

Introduction to **Information Retrieval**

Evaluation

Chris Manning and Pandu Nayak

CS276 – Information Retrieval and Web Search

Situation

- Thanks to your stellar performance in CS276, you quickly rise to VP of Search at internet retail giant nozama.com. Your boss brings in her nephew Sergey, who claims to have built a better search engine for nozama. Do you
 - Laugh derisively and send him to rival Tramlaw Labs?
 - Counsel Sergey to go to Stanford and take CS276?
 - Try a few queries on his engine and say “Not bad”?
 - ... ?

What could you ask Sergey?

- How fast does it index?
 - Number of documents/hour
 - Incremental indexing – nozama adds 10K products/day
- How fast does it search?
 - Latency and CPU needs for nozama's 5 million products
- Does it recommend related products?
- This is all good, but it says nothing about the *quality* of Sergey's search
 - You want nozama's users to be happy with the search experience

How do you tell if users are happy?

- Search returns products relevant to users
 - How do you assess this at scale?
- Search results get clicked a lot
 - Misleading titles/summaries can cause users to click
- Users buy after using the search engine
 - Or, users spend a lot of \$ after using the search engine
- Repeat visitors/buyers
 - Do users leave soon after searching?
 - Do they come back within a week/month/... ?

Happiness: elusive to measure

- Most common proxy: relevance of search results
 - Pioneered by Cyril Cleverdon in the Cranfield Experiments




- But how do you measure relevance?

Measuring relevance

- Three elements:
 1. A benchmark document collection
 2. A benchmark suite of queries
 3. An assessment of either Relevant or Nonrelevant for each query and each document

So you want to measure the quality of a new search algorithm?

- Benchmark documents – nozama's products
- Benchmark query suite – more on this
- Judgments of document relevance for each query



Relevance judgments

- Binary (relevant vs. non-relevant) in the simplest case
 - More nuanced relevance levels also used(0, 1, 2, 3 ...)
- What are some issues already?
- 5 million times 50K takes us into the range of a quarter trillion judgments
 - If each judgment took a human 2.5 seconds, we'd still need 10^{11} seconds, or nearly \$300 million if you pay people \$10 per hour to assess
 - 10K new products per day

Crowd source relevance judgments?

- Present query-document pairs to low-cost labor on online crowd-sourcing platforms
 - Hope that this is cheaper than hiring qualified assessors
- Lots of literature on using crowd-sourcing for such tasks
 - You get fairly good signal, but the variance in the resulting judgments is quite high

What else?

- Still need test queries
 - Must be germane to docs available
 - Must be representative of actual user needs
 - Random query terms from the documents are not a good idea
 - Sample from query logs if available
- Classically (non-Web)
 - Low query rates – not enough query logs
 - Experts hand-craft “user needs”

Early public test Collections (20th C)

TABLE 4.3 Common Test Corpora

<i>Collection</i>	<i>NDocs</i>	<i>NQrys</i>	<i>Size (MB)</i>	<i>Term/Doc</i>	<i>Q-D RelAss</i>
ADI	82	35			
AIT	2109	14	2	400	>10,000
CACM	3204	64	2	24.5	
CISI	1460	112	2	46.5	
Cranfield	1400	225	2	53.1	
LISA	5872	35	3		
Medline	1033	30	1		
NPL	11,429	93	3		
OSHMED	34,8566	106	400	250	16,140
Reuters	21,578	672	28	131	
TREC	740,000	200	2000	89-3543	» 100,000



Typical
TREC

Recent datasets: 100s of million web pages (GOV, ClueWeb, ...)

Now we have the basics of a benchmark

- Let's review some evaluation measures
 - *Precision*
 - *Recall*
 - DCG
 - ...

