

# Simrank++: Query rewriting through link analysis of the click graph

Ioannis Antonellis \*

Hector Garcia-Molina †

Chi-Chao Chang ‡

## Abstract

We focus on the problem of query rewriting for sponsored search. We base rewrites on a historical click graph that records the ads that have been clicked on in response to past user queries. Given a query  $q$ , we first consider Simrank [5] as a way to identify queries similar to  $q$ , i.e., queries whose ads a user may be interested in. We argue that Simrank fails to properly identify query similarities in our application, and we present two enhanced versions of Simrank: one that exploits weights on click graph edges and another that exploits “evidence.” We experimentally evaluate our new schemes against Simrank, using actual click graphs and queries from Yahoo!, and using a variety of metrics. Our results show that the enhanced methods can yield more and better query rewrites.

## 1 Introduction

In sponsored search, paid advertisements (ads) relevant to a user’s query are shown above or along-side traditional web search results. The placement of these ads is in general related to a ranking score which is a function of the semantic relevance to the query and the advertiser’s bid.




Figure 1: General sponsored search system architecture.

Ideally, a sponsored search system would appear as in Figure 1. The system has access to a database of available ads and a set of bids. Conceptually, each bid consists of a query  $q$ , an ad  $\alpha$ , and a price  $p$ . With such a bid, the bidder offers to pay if the ad  $\alpha$  is both displayed and clicked when a user issues query  $q$ . For many queries, there are not enough direct bids, so the sponsored search system attempts to find other ads that may be of interest to the user who submitted the query. Even though there is no direct bid, if the user clicks on one of these ads, the search engine will make some money (and the advertiser will receive a customer). The challenge is then to find ads related to incoming queries that may yield user click throughs.

For a variety of practical and historical reasons, the sponsored search system is often split into two components, as shown in Figure 2. A front-end takes an input query  $q$  and produces a list of *re-writes*, i.e., of other queries that are “similar” to  $q$ . For example, for query “camera,” the queries “digital camera” and “photography” may be useful because the user may also be interested in ads for those related queries. The query “battery” may also be useful because users that want a camera may also be in the market for a spare battery. The query and its rewrites are then considered by the back-end, which displays ads that have bids for the query or its rewrites. The

\*Computer Science Dept, Stanford University. Email: antonell@cs.stanford.edu

†Computer Science Dept, Stanford University. Email: hector@cs.stanford.edu

‡Yahoo! Inc. Email: chichao@yahoo-inc.com




Figure 2: A common sponsored search system architecture.

split approach reduces the complexity of the back-end, which has to deal with rapidly changing bids. The work of finding relevant ads, indirectly through related queries, is off-loaded to the front-end.

At the front-end, queries can be rewritten using a variety of techniques (reviewed in our Related Work section) developed for document search. However, these techniques often do not generate enough useful rewrites. Part of the problem is that in our case “documents” (the ads) have little text, and queries are very short, so there is less information to work with, as compared with larger documents. Another part of the problem is that there are relatively few queries in the bid database, so even if we found all the textually related ones, we may not have enough. Thus, it is important to generate additional rewrites, using other techniques.

In this paper we focus on query rewrites based on the recent history of ads displayed and clicked on. The back-end generates a historical *click graph* that records the clicks that were generated by ads when a user inputs a given query. The click graph is a weighted bi-partite graph, with queries on one side and ads on the other (details in Section 2). The schemes we present analyze the connections in the click graph to identify rewrites that may be useful. Our techniques identify not only queries that are directly connected by an ad (e.g., users that submit either “mp3” or “i-tunes” click on ad an for “iPod.”) but also queries that are more indirectly related (Section 3). Our techniques are based on the notion of *SimRank* [5], which can compute query similarity based on the connections in a bi-partite click-graph. However, in our case we need to extend *SimRank* to take into account the specifics of our sponsored search application.

Briefly, the contributions of this paper are as follows.

- We present a framework for query rewriting in a sponsored search environment.
- We identify cases where *SimRank* fails to transfer correctly the relationships between queries and ads into similarity scores.
- We present two *SimRank* extensions: one that takes into account the weights of the edges in the click graph, and another that takes into account the “evidence” supporting the similarity between queries.
- We experimentally evaluate these query rewriting techniques, using an actual click graph from Yahoo!, and a set of queries extracted from Yahoo! logs. We evaluate the resulting rewrites using several metrics. One of the comparisons we perform involves manual evaluation of query-rewrite pairs by members of Yahoo!’s Editorial Evaluation Team. Our results show that we can significantly increase the number of useful rewrites over those produced by *SimRank* and by another basic technique.

**1.1 Related Work** The query rewriting problem has been extensively studied in terms of traditional web search. In traditional web search, query rewriting techniques are used for recommending more useful queries to the user and for improving the quality of search results by incorporating users’ actions in the results’ ranking of future searches. Given a query and a search engine’s results on this, the indication that a user clicked on some results can be interpreted as a vote that these specific results are matching the user’s needs and thus are more relevant to the query. This information can then be used for improving the search results on future queries. Existing query rewriting techniques for traditional web search, include relevance feedback and pseudo-relevance feedback, query term deletion [6], substituting query terms with related terms from retrieved documents [11],

dimensionality reduction such as Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) [4], machine learning techniques [13, 12, 2] and techniques based on the analysis of the click graph [3].

Pseudo-relevance feedback techniques involve submitting a query for an initial retrieval, processing the resulting documents, modifying the query by expanding it with additional terms from the documents retrieved and then performing an additional retrieval on the modified query. However, pseudo-relevance feedback requires that the initial query retrieval procedure returns some results, something that is not always the case in sponsored search, as described before. In addition, pseudo-relevance has many limitations in effectiveness [9]. It may lead to query drift, as unrelated terms might be added to the query and is also computationally expensive. Query relaxation or deleting query terms leads to a loss of specificity from the original query.

In LSI, a collection of queries is represented by a terms queries matrix where each column corresponds to the vector space representation of a query. The column space of that matrix is approximated by a space of much smaller dimension that is obtained from the leading singular vectors of the matrix and then similarity scores between different queries can be computed. LSI is frequently found to be very effective even though the analysis of its success is not as straightforward [8]. The computational kernel in LSI is the singular value decomposition (SVD). This provides the mechanism for projecting both the queries on a lower-dimensional space spanned by the leading left singular vectors. In addition to performing dimensionality reduction, LSI captures hidden semantic structure in the data and resolves problems caused by synonymy and polysemy in the terms used. However, a well known difficulty with LSI is the high cost of the SVD for the large, sparse matrices appearing in practice.

