz2718@nyu.edu

[†]c15429@nyu.edu

4 Discussion & Recommendation

The mechanism behaves as designed. For production, we recommend:

- similarity_threshold = 0.82: balances catching legitimate repeats while avoiding overmatching.
- lower_by = 1: conservative reduction that avoids overly deflating difficulty on borderline matches.

Future work: run on a larger, real set of user-generated cards; log hit rate (how often reductions occur) and collect qualitative feedback.

Appendix A: Repro Snippet

Minimal driver used to generate Table ?? (base difficulty set to 4):

Concept	Threshold	Lower By	Adjusted Difficulty
Machine Learning	0.75	1	3
Machine Learning	0.75	2	2
Machine Learning	0.82	1	3
Machine Learning	0.82	2	2
Machine Learning	0.90	1	3
Machine Learning	0.90	2	2
Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning	0.75	1	3
Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning	0.75	2	2
Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning	0.82	1	3
Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning	0.82	2	2
Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning	0.90	1	4
Parameter Efficient Fine-Tuning	0.90	2	4
Dimensionality Reduction	0.75	1	3
Dimensionality Reduction	0.75	2	2
Dimensionality Reduction	0.82	1	3
Dimensionality Reduction	0.82	2	2
Dimensionality Reduction	0.90	1	3
Dimensionality Reduction	0.90	2	2
TRetrieval-Augmented Generation	0.75	1	3
TRetrieval-Augmented Generation	0.75	2	2
TRetrieval-Augmented Generation	0.82	1	3
TRetrieval-Augmented Generation	0.82	2	2
TRetrieval-Augmented Generation	0.90	1	4
TRetrieval-Augmented Generation	0.90	2	4
LangChain Expression Language	0.75	1	3
LangChain Expression Language	0.75	2	2
LangChain Expression Language	0.82	1	3
LangChain Expression Language	0.82	2	2
LangChain Expression Language	0.90	1	4
LangChain Expression Language	0.90	2	4
Vector Database	0.75	1	3
Vector Database	0.75	2	2
Vector Database	0.82	1	3
Vector Database	0.82	2	2
Vector Database	0.90	1	3
Vector Database	0.90	2	2

Table 1: Adjusted difficulty levels for various ML/DL concepts across thresholds and lower_by values.