Evaluating an IR system

- Note: **user need** is translated into a **query**
- Relevance is assessed relative to the **user need**, *not* the **query**
- E.g., Information need: *My swimming pool bottom is becoming black and needs to be cleaned.*
- Query: *pool cleaner*
- Assess whether the doc addresses the underlying need, not whether it has these words

Unranked retrieval evaluation:

Precision and Recall – recap from IIR 8/video

■ Binary assessments

Precision: fraction of retrieved docs that are relevant = $P(\text{relevant} | \text{retrieved})$

Recall: fraction of relevant docs that are retrieved
= $P(\text{retrieved} | \text{relevant})$

	Relevant	Nonrelevant
Retrieved	tp	fp
Not Retrieved	fn	tn

- Precision $P = tp / (tp + fp)$
- Recall $R = tp / (tp + fn)$

Rank-Based Measures

- Binary relevance
 - Precision@K ($P@K$)
 - Mean Average Precision (MAP)
 - Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR)
- Multiple levels of relevance
 - Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG)

Precision@K

- Set a rank threshold K
- Compute % relevant in top K
- Ignores documents ranked lower than K


■ Ex:

- $\text{Prec}@3$ of $2/3$
- $\text{Prec}@4$ of $2/4$
- $\text{Prec}@5$ of $3/5$



- In similar fashion we have $\text{Recall}@K$

A precision-recall curve



Mean Average Precision

- Consider rank position of each *relevant* doc
 - $K_1, K_2, \dots K_R$
- Compute Precision@K for each $K_1, K_2, \dots K_R$
- Average precision = average of P@K











- Ex:  has AvgPrec of $\frac{1}{3} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{1} + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{3}{5} \right) \approx 0.76$

- MAP is Average Precision across multiple queries/rankings











Average Precision

 = the relevant documents

Ranking #1

										
Recall	0.17	0.17	0.33	0.5	0.67	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	1.0
Precision	1.0	0.5	0.67	0.75	0.8	0.83	0.71	0.63	0.56	0.6

Ranking #2

										
Recall	0.0	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.33	0.5	0.67	0.67	0.83	1.0
Precision	0.0	0.5	0.33	0.25	0.4	0.5	0.57	0.5	0.56	0.6











Ranking #1: $(1.0 + 0.67 + 0.75 + 0.8 + 0.83 + 0.6)/6 = 0.78$


Ranking #2: $(0.5 + 0.4 + 0.5 + 0.57 + 0.56 + 0.6)/6 = 0.52$

MAP











 = relevant documents for query 1

Ranking #1

										
Recall	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.0
Precision	1.0	0.5	0.67	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.43	0.38	0.44	0.5

 = relevant documents for query 2

Ranking #2

										
Recall	0.0	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.67	0.67	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Precision	0.0	0.5	0.33	0.25	0.4	0.33	0.43	0.38	0.33	0.3

$$\text{average precision query 1} = (1.0 + 0.67 + 0.5 + 0.44 + 0.5)/5 = 0.62$$


$$\text{average precision query 2} = (0.5 + 0.4 + 0.43)/3 = 0.44$$

$$\text{mean average precision} = (0.62 + 0.44)/2 = 0.53$$

Mean average precision

- If a relevant document never gets retrieved, we assume the precision corresponding to that relevant doc to be zero
- MAP is macro-averaging: each query counts equally
- Now perhaps most commonly used measure in research papers
- Good for web search?
- MAP assumes user is interested in finding many relevant documents for each query
- MAP requires many relevance judgments in text collection

BEYOND BINARY RELEVANCE





Web Images Video Local Shopping More ▾

Toyota safety

Search


Options ▾


 Search Pad


 SearchScan - On


108,000,000 results for **Toyota safety:**

Show All

 Toyota

 Motor Trend

 CarsDirect

 Shopping Sites

Also try: [toyota safety ratings](#), [toyota safety recall](#), [More...](#)

Toyota Recall

Toyota Takes Care of its Customers. Read the FAQs at **Toyota.com**.
[www.Toyota.com/Recall](#)

Toyota Safety

& Latest Prices. Free Info. **Toyota** Research, Reviews.
[www.Toyota.Edmunds.com](#)

TOYOTA | Car Safety Innovation and Technology

Toyota home page for car **safety** and car technology Prius model.
[www.safetytoyota.com](#) - [Cached](#)

Toyota home page for car safety and car technology ...

We are presenting **Toyota's safety** technologies for cars. We clearly explain about car **safety** and car technology using movies and more.
[www.safetytoyota.com/en-gb](#) - [Cached](#)

Toyota Safety Ratings - Toyota Safety Features - Motor Trend ...