## 2 Problem Definition

Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  denote a set of  $n$  queries and  $\mathcal{A}$  denote a set of  $m$  ads. A click graph for a specific time period is an undirected, weighted, bipartite graph  $G = (\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{A}, E)$  where  $E$  is a set of edges that connect queries with ads.  $G$  has an edge  $(q, \alpha)$  if at least one user that issued the query  $q$  during the time period also clicked on the ad  $\alpha$ . Each edge  $(q, \alpha)$  has three weights associated with it. The first one is the number of times that  $\alpha$  has been displayed as a result for  $q$  and is called the impressions of  $\alpha$  given  $q$ . The second weight is the number of clicks that  $\alpha$  received as a result of being displayed for they query  $q$ . This second weight is less than or equal to the first weight. The number of clicks divided by the number of impressions gives us the likelihood that a displayed ad will be clicked on. However, to be more accurate, this ratio needs to be adjusted to take into account the position where the ad was displayed. That is, an ad  $\alpha$  placed near the top of the sponsored results is more likely to be clicked on, regardless of how good an ad it is for query  $q$ . Thus, the third weight associated with an edge  $(q, \alpha)$  is the *expected click rate*, an adjusted clicks over impressions rate. The expected click rate is computed by the back-end (Figure 2), and we do not discuss the details here.

Finally, for a node  $v$  in a graph, we denote by  $E(v)$  the set of neighbors of  $v$ . We also define  $N(v) = |E(v)|$  that is  $N(v)$  denotes the number of  $v$ 's total neighbors.

As discussed in the introduction, our goal is to find queries that are *similar*, in the sense that the ads clicked on for one query are likely to be clicked on when displayed for a user that entered the second query. We will predict similarity based on the information in the click graph: The intuition is that if an ad received clicks when displayed for both queries  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , then the queries are similar. Furthermore, if  $q_2$  is related to  $q_3$  in the same way but through some other ad, then  $q_1$  and  $q_3$  are also similar, although possibly to a lesser degree. We discuss our notion of similarity more in the following section.

Note that if the click graph does *not* contain an ad  $\alpha$  that received clicks when  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  were issued, then we *cannot* infer that  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are *not* similar. The queries could very well be similar (in our sense), but while the click-graph was collected, the back-end did not display ads that would have shown this similarity. (Perhaps there were no bids for those ads at the time.) As we will see later, even without the common ad  $\alpha$ , we may still be able to discover the similarity of  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  through other similarity relationships in the click-graph.

Also note that in this paper we are not addressing problems of click or ad fraud. Fraud is a serious problem, where organizations or individuals generate clicks or place ads with the intent of defrauding or misleading the advertiser and/or the search engine. Query rewriting strategies may need to be adjusted to protect from fraud, but we do not consider such issues here.

Finally, notice that our query rewriting problem is a type of collaborative filtering (CF) problem. We can view the queries as “users” who are recommending “ads” by clicking on them. When we identify similar queries, we are finding queries that have similar recommendations, just like in CF, where one finds users that have similar tastes. In our setting, we are only trying to find similar queries (users), and not actually predicting recommended

ads. Furthermore, as we will see, we are tuning our similarity metrics so they work well for sponsored search, as opposed to generic recommendations.

### 3 Similar queries

In this section we discuss the notion of query similarity that we are interested in. As we mentioned earlier, we will be saying that two queries are similar if they tend to make the search engine users to click on the same ads. Let us illustrate this with an example. Figure 3 shows a small click graph; for simplicity we have removed the weights from the edges and thus an edge indicates the existence of at least one click from a query to an ad. In this graph, the queries “pc” and “camera” are connected through a common ad and thus can be considered similar. Notice that this notion of similarity is not related to the actual similarity of the concepts described by the query terms. Now, we can observe that the queries “camera” and “digital camera” are connected through two common ads and thus can be considered similar. In contrast, queries “pc” and “tv” are not connected through any ad. However, both “pc” and “tv” are connected through an ad with the queries “digital camera” and “camera” which we already saw that are similar. Thus, we have a small amount of evidence that “pc” and “tv” are somehow similar, because they are both similar with queries that bring clicks to the same ads. In that case we will be saying that “pc” and “tv” are one hop away from queries that have a common ad. There might actually be cases where two queries will be two or more hops away from queries that bring clicks to the same ad. Finally, let us consider the queries “tv” and “flower”. There is no path in the click graph that connects these two queries and thus we conclude that these queries are not similar.




Figure 3: Sample unweighted click graph. An edge indicates the existence of at least one click from a query to an ad.

Thus, a naive way to measure the similarity of a pair of queries would be to count the number of common ads that they are connected to. Table 1 presents the resulting similarity scores for our sample click graph. As we can see there, “pc” has a similarity score 1 both with “camera” and “digital camera” but no similarity with “tv” and “flower”. However, “camera” has a similarity score 2 with “digital camera” which indicates a stronger similarity. Also, “tv” has similarity 0 both with “pc” and “flower”. Notice also that flower has similarity 0 with all the other queries. It is obvious that this naive technique cannot capture the similarity between “pc” and “tv” (as it does not look at the whole graph structure) and determines that their similarity is zero. In the following section we will see how we can compute similarity scores that take into account all the interactions appearing in the graph.

### 4 Simrank-based query similarity

Simrank [5] is a method for computing object similarities, applicable in any domain with object-to-object relationships, that measures similarity of the structural context in which objects occur, based on their relationships with other objects. Specifically, in the case where there are two types of objects, bipartite Simrank is an iterative

Table 1: Query-query similarity scores for the sample click graph of Figure 3. Scores have been computed by counting the common ads between the queries

	pc	camera	digital camera	tv	flower
pc	-	1	1	0	0
camera	1	-	2	1	0
digital camera	1	2	-	1	0
tv	0	1	1	-	0
flower	0	0	0	0	-

technique to compute the similarity score for each pair of objects of the same type. Bipartite Simrank is based on the underlying idea that two objects of one type are similar if they are related to similar objects of the second type. In our case, we can consider the queries as one type of objects and the ads as the other and use bipartite Simrank to compute similarity scores for each query-query pair.

Let  $s(q, q')$  denote the similarity between queries  $q$  and  $q'$ , and let  $s(\alpha, \alpha')$  denote the similarity between ads  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$ . For  $q \neq q'$ , we write the equation:

$$(4.1) \quad s(q, q') = \frac{C_1}{N(q)N(q')} \sum_{i \in E(q)} \sum_{j \in E(q')} s(i, j)$$

where  $C_1$  is a constant between 0 and 1. For  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ , we write:

$$(4.2) \quad s(\alpha, \alpha') = \frac{C_2}{N(\alpha)N(\alpha')} \sum_{i \in E(\alpha)} \sum_{j \in E(\alpha')} s(i, j)$$

where again  $C_2$  is a constant between 0 and 1.

If  $q = q'$ , we define  $s(q, q') = 1$  and analogously if  $\alpha = \alpha'$  we define  $s(\alpha, \alpha') = 1$ . Neglecting  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , equation 4.1 says that the similarity between queries  $q$  and  $q'$  is the average similarity between the ads that were clicked on for  $q$  and  $q'$ . Similarly, equation 4.2 says that the similarity between ads  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  is the average similarity between the queries that triggered clicks on  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$ .

In the SimRank paper [5], it is shown that a simultaneous solution  $s(*, *) \in [0, 1]$  to the above equations always exists and is unique. Also notice that the SimRank scores are symmetric, i.e.  $s(q, q') = s(q', q)$ .

