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## Information Retrieval
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## Bigger corpora

- Consider $N=1 \mathrm{M}$ documents, each with about 1 K terms.
- Avg 6 bytes/term incl spaces/punctuation
- 6 GB of data in the documents.
- Say there are $m=500 \mathrm{~K}$ distinct terms among these.


## Can't build the matrix

- $500 \mathrm{~K} x 1 \mathrm{M}$ matrix has half-a-trillion 0's and 1's.
- But it has no more than one billion 1's.
- matrix is extremely sparse.
- What's a better representation?
- We only record the 1 positions.
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## Inverted index

- For each term $T$, we must store a list of all documents that contain $T$.
- Do we use an array or a list for this?

| $\mid$ Brutus |
| :--- |
| Calpurnia |
| Caesar |

What happens if the word Caesar is added to document 14 ?

## Inverted index

- Linked lists generally preferred to arrays
- Dynamic space allocation
- Insertion of terms into documents easy
- Space overhead of pointers

Brutus


Dictionary
Postings lists
Sorted by docID (more later on why).

## Inverted index construction



## Indexer steps

- Sequence of (Modified token, Document ID) pairs.

$$
\text { Doc } 1 \quad \text { Doc } 2
$$

I did enact Julius
Caesar I was killed i' the Capitol; Brutus killed me.

So let it be with Caesar. The noble Brutus hath told you Caesar was ambitious

| Term | Doc \# |
| :---: | :---: |
| I | 1 |
| did | 1 |
| enact | 1 |
| julius | 1 |
| caesar | 1 |
| I | 1 |
| was | 1 |
| killed | 1 |
| $i^{\prime}$ | 1 |
| the | 1 |
| capitol | 1 |
| brutus | 1 |
| killed | 1 |
| me | 1 |
| so | 2 |
| let | 2 |
| it | 2 |
| be | 2 |
| with | 2 |
| caesar | 2 |
| the | 2 |
| noble | 2 |
| brutus | 2 |
| hath | 2 |
| told | 2 |
| you | 2 |
| caesar | 2 |
| was | 2 |
| ambitious | 2 |

- Sort by terms.


## Core indexing step.

| Term | Doc \# | Term | Doc \# |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | ambitious | 2 |
| did | 1 | be | 2 |
| enact | 1 | brutus | 1 |
| julius | 1 | brutus | 2 |
| caesar | 1 | capitol | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | caesar | 1 |
| was | 1 | caesar | 2 |
| killed | 1 | caesar | 2 |
| $i^{\prime}$ | 1 | did | 1 |
| the | 1 | enact | 1 |
| capitol | 1 | hath | 1 |
| brutus | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| killed | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| me | 1 | i' | 1 |
| so | 2 | it | 2 |
| let | 2 | julius | 1 |
| it | 2 | killed | 1 |
| be | 2 | killed | 1 |
| with | 2 | let | 2 |
| caesar | 2 | me | 1 |
| the | 2 | noble | 2 |
| noble | 2 | so | 2 |
| brutus | 2 | the | 1 |
| hath | 2 | the | 2 |
| told | 2 | told | 2 |
| you | 2 | you | 2 |
| caesar | 2 | was | 1 |
| was | 2 | was | 2 |
| ambitious | 2 | with | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

- Multiple term entries in a single document are merged.
- Frequency information is added.


| Term |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| ambitious |  |
| ame | 2 |
| be | 2 |
| brutus | 1 |
| brutus | 2 |
| capitol | 1 |
| caesar | 1 |
| caesar | 2 |
| caesar | 2 |
| did | 1 |
| enact | 1 |
| hath | 1 |
| l | 1 |
| l | 1 |
| i | 1 |
| it | 2 |
| julius | 1 |
| killed | 1 |
| killed | 1 |
| let | 2 |
| me | 1 |
| noble | 2 |
| so | 2 |
| the | 1 |
| the | 2 |
| told | 2 |
| you | 2 |
| was | 1 |
| was | 2 |
| with | 2 |
|  |  |
|  |  |



## - The result is split into a Dictionary file and a

 Postings file.| Term | Doc \# | Freq |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ambitious | 2 | 21 |
| be | 2 | 21 |
| brutus | 1 | 1 |
| brutus | 2 | 21 |
| capitol | 1 | 1 |
| caesar | 1 | 1 |
| caesar | 2 | 22 |
| did | 1 | 1 |
| enact | 1 | 1 |
| hath | 2 | 21 |
| I | 1 | 12 |
| i' | 1 | 1 |
| it | 2 | 21 |
| julius | 1 | 1 |
| killed | 1 | 2 |
| let | 2 | 21 |
| me | 1 | 1 |
| noble | 2 | 21 |
| so | 2 | 21 |
| the | 1 | 1 |
| the | 2 | 21 |
| told | 2 | 21 |
| you | 2 | 21 |
| was | 1 | 1 |
| was | 2 | 1 |
| with | 2 | 21 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


|  |  |  | Freq |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Term | N docs | Coll freq | 1 |
| ambitious | 1 |  | 1 |
| be | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| brutus | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| capitol | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| caesar | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| did | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| enact | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| hath | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| i' | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| it | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| julius | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| killed | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| let | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| me | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| noble | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| so | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| the | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| told | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| you | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| was | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| with | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | 1 |

- Where do we pay in storage?



## The index we just built

- How do we process a query?
- Later - what kinds of queries can we process?



## Query processing: AND

- Consider processing the query:


## Brutus AND Caesar

- Locate Brutus in the Dictionary;
- Retrieve its postings.
- Locate Caesar in the Dictionary;
- Retrieve its postings.
- "Merge" the two postings:



## The merge

- Walk through the two postings simultaneously, in time linear in the total number of postings entries


If the list lengths are $x$ and $y$, the merge takes $\mathrm{O}(x+y)$ operations.
Crucial: postings sorted by docID.