MotorTrend offers **Toyota safety** ratings, comprehensive auto **safety** reports, and more. View a all of the standard **Toyota safety** features. ...
[motortrend.com/new_cars/07/toyota/safety_ratings/index.html](#) - 149k - [Cached](#)

Toyota Motor Europe Corporate Site Safety

Our approach. **Toyota** believes that all stakeholders in the road **safety** equation share a responsibility to reduce the frequency of road accidents. ...
[www.toyota.eu/Safety](#) - [Cached](#)

pdf European Safety Brochure 2005

4047k - Adobe PDF - [View as html](#)
not guarantee that all accidents or injuries will be avoided when driving a **Toyota** and/or Lexus brand motor vehicle equipped with the **safety** systems ...
[www.toyota.no/Images/Safety_Brochure_tcm308-344461.pdf](#)

Toyota - Star Safety System

Star **Safety** System ... **Toyota** Mobility Program. Careers. Contact Us. Home. contact us. site map. your privacy rights. legal terms. **Toyota** Newsroom. sign up for info ...
[www.toyota.com/vehicles/demos/star-safety.html](#) - 58k - [Cached](#)

Toyota Prius Safety Ratings - CarsDirect

Get overall **safety** ratings and NHTSA crash test results for the **Toyota** Prius at CarsDirect.

Sponsored Results

Safety for a Toyota
Research **Safety** Ratings and Reviews For New Car at Kelley Blue Book.
[www.kbb.com](#)

Toyota Safety
Find **Toyota Safety** dealers, new cars, prices, and photos.
[www.NewCars.org](#)

Toyota Safety
Toyota safety Discount Prices Save Money Shopping Online Today.
[www.smarter.com](#)

Safety Toyota
Explore 5,000+ Pro Sports Choices. Save On Safety Toyota.
[BaseballGear.Shopzilla.com](#)

[See your message here...](#)

Sponsored Results

Toyota Recall
Sponsored Results

fair

fair

Good

Discounted Cumulative Gain

- Popular measure for evaluating web search and related tasks
- Two assumptions:
 - Highly relevant documents are more useful than marginally relevant documents
 - the lower the ranked position of a relevant document, the less useful it is for the user, since it is less likely to be examined

Discounted Cumulative Gain

- Uses *graded relevance* as a measure of usefulness, or *gain*, from examining a document
- Gain is accumulated starting at the top of the ranking and may be reduced, or *discounted*, at lower ranks
- Typical discount is $1/\log(\textit{rank})$
 - With base 2, the discount at rank 4 is $1/2$, and at rank 8 it is $1/3$

Summarize a Ranking: DCG

- What if relevance judgments are in a scale of $[0, r]$? $r > 2$
- Cumulative Gain (CG) at rank n
 - Let the ratings of the n documents be r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n (in ranked order)
 - $CG = r_1 + r_2 + \dots + r_n$
- Discounted Cumulative Gain (DCG) at rank n
 - $DCG = r_1 + r_2 / \log_2 2 + r_3 / \log_2 3 + \dots + r_n / \log_2 n$
 - We may use any base for the logarithm

Discounted Cumulative Gain

- *DCG* is the total gain accumulated at a particular rank p :

$$DCG_p = rel_1 + \sum_{i=2}^p \frac{rel_i}{\log_2 i}$$

- Alternative formulation:

$$DCG_p = \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{2^{rel_i} - 1}{\log(1+i)}$$

- used by some web search companies
- emphasis on retrieving highly relevant documents

DCG Example

- 10 ranked documents judged on 0–3 relevance scale:
3, 2, 3, 0, 0, 1, 2, 2, 3, 0
- discounted gain:
 $3, 2/1, 3/1.59, 0, 0, 1/2.59, 2/2.81, 2/3, 3/3.17, 0$
 $= 3, 2, 1.89, 0, 0, 0.39, 0.71, 0.67, 0.95, 0$
- DCG:
3, 5, 6.89, 6.89, 6.89, 7.28, 7.99, 8.66, 9.61, 9.61

NDCG for summarizing rankings

- Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (NDCG) at rank n
 - Normalize DCG at rank n by the DCG value at rank n of the ideal ranking
 - The ideal ranking would first return the documents with the highest relevance level, then the next highest relevance level, etc
- Normalization useful for contrasting queries with varying numbers of relevant results
- NDCG is now quite popular in evaluating Web search