In order to understand the role of the  $C_1, C_2$  constants, let us consider a simple scenario where two ads  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  were clicked on for a query  $q$  (which means that edges from  $q$  towards  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  exist), so we can conclude some similarity between  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$ . The similarity of  $q$  with itself is 1, but we probably don't want to conclude that  $s(\alpha, \alpha') = s(q, q) = 1$ . Rather, we let  $s(\alpha, \alpha') = C_2 \cdot s(q, q)$ , meaning that we are less confident about the similarity between  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  than we are between  $q$  and itself.

Let us look now at the similarity scores that Simrank computes for our simple click graph of Figure 3. Table 2 presents the similarity scores between all query pairs. If we compare these similarity scores with the ones in Table 1, we can make the following observations. Firstly, "camera" and "digital camera" have now the same similarity score with all other queries except for "flower". Secondly, "tv" has similarity 0.437 with "pc", 0.619 with "camera" and "digital camera" and zero with "flower". Notice that Simrank takes into account the whole graph structure and thus correctly produces a nonzero similarity score for the pair "tv" - "pc". Also notice that "camera" has two common ads with "digital camera" and only one common ad with "tv". However, Simrank does not produce different similarity scores for the "camera"-"digital camera" and "camera"-"tv" pairs. We will come back to this issue in detail in Section 6.

## 5 Random walks behind Simrank

The intuition behind the similarity scores that Simrank defines is based on a "random surfers" model. According to this, a Simrank score  $\text{sim}(a, b)$  measures how soon two random surfers are expected to meet at the same node if they started at nodes  $a, b$  and randomly walked the graph. The transition probabilities of this random walk are uniform, which means that (assuming  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ ) if  $a$  has  $n$  out-neighbors, with the same probability  $1/n$  the random surfer will move to one of these out-neighbors.

Table 2: Query-query similarity scores for the sample click graph of Figure 3. Scores have been computed by Simrank with  $C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$

	pc	camera	digital camera	tv	flower
pc	-	0.619	0.619	0.437	0
camera	0.619	-	0.619	0.619	0
digital camera	0.619	0.619	-	0.619	0
tv	0.437	0.619	0.619	-	0
flower	0	0	0	0	-

The decay factors  $C_1, C_2$  allow for self-transitions. Self-transitions correspond to transitions from a node to itself.  $C_1$  affects the self-transition probabilities of one of the graph’s node sets while  $C_2$  affects the self-transition probabilities of the other node set. Given that  $C_1 < 1$ , with probability  $1 - C_1$  a random surfer will remain in the same node and with probability  $C_1/n$  he will move to one of the  $n$  out-neighbors of the node.

## 6 Simrank in complete bipartite graphs

Some simple bipartite graphs that often appear as subgraphs of a click graph are the complete bipartite graphs. A complete bipartite graph is a special kind of bipartite graph where every vertex of the first node set is connected to every vertex of the second nodes set. In the click graph of Figure 3, the subgraphs consisting of the nodes “flower”, “Teleflora.com”, “orchids.com” and “camera”, “digital camera”, “hp.com”, “bestbuy.com” are two examples of complete bipartite subgraphs. Formally, a complete bipartite graph  $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$  is a bipartite graph such that for any two vertices  $v_1 \in V_1$  and  $v_2 \in V_2$ ,  $(v_1, v_2)$  is an edge in  $E$ . The complete bipartite graph with partitions of size  $|V_1| = m$  and  $|V_2| = n$ , is denoted  $K_{m,n}$ . Figure 4(a) shows a  $K_{2,2}$  graph from a click graph and Figure 4(b) shows a  $K_{1,2}$  click graph.




Figure 4: Sample complete bipartite graphs ( $K_{2,2}$  and  $K_{1,2}$ ) extracted from a click graph.

Let us look at the similarity scores that Simrank computes for the pairs “camera” - “digital camera” and “pc” - “camera” from the graphs of Figure 4. Table 3 tabulates these scores for the first 7 iterations. As we can see  $\text{sim}(\text{“camera”}, \text{“digital camera”})$  is always less than  $\text{sim}(\text{“pc”}, \text{“camera”})$  although we observe that  $\text{sim}(\text{“camera”}, \text{“digital camera”})$  increases as we include more iterations. In fact, we can prove that  $\text{sim}(\text{“camera”}, \text{“digital camera”})$  becomes eventually equal to  $\text{sim}(\text{“pc”}, \text{“camera”})$  as we include more iterations. We can actually prove the following two Theorems for the similarity scores that Simrank computes in complete bipartite graphs (refer to Appendix A for the proofs).

**THEOREM 6.1.** *Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{1,2}$  and  $G' = K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1 = \{b, c\}$  and  $V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then,  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \geq \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 0$ . ■*

**THEOREM 6.2.** *Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{m,2}$  and  $G' = K_{n,2}$  with  $m < n$  and nodes sets  $V_1, V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1, V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then,*

- (i)  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) > \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 0$ , and

Table 3: Query-query similarity scores for the sample click graphs of Figure 4. Scores have been computed by Simrank with  $C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$

Iteration	sim("camera", "digital camera")	sim("pc", "camera")
1	0.4	0.8
2	0.56	0.8
3	0.624	0.8
4	0.6496	0.8
5	0.65984	0.8
6	0.663936	0.8
7	0.6655744	0.8

(ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  if and only if  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ , where  $C_1, C_2$  are the decay factors of the bipartite Simrank equations.  $\blacksquare$

These Theorems provide us two pieces of evidence that Simrank scores are not intuitively correct in complete bipartite graphs. First, as in practice Simrank computations are limited to a small number of iterations, we would reach the conclusion that the pair "pc" - "camera" is more similar than the pair "camera" - "digital camera" which is obviously not correct. Second, even if we had the luxury to run Simrank until it converges, we would reach the conclusion that the similarity scores of the two pairs are the same. However, the fact that there are two advertisers that are connected with the queries "camera" and "digital camera" (versus the one that connects "pc" with "camera") is an indication that their similarity is stronger. We will try to fix such cases by introducing the notion of "evidence of similarity" in the following section.

## 7 Revising Simrank

Consider a bipartite graph  $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$  and two nodes  $a, b \in V_1$ . We will denote as  $\text{evidence}(a, b)$  the evidence existing in  $G$  that the nodes  $a, b$  are similar. The definition of  $\text{evidence}(a, b)$  we use is shown on Equation 7.3.

$$(7.3) \quad \text{evidence}(a, b) = \sum_{i=1}^{|E(a) \cap E(b)|} \frac{1}{2^i}$$

The intuition behind choosing such a function is as follows. We want the evidence score  $\text{evidence}(a, b)$  to be an increasing function of the common neighbors between  $a$  and  $b$ . In addition we want the evidence scores to get closer to one as the common neighbors increase. Thus, another reasonable choice would be the following:

$$(7.4) \quad \text{evidence}(a, b) = \left(1 - e^{-|E(a) \cap E(b)|}\right)$$

In our experiments we used the first definition although preliminary results with both formulas did not show substantial differences.

