Building up our query technology

- "Matching" search
  - Linear on-demand retrieval (aka grep)
  - 0/1 Vector-Based Boolean Queries
  - Posting-Based Boolean Queries
- Ranked search
  - Parametric Search
  - Zones
  - Scoring
Subqueries could be *any* Boolean query

Where do we get the weights? (e.g., 0.6, 0.3, 0.1)

- Rarely from the user
- Usually built into the query engine
  - Where does the query engine get them from?
    - Machine learning

\[ \text{Score} = 0.6(\text{instant} \in \text{TITLE}) + 0.3(\text{oatmeal} \in \text{BODY}) + 0.1(\text{health} \in \text{ABSTRACT}) \]
Scoring Exercise

- Calculate the score for each document based on the weightings (0.1 author), (0.3 body), (0.6 title)
- For the query
  - “bill” or “rights”
Building up our query technology

- “Matching” search
  - Linear on-demand retrieval (aka grep)
  - 0/1 Vector-Based Boolean Queries
  - Posting-Based Boolean Queries
- Ranked search
  - Parametric Search
  - Zones
  - Scoring
Zones combination index

- Encode the zone in the posting
- At query time accumulate the contributions to the total score from the various postings
Zone scoring with zones combination index

“bill OR rights” (0.1 author), (0.3 body), (0.6 title)
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“bill OR rights” (0.1 author), (0.3 body), (0.6 title)

Results: 9,8,5,3,2,1
Zone scoring with zones combination index

- As we walk, we accumulate scores linearly
- Note: getting “bill” and “rights” in the title field didn’t cause us to score any higher
  - Should it?
- Where do the weights come from?
  - Machine learning
    - Given a corpus, test queries and “gold standard” relevance scores, compute weights which come as close as possible to “gold standard”
Full text queries

- Previous example was for “bill OR rights”
- Average user is likely to type “bill rights” or “bill of rights”
  - How do we interpret such a query?
  - No Boolean operators
  - Some query terms might not be in the document
  - Some query terms might not be in a zone
Full text queries

- To use zone combinations for free text queries, we need:
  - A way of scoring = Score(full-text-query, zone)
  - Zero query terms in zone -> zero score
  - More query terms in a zone -> higher score
  - Scores don’t have to be boolean (0 or 1) anymore
- Let’s look at the alternatives...
Building up our query technology

- “Matching” search
  - Linear on-demand retrieval (aka grep)
  - 0/1 Vector-Based Boolean Queries
  - Posting-Based Boolean Queries
- Ranked search
  - Parametric Search
  - Zones
  - Scoring
  - Term Frequency Matrices
Incidence Matrices

- Recall how a document, $d$, (or a zone) is a $(0,1)$ column vector.
- A query, $q$, is also a column vector. How so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anthony and Cleopatra</th>
<th>Julius Caesar</th>
<th>The Tempest</th>
<th>Hamlet</th>
<th>Othello</th>
<th>Macbeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpurnia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incidence Matrices

• Using this formalism, score can be overlap measure:

\[ |q \cap D| \]
Querying

Incidence Matrices

• Example:
  • Query “ides of march”
  • Shakespeare’s “Julius Caesar” has a score of 3
  • Plays that contain “march” and “of” score 2
  • Plays that contain “of” score 1

• Algorithm:
  • Bitwise-And between q and matrix, D
  • Column summation
  • Sort
Incidence Matrices

- What is wrong with the overlap measure?
- It doesn’t consider:
  - Term frequency in a document
  - Term scarcity in corpus
  - “ides” is much rarer than “of”
  - Length of a document
  - Length of queries
Toward better scoring

- Overlap Measure
- Normalizing queries
  - Jaccard Coefficient
    - Score is number of words that overlap divided by total number of words
  - What documents would score best?
- Cosine Measure
  - Will the same documents score well?
Toward Better Scoring

- Scores so far capture position (zone) and overlap
- Next step: a document which talks about a topic should be a better match
  - Even when there is a single term in the query
  - Document is relevant if the term occurs a lot
- This brings us to term weighting
Bag of Words Model

- “Don fears the mole man” equals “The mole man fears Don”
- The incidence matrix for both looks the same
### Term Frequency Matrix

- **Bag of words**
- **Document is vector with integer elements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Antony and Cleopatra</th>
<th>Julius Caesar</th>
<th>The Tempest</th>
<th>Hamlet</th>
<th>Othello</th>
<th>Macbeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brutus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpurnia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mercy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worser</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Querying

Term Frequency - tf

- Long documents are favored because they are more likely to contain query terms
- Reduce the impact by normalizing by document length
- Is raw term frequency the right number?
Querying

Weighting Term Frequency - WTF

• What is the relative importance of
  • 0 vs. 1 occurrence of a word in a document?
  • 1 vs. 2 occurrences of a word in a document?
  • 2 vs. 100 occurrences of a word in a document?

• Answer is unclear:
  • More is better, but not proportionally

• An alternative to raw tf: 

\[
\text{WTF}(t, d) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \text{tf}_{t,d} = 0 \\
2 & \text{then return}(0) \\
3 & \text{else return}(1 + \log(\text{tf}_{t,d})) 
\end{cases}
\]
Weighting Term Frequency - WTF

The score for query, $q$, is:

- Sum over terms, $t$

$$\text{Score}_{WTF}(q, d) = \sum_{t \in q} (WTF(t, d))$$

$WTF(t, d)$

1. if $tf_{t,d} = 0$
2. then return $(0)$
3. else return $(1 + \log(tf_{t,d}))$

$Score_{WTF}("bill rights", declarationOfIndependence) = WTF("bill", declarationOfIndependence) + WTF("rights", declarationOfIndependence) = 0 + 1 + \log(3) = 1.48$
Weighting Term Frequency - WTF

\[
Score_{WTF}(q, d) = \sum_{t \in q} (WTF(t, d))
\]

\[
Score_{WTF}("bill rights", \text{declarationOfIndependence}) = \]
\[
WTF("bill", \text{declarationOfIndependence}) +
WTF("rights", \text{declarationOfIndependence}) =
0 + 1 + \log(3) = 1.48
\]

\[
Score_{WTF}("bill rights", \text{constitution}) =
WTF("bill", \text{constitution}) +
WTF("rights", \text{constitution}) =
1 + \log(10) + 1 + \log(1) = 3
\]
Weighting Term Frequency - WTF

• Can be zone combined:

\[
\text{Score} = 0.6(Score_{WTF}("instant oatmeal health", d.title) + \\
0.3(Score_{WTF}("instant oatmeal health", d.body) + \\
0.1(Score_{WTF}("instant oatmeal health", d.abstract))
\]

• Note that you get 0 if there are no query terms in the document.

• Is that really what you want?

• We will eventually address this
Unsatisfied with term weighting

- Which of these tells you more about a document?
  - 10 occurrences of “mole”
  - 10 occurrences of “man”
  - 10 occurrences of “the”
- It would be nice if common words had less impact
- How do we decide what is common?
- Let’s use corpus-wide statistics
Corpus-wide statistics

- **Collection Frequency**, $cf$
  - Define: The total number of occurrences of the term in the entire corpus

- **Document Frequency**, $df$
  - Define: The total number of documents which contain the term in the corpus
Corpus-wide statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Collection Frequency</th>
<th>Document Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insurance</td>
<td>10440</td>
<td>3997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>try</td>
<td>10422</td>
<td>8760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This suggests that df is better at discriminating between documents
- How do we use df?