## Boolean queries: Exact match

- The Boolean Retrieval model is being able to ask a query that is a Boolean expression:
- Boolean Queries are queries using $A N D, O R$ and $N O T$ to join query terms
- Views each document as a set of words
- Is precise: document matches condition or not.
- Primary commercial retrieval tool for 3 decades.
- Professional searchers (e.g., lawyers) still like Boolean queries:
- You know exactly what you're getting.


## Example: WestLaw

- Largest commercial (paying subscribers) legal search service (started 1975; ranking added 1992)
- Tens of terabytes of data; 700,000 users
- Majority of users still use boolean queries
- Example query:
- What is the statute of limitations in cases involving the federal tort claims act?
- LIMIT! /3 STATUTE ACTION /S FEDERAL /2 TORT /3 CLAIM
- /3 = within 3 words, /S = in same sentence


## Example: WestLaw

- Another example query:
- Requirements for disabled people to be able to access a workplace
- disabl! /p access! /s work-site work-place (employment /3 place
- Note that SPACE is disjunction, not conjunction!
- Long, precise queries; proximity operators; incrementally developed; not like web search
- Professional searchers often like Boolean search:
- Precision, transparency and control
- But that doesn't mean they actually work better....


## Boolean queries: More general merges

- Exercise: Adapt the merge for the queries: Brutus AND NOT Caesar Brutus OR NOT Caesar

Can we still run through the merge in time $\mathrm{O}(x+y)$ or what can we achieve?

## Merging

What about an arbitrary Boolean formula?
(Brutus OR Caesar) AND NOT
(Antony OR Cleopatra)

- Can we always merge in "linear" time?
- Linear in what?
- Can we do better?


## Query optimization

- What is the best order for query processing?
- Consider a query that is an $A N D$ of $t$ terms.
- For each of the $t$ terms, get its postings, then $A N D$ them together.

| Brutus |
| :--- |
| Calpurnia |
| Caesar |

## Query: Brutus AND Calpurnia AND Caesar

## Query optimization example

- Process in order of increasing freq:
- start with smallest set, then keep cutting further.


This is why we kept
freq in dictionary

| Brutus |
| :--- |
| Calpurnia |
| Caesar |

Execute the query as (Caesar AND Brutus) AND Calpurnia.

More general optimization

- e.g., (madding OR crowd) AND (ignoble OR strife)
- Get freq's for all terms.
- Estimate the size of each $O R$ by the sum of its freq's (conservative).
- Process in increasing order of $O R$ sizes.


## Exercise

- Recommend a query processing order for
(tangerine OR trees) AND (marmalade OR skies) AND (kaleidoscope OR eyes)

| Term | Freq |
| :--- | ---: |
| eyes | 213312 |
| kaleidoscope | 87009 |
| marmalade | 107913 |
| skies | 271658 |
| tangerine | 46653 |
| trees | 316812 |

## Query processing exercises

- If the query is friends AND romans AND (NOT countrymen), how could we use the freq of countrymen?
- Exercise: Extend the merge to an arbitrary Boolean query. Can we always guarantee execution in time linear in the total postings size?
- Hint: Begin with the case of a Boolean formula query: in this, each query term appears only once in the query.


## What's ahead in IR? Beyond term search

- What about phrases?
- Stanford University
- Proximity: Find Gates NEAR Microsoft.
- Need index to capture position information in docs. More later.
- Zones in documents: Find documents with (author = Ullman) AND (text contains automata).


## Evidence accumulation

- 1 vs. 0 occurrence of a search term
- 2 vs. 1 occurrence
- 3 vs. 2 occurrences, etc.
- Usually more seems better
- Need term frequency information in docs


## Ranking search results

- Boolean queries give inclusion or exclusion of docs.
- Often we want to rank/group results
- Need to measure proximity from query to each doc.
- Need to decide whether docs presented to user are singletons, or a group of docs covering various aspects of the query.

IR vs. databases:
Structured vs unstructured data

- Structured data tends to refer to information in "tables"

| Employee | Manager | Salary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Smith | Jones | 50000 |
| Chang | Smith | 60000 |
| Ivy | Smith | 50000 |

Typically allows numerical range and exact match (for text) queries, e.g., Salary < 60000 AND Manager = Smith.

## Unstructured data

- Typically refers to free text
- Allows
- Keyword queries including operators
- More sophisticated "concept" queries e.g.,
- find all web pages dealing with drug abuse
- Classic model for searching text documents


## Semi-structured data

- In fact almost no data is "unstructured"
- E.g., this slide has distinctly identified zones such as the Title and Bullets
- Facilitates "semi-structured" search such as
- Title contains data AND Bullets contain search
... to say nothing of linguistic structure


## More sophisticated semi-structured search

- Title is about Object Oriented Programming AND Author something like stro*rup
- where * is the wild-card operator
- Issues:
- how do you process "about"?
- how do you rank results?
- The focus of XML search.


## Clustering and classification

- Given a set of docs, group them into clusters based on their contents.
- Given a set of topics, plus a new doc $D$, decide which topic(s) $D$ belongs to.


## The Web and its challenges

- Unusual and diverse documents
- Unusual and diverse users, queries, information needs
- Beyond terms, exploit ideas from social networks
- link analysis, clickstreams ...
- How do search engines work? And how can we make them better?


## More sophisticated information retrieval

- Cross-language information retrieval
- Question answering
- Summarization
- Text mining
- ...