We can now incorporate the evidence metric into the Simrank equations. We modify the equations 4.1 and 4.2 as follows:

For  $q \neq q'$ , we write the equation:

$$(7.5) \quad s_{\text{evidence}}(q, q') = \text{evidence}(q, q') \cdot s(q, q')$$

where  $s(q, q')$  is the Simrank similarity between  $q$  and  $q'$ . For  $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ , we write:

$$(7.6) \quad s_{\text{evidence}}(\alpha, \alpha') = \text{evidence}(\alpha, \alpha') \cdot s(\alpha, \alpha')$$

where again  $s(\alpha, \alpha')$  is the Simrank similarity between  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$ .

Notice, that we could use  $k$  only iterations to compute the Simrank similarity scores and then multiply them by the evidence scores to come up with evidence-based similarities after  $k$  iterations. We will be loosely referring to these scores as evidence-based similarity scores after  $k$  iterations and we will be denoting them by  $s_{\text{evidence}}^{(k)}(q, q')$ .

Table 4: Query-query similarity scores for the sample click graphs of Figure 4. Scores have been computed by the evidence-based Simrank with  $C_1 = C_2 = 0.8$

Iteration	$\text{sim}(\text{"camera"}, \text{"digital camera"})$	$\text{sim}(\text{"pc"}, \text{"camera"})$
1	0.3	0.4
2	0.42	0.4
3	0.468	0.4
4	0.4872	0.4
5	0.49488	0.4
6	0.497952	0.4
7	0.4991808	0.4

Let us see now what the new Simrank equations compute for our sample click graphs. Table 4 tabulates these scores. As we can see  $\text{sim}(\text{"camera"}, \text{"digital camera"})$  is greater than  $\text{sim}(\text{"pc"}, \text{"camera"})$  after the first iteration. We can actually prove the following Theorem for the similarity scores that evidence-based Simrank computes in complete bipartite graphs (refer to Appendix B for the proof).

**THEOREM 7.1.** *Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{m,2}$  and  $G' = K_{n,2}$  with  $m < n$  and nodes sets  $V_1, V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1, V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite evidence-based Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations and let  $C_1, C_2 > \frac{1}{2}$ , where  $C_1, C_2$  are the decay factors of the bipartite Simrank equations. Then,*

(i)  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 1$ , and

(ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ . ■

This Theorem indicates that the evidence-based Simrank scores in complete bipartite graphs will be consistent with the intuition of query similarity (as we discussed it in Section 3) even if we effectively limit the number of iterations we perform.

## 8 Weighted Simrank

In the previous sections we ignored the information contained in the edges of a click graph and we tried to derive similarity scores for query pairs by just using the click graph’s structure. In this section, we focus on weighted click graphs. We explore ways to derive query-query similarity scores that (i) are consistent with the graph’s weights and (ii) utilize the edge weights in the computation of similarity scores.

**8.1 Consistent similarity scores** We illustrate the notion of consistency between similarity scores and the graph’s weights with the following two examples. Firstly, consider the two weighted click graphs in Figure 5. Apparently the queries “flower”-“orchids” of the left graph are more “similar” than the queries “flower”-“teleflora” of the right graph. This is true because, although both pairs bring clicks to the same ad, the queries of the first pair bring equally the same amount of clicks whereas in the second pair the number of clicks each query brings differ a lot. If we now try to use Simrank or even the evidence-based Simrank to compute similarity scores for these two pairs we will see that it will output the exact same similarity scores for both pairs. It is thus obvious that Simrank scores are not consistent with the the weights on the graph. Now, consider the two graphs



Figure 5: Sample weighted click graphs



of Figure 6. Apparently the similarity scores are no longer affected by the previous notion of consistency as in both graphs the spread of values of the right node is the same. However, it is also obvious that now the queries “flower-orchids” are more similar than the queries “flower-teleflora” since there are more clicks that connect the first pair with an ad. Again, Simrank or evidence-based Simrank will output the exact same similarity scores for both pairs.



Figure 6: Sample weighted click graphs

In general, we define the notion of consistency as follows:

**DEFINITION 8.1. (CONSISTENT SIMILARITY SCORES)** Consider a weighted bipartite graph  $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$ . Consider also two nodes  $v_1, v_2 \in V_2$  and four nodes  $i_1, j_1, i_2, j_2 \in V_1$ . We now define the sets  $W(v_1) = \{w(i_1, v_1), w(j_1, v_1)\}$  and  $W(v_2) = \{w(i_2, v_2), w(j_2, v_2)\}$  and let  $\text{variance}(v_1)$  ( $\text{variance}(v_2)$ ) denote a measure of  $W(v_1)$ 's ( $W(v_2)$ 's) variance respectively. We will be saying that a set of similarity scores  $\text{sim}(i, j) \forall i, j \in V_1$  is consistent with the graph's weights if and only if  $\forall i_1, j_1, i_2, j_2 \in V_1$  and  $\forall v_1, v_2 \in V_2$  such that  $\exists (i_1, v_1), (j_1, v_1), (i_2, v_2), (j_2, v_2) \in E$  both of the following are true:

- (i) If  $\text{variance}(v_1) = \text{variance}(v_2)$  and  $w(i_1, v_1) > w(i_2, v_2)$  then  $\text{sim}(i_1, j_1) > \text{sim}(i_2, j_2)$
- (ii) If  $\text{variance}(v_1) < \text{variance}(v_2)$  and  $w(i_1, v_1) > w(i_2, v_2)$  then  $\text{sim}(i_1, j_1) > \text{sim}(i_2, j_2)$

**8.2 Revising Simrank** We can now modify the underlying random walk model of Simrank. Again we use the evidence scores as defined in Section 7, but now we will perform a different random walk. Remember that Simrank's random surfers model implies that a Simrank score  $\text{sim}(a, b)$  for two nodes  $a, b$  measures how soon two random surfers are expected to meet at the same node if they started at nodes  $a, b$  and randomly walked the graph. In order to impose the consistency rules in the similarity scores we perform a new random walk where its transition probabilities  $p(\alpha, i)$ ,  $\forall \alpha \in V_1, i \in E(\alpha)$  are defined as follows:

$$p(\alpha, i) = \text{spread}(i) \cdot \text{normalized\_weight}(\alpha, i), \forall i \in E(\alpha), \text{ and}$$

$$p(\alpha, \alpha) = 1 - \sum_{i \in E(\alpha)} p(\alpha, i)$$

where:

$$\text{spread}(i) = e^{-\text{variance}(i)}, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{normalized\_weight}(\alpha, i) = \frac{w(\alpha, i)}{\sum_{j \in E(\alpha)} w(\alpha, j)}$$

Notice how the new transition probability  $p(\alpha, i)$  between two nodes  $\alpha \in V_1, i \in V_2$  utilizes both the  $\text{spread}(i)$  value and the  $w(\alpha, i)$  value in order to satisfy the consistency rules. Actually, we can prove the following Theorem that ensures us that weighted Simrank produces consistent similarity scores.

