COMP4650 Assignment 1 Answers

Jieli Zheng

u6579712

Q1 & Q2

TF scores:

Mean Average Precision: 0.16925271708009806

R-Precision: 0.19803030303030303 Reciprocal rank: 0.37175925925925923 Precision at 5: 0.1999999999999998 Precision at 10: 0.1466666666666667 Precision at 15: 0.09777777777778

TF-IDF scores:

Mean Average Precision: 0.28087837129801413

$\mathbf{Q3}$

The system performs better with TF-IDF instead of TF similarity.

I think the Reciprocal rank is the most useful measure for evaluating this government system.

Firstly I assume that this information retrieval system is designed for government office to search for the previous official government documents. Officer usually has clearly targets so that only the exact document will be needed. And in this case it's a precision-critical task and there is only one relevant document in the system. As a result, the Reciprocal rank should be the most important measure depending on our demand.

First setting:

 $PorterStemmer\ (Default),\ PunktSentenceTokenizer$

Scores:

Mean Average Precision: 0.7524007936507937

R-Precision: 0.69500000000000001 Reciprocal rank (chosen): 0.9

Precision at 5: 0.6

Firstly, we only change the Tokenizer to PunktSentenceTokenizer, which tokenize text by using punctuations (';', ':', ',', '', '!', '?'). Compared to the default setting in Q2, we find that Reciprocal rank of the first setting is much better than the default one in Q2. The main reason is that WhitespaceTokenizer divides text by space, tab and newline, which is less informative than punctuations because government documents usually have more punctuations than whitespaces and punctuations are designed for spliting meanings.

Second setting:

LancasterStemmer, PunktSentenceTokenizer:

Scores:

Mean Average Precision: 0.5935119047619046

R-Precision: 0.575

Reciprocal rank (chosen): 0.7 Precision at 5: 0.4800000000000001

Precision at 10: 0.32

Precision at 15: 0.21333333333333333

In the second setting, both the Tokenizer and the stemmer have been changed. We find that the Reciprocal rank of the second setting is worse than the first one when we change default PorterStemmer to LancasterStemmer. LancasterStemmer is based on Lancaster (Paice/Husk) stemming algorithm, which performs worse than PorterStemmer which is based on the Porter stemming algorithm. LancasterStemmer is less effective than PorterStemmer because LancasterStemmer only converts suffixes.

Third setting:

SnowballStemmer with language set to English, WhitespaceTokenizer(Default)

Scores:

Mean Average Precision: 0.22738894328775283

R-Precision: 0.24219696969696972

Reciprocal rank (chosen): 0.5253703703703703

In the third setting, we use SnowballStemmer in English and default tokenizer. And we find the Reciprocal rank is relatively the same as the default setting. SnowballStemmer is designed by the suffix stripping algorithm, which is similar to PorterStemmer.

Forth setting:

ISRIStemmer, WhitespaceTokenizer(Default)

Scores:

Mean Average Precision: 0.09838395863395863

R-Precision: 0.15106060606060603

In the forth setting, we use ISRIStemmer and default tokenizer. ISRIStemmer is based on Arabic Stemming without a root dictionary Algorithm and the Reciprocal rank of this setting is much worse than the default setting. The main reason is that ISRIStemmer sometimes converts words to wrong word stems that changes the vector form of the document.

 $\mathbf{Q4}$