**THEOREM 8.1.** Consider a weighted bipartite graph  $G = (V_1, V_2, E)$  and let  $w(e)$  denote the weight associated with an edge  $e \in E$ . Let also  $\text{sim}(i, j)$  denote the similarity score that weighted Simrank computes for two nodes  $i, j \in V_1$ . Then,  $\forall i, j \in V_1$ ,  $\text{sim}(i, j)$  is consistent with the graph's weights. ■

The actual similarity scores that weighted Simrank gives after applying the modified random walk are:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\text{weighted}}(q, q') &= \text{evidence}(q, q') \cdot C_1 \sum_{i \in E(q)} \sum_{j \in E(q')} W(q, i) W(q', j) s_{\text{weighted}}(i, j) \\ s_{\text{weighted}}(\alpha, \alpha') &= \text{evidence}(\alpha, \alpha') \cdot C_2 \sum_{i \in E(\alpha)} \sum_{j \in E(\alpha')} W(\alpha, i) W(\alpha', j) s_{\text{weighted}}(i, j) \end{aligned}$$

where the factors  $W(q, i)$  and  $W(a, i)$  are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W(q, i) &= \text{spread}(i) \cdot \text{normalized\_weight}(q, i) = e^{-\text{variance}(i)} \frac{w(q, i)}{\sum_{j \in E(q)} w(q, j)}, \text{ and} \\ W(\alpha, i) &= \text{spread}(i) \cdot \text{normalized\_weight}(\alpha, i) = e^{-\text{variance}(i)} \frac{w(\alpha, i)}{\sum_{j \in E(\alpha)} w(\alpha, j)} \end{aligned}$$

## 9 Experiments

We conducted experiments to compare the performance of Simrank, evidence-based Simrank and weighted Simrank as techniques for query rewriting. Our baseline was a query rewriting technique based on the Pearson correlation.

**9.1 Baseline** The Pearson correlation between two queries  $q$  and  $q'$  is defined as:

$$\text{sim}_{\text{pearson}}(q, q') = \frac{\sum_{\alpha \in E(q) \cap E(q')} (w(q, \alpha) - \bar{w}_q)(w(q', \alpha) - \bar{w}_{q'})}{\sqrt{\sum_{\alpha \in E(q) \cap E(q')} (w(q, \alpha) - \bar{w}_q)^2 (w(q', \alpha) - \bar{w}_{q'})^2}}$$

where  $\bar{w}_q = \sum_{i \in E(q)} \frac{w(q, i)}{|E(q)|}$  is the average weight of all edges that have  $q$  as an endpoint. If  $E(q) \cap E(q') = \emptyset$  then  $\text{sim}_{\text{pearson}}(q, q') = 0$ . The Pearson correlation indicates the strength of a linear relationship between two variables. In our case, we use it to measure the relationship between two queries. Notice, that  $\text{sim}_{\text{pearson}}$  takes values in the interval  $[-1, 1]$  and it requires that the two queries  $q$  and  $q'$  have at least one common neighbor in the click graph.

**9.2 Dataset** We started from a two-weeks click graph from US Yahoo! search, containing approximately 15 million distinct queries, 14 million distinct ads and 28 million edges. An edge in this graph connects a query with an ad if and only if the ad had been clicked at least once from a user that issued the query. In addition, each edge contains the number of clicks, the number of impressions, as well as the expected click rate. This graph consists of one huge connected component and several smaller subgraphs. In all our experiments that required the use of an edge weight we used the expected click rate.

To make the dataset size more manageable, we used the subgraph extraction method described in [1] to further decompose the largest component and we produced five smaller subgraphs. In summary, the algorithm in [1] is an efficient local graph partitioning algorithm that uses the PageRank vectors. Given a graph and an initial node, it tries to find a cut with small conductance<sup>1</sup> near that starting node. We started from different nodes and run the algorithm iteratively in order to discover big enough, distinct subgraphs. Table 5 tabulates the total number of nodes (queries and ads) and edges contained in the five-subgraphs dataset. We also observed a number of power-law distributions, including ads-per-query, queries-per-ad and number of clicks per query-ad pair. We used this dataset as the input click graph for all query rewriting techniques we experimented with.

The query set for evaluation is sampled, with uniform probability, from live traffic during the same two-weeks period. This traffic contains all queries issued at Yahoo! during that period; even the ones that did not bring any clicks on a sponsored search result. More specifically, we used a standardized 1200 query sample that has been generated by the above procedure and is currently being used as a benchmark at Yahoo!. We looked at these

<sup>1</sup>The conductance is a way to measure how hard it is to leave a small set of a graph's nodes. If  $\Phi_S$  is the conditional probability of leaving a set of nodes  $S$  given that we started from a node in  $S$ , then the conductance is defined as the minimal  $\Phi_S$  over all sets  $S$  that have a total stationary probability of at most  $1/2$ . More information can be found in [10].

Table 5: Dataset statistics

	# of Queries	# of Ads	# of Edges
subgraph 1	585,218	434,938	1,280,920
subgraph 2	530,797	374,243	1,130,314
subgraph 3	322,252	214,952	713,253
subgraph 4	313,951	243,406	703,747
subgraph 5	91,195	87,442	216,828
Total	1,843,413	1,354,981	4,045,062

1200 queries and extracted only the ones that actually appear in our five-subgraphs dataset as only for those our query rewriting methods would be able to provide rewrites. We found out that these are 120 queries and these are the queries that constitute our evaluation set. Using such an evaluation query selection procedure we made sure that queries issued rarely had a smaller probability of appearing in the evaluation set whereas more popular queries could appear with higher probability. We made this decision since we are interested in comparing the query rewriting techniques using a realistic query set. In other words, we prefer a rewriting technique that provides high quality rewrites for popular queries from another one that does the same only for rare queries.

**9.3 Evaluation Method** We run each method on the five-subgraphs dataset and recorded the top 100 rewrites for each query on our queries sample. We then use stemming to filter out duplicate rewrites (notice that such rewrites might appear in the click graph). In addition we perform *bid term filtering*, i.e., we remove queries that are *not* in a list of all queries that saw bids in the two-week period when the click graph was gathered. This list contains any query that received at least one bid at any point in the period; hence, if a query is not in the list it is unlikely to have bids currently. (Note that such queries with no bids may still be connected to ads in the click graph. These ads were displayed and clicked on because of query rewriting that took place when the query was originally submitted.)

The queries that remain after duplicate elimination and bid term filtering are considered for our evaluation. However, we limit ourselves to at most 5 rewrites per query per method because of the cost of the manual evaluation we describe next. Note that a method may generate fewer than 5 rewrites after filtering. We call the number of remaining rewrites the *depth* of a method.

To evaluate the quality of rewrites, we consider two methods. The first is a manual evaluation, carried out by professional members of Yahoo!’s editorial evaluation team. Each query – rewrite pair is considered by an evaluator, and is given a score on a scale from 1 to 4, based on their relevance judgment. (The scoring is the same as used in [7, 14]). The query rewrites that were more relevant with the original query assigned a score of 1, and the least related assigned a score of 4. Table 6 summarizes the interpretation of the four grades and their description is shown below.

1. Precise rewrite: The query rewrite matches the user’s intent and it preserves the core meaning of the original query
2. Approximate rewrite: The query rewrite has a direct close relationship to the topic described by the initial query, but the scope has narrowed or broadened or there has been a slight shift to a closely related topic.
3. Possible rewrite: The query rewrite either has some categorical relationship to the initial query (i.e. the two are in the same broad category of products or services) or describes a complementary product, but is otherwise distinct from the original user intent.
4. Clear Mismatch: The query rewrite has no clear relationship to the intent of the original query.

The judgment scores are solely based on the evaluator’s knowledge, and not on the contents of the click graph. Our second evaluation method addresses the question of whether our methods made the “right” decision based on the evidence found in the click graph. The basic idea is to remove certain edges from the click graph and to see if using the remaining data our schemes can still make useful inferences related to the missing data.




Figure 7: Sample setup for testing the ability of a rewriting method to compute correct query rewrites. By removing the red, dashed edges, we remove all direct similarity evidence between  $q_1$  and  $q_2, q_3$ .

Table 6: Editorial scoring system for query rewrites.

Score		Definition	Example (query - re-write)
1	Precise Match	near-certain match	corvette car - chevrolet corvette
2	Approximate Match	probable, but inexact match with user intent	apple music player - ipod shuffle
3	Marginal Match	distant, but plausible match to a related topic	glasses - contact lenses
4	Mismatch	clear mismatch	time magazine - time & date magazine

In particular, consider Figure 7, showing two queries  $q_2$  and  $q_3$  that share at least one common arc with a query  $q_1$ . In order to distinguish which query between  $q_2$  and  $q_3$  is a preferable rewrite for  $q_1$ , we define the desirability of query  $q_2$  for query  $q_1$  as  $\text{des}(q_1, q_2) = \sum_{i \in E(q_1) \cap E(q_2)} \frac{1}{|E(q_2)|} \cdot w(q_2, i)$ . By computing the desirability scores  $\text{des}(q_1, q_2), \text{des}(q_1, q_3)$  we can determine the most desirable rewrite for  $q_1$ . That is, given the evidence in the graph, if  $\text{des}(q_1, q_2) > \text{des}(q_1, q_3)$  then  $q_2$  would be a better rewrite for  $q_1$  than  $q_3$ .

Given our definition of desirability, we can now conduct the following experiment. First, we remove the edges that connect  $q_1$  to ads that are also connected with  $q_3$  or  $q_2$ . In Figure 7 these are the red, dashed edges. Then, we run each variation of Simrank on the remaining graph and record the similarity scores  $\text{sim}(q_1, q_2)$  and  $\text{sim}(q_1, q_3)$  that the method gives. Finally, we test whether the ordering for  $q_2, q_3$  that these similarity scores provide is consistent with the ordering derived from the desirability scores. In our example, if  $\text{des}(q_1, q_2) > \text{des}(q_1, q_3)$  and  $\text{sim}(q_1, q_2) > \text{sim}(q_1, q_3)$  then we would say that the similarity score was successful in predicting the desirable rewrite.

We repeated this edge removal experiment for 50 queries randomly selected from our five-subgraphs dataset. These queries played the role of query  $q_1$  as described above. For each of those queries we identified all the queries from the dataset that shared at least one common ad with it and we randomly selected two of them. Those were the  $q_2$  and  $q_3$  queries. In order to make sure that a Simrank similarity score can be computed after the deletion of the edges in our experiment, we selected the queries  $q_2, q_3$  after making sure that after edge removal there would still exist a path from  $q_2$  to  $q_1$  and from  $q_3$  to  $q_1$  through other edges in the graph. Since Pearson correlation only can be used provided that there is at least a common ad between two queries, we did not include the technique in this part of our evaluation.

#### 9.4 Metrics

The evaluation metrics we used were the following four:

- (i) Precision/recall: We consider two IR tasks. Firstly, we interpret the rewrites with scores 1-2 as relevant queries and the rewrites with scores 3-4 as irrelevant queries. Secondly, we interpret as relevant query rewrites only the ones with score 1 and the rest as irrelevant. Thus, we can define the precision/recall of

method  $m$  for query  $q$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{precision}(q, m) &= \frac{\text{relevant rewrites of } q \text{ that } m \text{ provides}}{\text{number of rewrites for } q \text{ that } m \text{ provides}} \\ \text{recall}(q, m) &= \frac{\text{relevant rewrites of } q \text{ that } m \text{ provides}}{\text{number of relevant rewrites for } q \text{ among all methods}} \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) **Query Coverage:** We are also interested in the absolute number of queries (from our 120 query sample) for which each method manages to provide at least one rewrite. We call this number query coverage. In general, we prefer methods that cover as many as possible queries.
- (iii) **Query rewriting depth:** Here, we are interested in the total number of query rewrites that a method provides for a given query. This is called the depth of a query rewriting technique. Again, we are interested in methods that have larger rewriting depth.
- (iv) **Desirability prediction:** For our desirability experiment, we report the fraction of the 50 queries for which a method was able to correctly predict the desirability of  $q_2$  (or  $q_3$ ) over the other query.

## 10 Results




Figure 8: Comparing the query coverage of Pearson and Simrank

**10.1 Query Coverage** Figure 8 illustrates the percentage of queries from the 120 queries sample that Pearson and Simrank provide rewrites for. Simrank provides rewrites almost for all queries (98%) when Pearson gives rewrites only for the 41% of the queries. This can be considered as expected, since Pearson can only measure similarity between two queries if they share a common ad, whereas Simrank takes into account the whole graph structure and does not require something similar. Also notice, that evidence-based Simrank further improves the coverage to 99%.

**10.2 Precision-Recall** Figure 9 presents the precision/recall graphs for Pearson and Simrank as well as the precision at 1-5 queries (P@X). For the computation of precision and recall the editorial scores were used in a binary classification manner; scores 1-2 were the positive class and scores 3-4 the negative class. For instance, in Figure 9 (bottom graph) we see that Weighted Simrank has 93% precision for 2 rewrites, meaning that 93% of its rewrites in the top two ranks were given scores of 1 or 2 by the evaluators. Figure 10 presents more precision/recall graphs for Pearson and Simrank as well as precision at 1-5 queries (P@X). However, now, the positive class of the binary classification problem consists of the editorial score 1, whereas the negative class contains the editorial scores 2-4.

In both cases we see that simple Simrank substantially improves the precision of the rewrites compared to Pearson. In addition, the use of the evidence score and the exploitation of the graph weights further boosts the precision, as expected.




Figure 9: Precision at 11 standard recall levels (top) and precision after  $X = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  query rewrites ( $P@X$ ) (bottom) using as positive class rewrites with score  $\{1-2\}$  and negative class rewrites with score  $\{3-4\}$




Figure 10: Precision at 11 standard recall levels (top) and precision after  $X = 1, 2, \dots, 5$  query rewrites ( $P@X$ ) (bottom) using as positive class rewrites with score 1 and negative class rewrites with score  $\{2-4\}$

**10.3 Rewriting Depth** Figure 11 compares the rewriting depth of Pearson and the variations of Simrank. Note that our two enhanced schemes can provide the full 5 rewrites for over 85% of the queries. As mentioned earlier, the more rewrites we can generate, the more options the back-end will have for finding ads with active bids.




Figure 11: Comparing the rewriting depth of Pearson and Simrank




Figure 12: Comparing the ability of query rewriting methods to correctly predict the order of query rewrite candidates

**10.4 Desirability prediction** Figure 12 provides the results of our experiments for identifying the correct order of query rewrites as described in Section 9.3. Simple Simrank and evidence-based Simrank manage to predict successfully the desirable rewrite for 27 out of the 50 queries (54%). Note that both methods do not exploit the graph weights in the similarity computations and rely only on the graph structure. Weighted Simrank predicts correctly the desirable rewrite for 46 queries (92%).



**10.5 Discussion** As we can see, simple Simrank outperforms Pearson both in query coverage, rewriting depth and precision/recall. Notice here that this version of Simrank does not utilize at all the qualitative information in the click graph, whereas Pearson does.

The introduction of evidence scores increases query coverage slightly (by 1%) and substantially improves the quality of the rewrites. For instance, the precision at 5 rewrites of simple Simrank is 75% whereas the precision after 5 rewrites of evidence-based Simrank is 80% (Figure 9). In addition, in the P@X rewrites diagram (Figure 9) the line corresponding to the precision of evidence-based Simrank is always above the one corresponding to the precision of simple Simrank. Finally, evidence-based Simrank increases the rewriting depth. For example, simple Simrank provides five rewrites for 79% of the queries, whereas evidence based Simrank gives five rewrites for the 89% of the queries (Figure 11).

Weighted Simrank builds upon evidence-based Simrank and utilizes the graph weights. It maintains the query coverage percentage of evidence-based Simrank at 99% (Figure 8) and substantially improves the quality of the rewrites. Figure 9 shows that the P@X line of weighted Simrank is always above the one of evidence-based Simrank. The precision at 5 rewrites of weighted Simrank goes from 80% (evidence-based Simrank) to 86%. Also, 96% of the queries have a high-quality top rewrite when we use weighted Simrank (P@1, Figure 9) when the corresponding percentages for evidence-based Simrank, simple Simrank and Pearson are 81%, 80% and 70%. In our desirability experiment, weighted Simrank predicted successfully the desirable rewrite for 92% of the cases (Figure 12). Finally, weighted-based Simrank maintains the rewriting depth of evidence-based Simrank (Figure 11).

## 11 Conclusions

In this paper we focused on the problem of query rewriting for sponsored search. We proposed Simrank to exploit the click graph structure and we introduced two extensions: one that takes into account the weights of the edges in the click graph, and another that takes into account the “evidence” supporting the similarity between queries. Our experimental results show that weighted-based Simrank is the overall best method for generating rewrites based on a click graph.

There are several query rewriting issues that we did not address in our analysis. Spam clicks can mislead our techniques and thus spam-resistant variations of our techniques would be useful. Also, methods for combining our similarity scores with semantic text-based similarities could be considered.

Even though our new schemes were developed and tested for query rewriting based on a click graph, we suspect that the weighted and evidence-based Simrank methods could be of use in other applications that exploit bi-partite graphs. We plan to experiment with these schemes in other domains, including collaborative filtering.

## 12 Acknowledgements

We thank Kevin Lang for providing us his code from [1] and for helping us with the subgraph extraction procedure. We also thank Yahoo! Editorial team for carrying out the evaluation of our techniques. Finally, we thank Panagiotis Papadimitriou, Zoltán Gyöngyi, Tasos Anastasakos and Tamás Sarlós for fruitful discussions.

## References

- [1] Reid Andersen, Fan Chung, and Kevin Lang. Local graph partitioning using pagerank vectors. In *47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'06)*, pages 475–486, 2006.
- [2] Doug Beeferman and Adam Berger. Agglomerative clustering of a search engine query log. In *KDD '00: Proceedings of the sixth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 407–416, 2000.
- [3] Nick Craswell and Martin Szummer. Random walks on the click graph. In *SIGIR '07: Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 239–246, 2007.
- [4] S.C. Deerwester, S.T. Dumais, T.K. Landauer, G.W. Furnas, and R.A. Harshman. Indexing by latent semantic analysis. volume 41(6), pages 391–407, 1990.
- [5] Glen Jeh and Jennifer Widom. Simrank: a measure of structural-context similarity. In *KDD '02: Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 538–543, 2002.
- [6] Rosie Jones and Daniel C. Fain. Query word deletion prediction. In *SIGIR '03: Proceedings of the 26th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in informaion retrieval*, pages 435–436, 2003.
- [7] Rosie Jones, Benjamin Rey, Omid Madani, and Wiley Greiner. Generating query substitutions. In *WWW 2007*.

- [8] Christos H. Papadimitriou, Hisao Tamaki, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Santosh Vempala. Latent semantic indexing: a probabilistic analysis. In *PODS '98: Proceedings of the seventeenth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART symposium on Principles of database systems*, pages 159–168, 1998.
- [9] Ian Ruthven. Re-examining the potential effectiveness of interactive query expansion. In *SIGIR '03: Proceedings of the 26th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in informaion retrieval*, pages 213–220, 2003.
- [10] A. Sinclair. Algorithms for random generation and counting: A markov chain approach. In *Birkhauser, Boston-Basel-Berlin*, 1993.
- [11] Egidio Terra and Charles L.A. Clarke. Scoring missing terms in information retrieval tasks. In *CIKM '04: Proceedings of the thirteenth ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*, pages 50–58, 2004.
- [12] Ji-Rong Wen, Jian-Yun Nie, and Hong-Jiang Zhang. Query clustering using user logs. volume 20, pages 59–81, 2002.
- [13] Wei Vivian Zhang, Xiaofei He, Benjamin Rey, and Rosie Jones. Query rewriting using active learning for sponsored search. In *SIGIR '07: Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*, pages 853–854, 2002.
- [14] Wei Vivian Zhang and Rosie Jones. Comparing click logs and editorial labels for training query rewriting. In *Query Log Analysis Workshop, WWW 2007*.

### A Simrank similarity scores on complete bipartite graphs

**THEOREM A.1.** Consider the complete bipartite graph  $K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a, b\}$  and  $V_2 = \{A, B\}$ . Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  denote the similarity between nodes  $A, B$  that bipartite Simrank computes after  $k$  iterations and let  $C_1, C_2$  denote the Simrank decay factors. Then:

$$(i) \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil}$$

$$(ii) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \leq C_2$$

**Proof** (i) We will follow the computation of the Simrank similarity scores from equations 4.1 and 4.2.

• Iteration 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sim}^{(1)}(A, B) &= \frac{C_2}{2 \cdot 2} (1 + 1) \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^1 \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sim}^{(1)}(a, b) &= \frac{C_1}{2 \cdot 2} (1 + 1) \\ &= \frac{C_1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

• Iteration 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sim}^{(2)}(A, B) &= \frac{C_2}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_1}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sim}^{(2)}(a, b) &= \frac{C_1}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_2}{2} \right) \\ &= \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \\ &= \frac{C_1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_2}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

• Iteration 3:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sim}^{(3)}(A, B) &= \frac{C_2}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \right) + \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} \right) \\ &= \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
sim^{(3)}(a, b) &= \frac{C_1}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \right) + \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

• *Iteration 4:*

$$\begin{aligned}
sim^{(4)}(A, B) &= \frac{C_2}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} \right) + \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^2}{16} \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} \right) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
sim^{(4)}(a, b) &= \frac{C_1}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} \right) + \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^2}{16} \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

• *Iteration 5:*

$$\begin{aligned}
sim^{(5)}(A, B) &= \frac{C_2}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} \right) + \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^2}{16} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^3}{32} \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} \right) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^5 \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
sim^{(5)}(a, b) &= \frac{C_1}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} \right) + \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^2}{16} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^3}{32} \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

• *Iteration 6:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{sim}^{(6)}(A, B) &= \frac{C_2}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + 2 \cdot \left( \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} + \frac{C_1^3 \cdot C_2^2}{32} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^3}{32} + \frac{C_1^3 \cdot C_2^3}{64} \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} + \frac{C_1^3 \cdot C_2^2}{32} \right) \\
&= \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \\
\\
\text{sim}^{(6)}(a, b) &= \frac{C_1}{2 \cdot 2} \left( 1 + 1 + 2 \cdot \left( \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} + \frac{C_2^3 \cdot C_1^2}{32} \right) \right) \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} + \frac{C_1 \cdot C_2}{4} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2}{8} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^2}{16} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1^3}{32} + \frac{C_1^3 \cdot C_2^3}{64} \\
&= \frac{C_1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{C_2}{2} + \frac{C_2 \cdot C_1}{4} + \frac{C_2^2 \cdot C_1}{8} + \frac{C_1^2 \cdot C_2^2}{16} + \frac{C_2^3 \cdot C_1^2}{32} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

We can easily observe that  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil}$

(ii) We know that  $C_1 \leq 1$  and  $C_2 \leq 1$ . Thus:

$$\frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \leq \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}}$$

Now we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \\
&\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} = \frac{C_2}{2} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} = \frac{C_2}{2} \cdot 2 = C_2
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \leq C_2$ . ■

**THEOREM A.2.** Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{1,2}$  and  $G' = K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1 = \{b, c\}$  and  $V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then,  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \geq \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 0$ .

**Proof** From equations 4.1, 4.2 we have:

$$\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \frac{C_2}{1 \cdot 1} 1 = C_2, \forall k > 0$$

Also, from Theorem A.1(i), we have:

$$\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D) = \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} = \frac{C_2}{2} \cdot 2 = C_2$$

Thus,  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \geq \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 0$ . ■

**THEOREM A.3.** Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{1,2}$  and  $G' = K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1 = \{b, c\}$  and  $V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  if and only if  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ , where  $C_1, C_2$  are the decay factors of the bipartite Simrank equations.

**Proof** Let us assume that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ .

That means that:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D) \Leftrightarrow \\ C_2 &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \Leftrightarrow \\ C_2 &= \frac{C_2}{2} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \Leftrightarrow \\ 1 &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \Leftrightarrow \\ \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} &= 2 \Leftrightarrow \\ C_1 &= C_2 = 1 \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us assume that  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ . We will have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \\ &= C_2 \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  if and only if  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ . ■

**COROLLARY A.1.** Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{1,2}$  and  $G' = K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1 = \{b, c\}$  and  $V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then, if for the decay factors of bipartite Simrank  $C_1, C_2$  we know that  $C_1 < 1$  or  $C_2 < 1$ , both of the following are true:

- (i)  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) > \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 0$ , and
- (ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) > \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$

**Proof** (i) It follows directly from Theorems A.2 and A.3.

(ii) We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \\ &< \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} \\ &= C_2 \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) > \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ . ■

**THEOREM A.4.** *Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{m,2}$  and  $G' = K_{n,2}$  with  $m < n$  and nodes sets  $V_1, V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1, V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then,*

- (i)  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) > \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 0$ , and
- (ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  if and only if  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$ , where  $C_1, C_2$  are the decay factors of the bipartite Simrank equations.

**Proof** Similar arguments as in Theorem A.1. ■

## B Evidence-based Simrank similarity scores on complete bipartite graphs

**THEOREM B.1.** Consider the complete bipartite graph  $K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a, b\}$  and  $V_2 = \{A, B\}$ . Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  denote the similarity between nodes  $A, B$  that evidence-based bipartite Simrank computes after  $k$  iterations and let  $C_1, C_2$  denote the Simrank decay factors. Then:

$$(i) \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\right) \cdot \frac{C_2}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil}$$

$$(ii) \text{ If } C_1, C_2 > \frac{1}{2} \text{ then } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) \geq \frac{C_2}{2}$$

**Proof** (i) It follows directly from the definition of evidence-based Simrank (Equations 7.5 and 7.6) and Theorem A.1

(ii) We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) &= \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}\right) \cdot \frac{C_2}{2} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{i-1}} C_1^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} C_2^{\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil} \\ &> 0.41666 \cdot C_2 \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{2^{2i}} \\ &= 0.41666 \cdot C_2 \cdot \frac{4}{3} \\ &= 0.5555 \cdot C_2 > \frac{C_2}{2} \end{aligned}$$

■

**THEOREM B.2.** Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{1,2}$  and  $G' = K_{2,2}$  with nodes sets  $V_1 = \{a\}, V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1 = \{b, c\}$  and  $V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite evidence-based Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations. Then, if for the decay factors of bipartite Simrank  $C_1, C_2$  we know that  $C_1, C_2 > \frac{1}{2}$  we have

$$(i) \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D), \forall k > 1, \text{ and}$$

$$(ii) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$$

**Proof** (i) It follows directly from the definition of evidence-based Simrank (Equations 7.5 and 7.6) and Theorem B.1

(ii) From Theorem B.1 we have:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D) \geq \frac{C_2}{2}$$

Also, from the definition of evidence-based Simrank (Equations 7.5 and 7.6) we have:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) = \frac{C_2}{2}$$

Thus,  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ . ■

**THEOREM B.3.** Consider the two complete bipartite graphs  $G = K_{m,2}$  and  $G' = K_{n,2}$  with  $m < n$  and nodes sets  $V_1, V_2 = \{A, B\}$  and  $V'_1, V'_2 = \{C, D\}$  correspondingly. Let  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B)$  and  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$  denote the similarity scores that bipartite evidence-based Simrank computes for the node pairs  $(A, B)$  and  $(C, D)$  after  $k$  iterations and let  $C_1, C_2 > \frac{1}{2}$ , where  $C_1, C_2$  are the decay factors of the bipartite Simrank equations. Then,



(i)  $\text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$ ,  $\forall k > 1$ , and

(ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(A, B) < \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{sim}^{(k)}(C, D)$

**Proof** Similar arguments as in Theorem B.2. ■