NDCG - Example

4 documents: d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4

i	Ground Truth		Ranking Function ₁		Ranking Function ₂	
	Document Order	r_i	Document Order	r_i	Document Order	r_i
1	d4	2	d3	2	d3	2
2	d3	2	d4	2	d2	1
3	d2	1	d2	1	d4	2
4	d1	0	d1	0	d1	0
	NDCG _{GT} =1.00		NDCG _{RF1} =1.00		NDCG _{RF2} =0.9203	

$$DCG_{GT} = 2 + \left(\frac{2}{\log_2 2} + \frac{1}{\log_2 3} + \frac{0}{\log_2 4} \right) = 4.6309$$

$$DCG_{RF1} = 2 + \left(\frac{2}{\log_2 2} + \frac{1}{\log_2 3} + \frac{0}{\log_2 4} \right) = 4.6309$$

$$DCG_{RF2} = 2 + \left(\frac{1}{\log_2 2} + \frac{2}{\log_2 3} + \frac{0}{\log_2 4} \right) = 4.2619$$

$$MaxDCG = DCG_{GT} = 4.6309$$

What if the results are not in a list?

- Suppose there's only one Relevant Document
- Scenarios:
 - known-item search
 - navigational queries
 - looking for a fact
- Search duration \sim Rank of the answer
 - measures a user's effort

Mean Reciprocal Rank

- Consider rank position, K , of first relevant doc
 - Could be – only clicked doc
- Reciprocal Rank score = $\frac{1}{K}$
- MRR is the mean RR across multiple queries

Human judgments are


- Expensive
- Inconsistent
 - Between raters
 - Over time
- Decay in value as documents/query mix evolves
- Not always representative of “real users”
 - Rating vis-à-vis query, don’t know underlying need
 - May not understand meaning of terms, etc.
- So – what alternatives do we have?

USING USER CLICKS

User Behavior


Taken with slight adaptation from Fan Guo and Chao Liu’s 2009/2010 CIKM tutorial: Statistical Models for Web Search: Click Log Analysis

- Search Results for “CIKM” (in 2009!)




User Behavior

- Adapt ranking to user clicks?




What do clicks tell us?

■ Tools needed for non-trivial cases





Strong position bias, so absolute click rates unreliable

Eye-tracking User Study



Click Position-bias



- Higher positions receive more **user attention (eye fixation)** and **clicks** than lower positions.
- This is true even in the extreme setting where the order of positions is **reversed**.
- “Clicks are informative but biased”.

[Joachims+07]

Relative vs absolute ratings

The screenshot shows a search engine results page for the query 'CIKM 2008'. The page includes a sidebar with 'ALL RESULTS', 'RELATED SEARCHES', and 'SEARCH HISTORY'. The main results list contains several entries for the Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM). Three blue arrows originate from the right side of the page and point to specific links in the results list, indicating a user's click sequence.

ALL RESULTS 1-10 of 131,000 results · [Advanced](#)

RELATED SEARCHES
[CIKM 2008](#)

SEARCH HISTORY
 Turn on search history to start remembering your searches.
[Turn history on](#)

ALL RESULTS

[CIKM 2008 | Home](#)
 Napa Valley Marriott Hotel & Spa: Napa Valley, California October 26-30, 2008
[cikm2008.org](#) · [Cached page](#)

Papers Program Committee
 Themes News
 Important Dates Napa Valley
 Banquet Posters
[Show more results from cikm2008.org](#)

[Conference on Information and Knowledge Management \(CIKM\)](#)
 Provides an international forum for presentation and discussion of research on information and knowledge management, as well as recent advances on data and knowledge bases ...
[www.cikm.org](#) · [Cached page](#)

[Conference on Information and Knowledge Management \(CIKM'02\)](#)
 SAIC Headquarters, McLean, Virginia, USA, 4-9 November 2002.
[www.cikm.org/2002](#) · [Cached page](#)

[ACM CIKM 2007 - Lisbon, Portugal](#)
 News and announcements: 12/02 - Best interdisciplinary paper award at CIKM 2007 went to Fei Wu and Daniel Weld for Autonomously Semantifying Wikipedia.
[www.fc.ul.pt/cikm2007](#) · [Cached page](#)

[CIKM 2009 | Home](#)
 CIKM 2009 (The 18th ACM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management) will be held on November 2-6, 2009, Hong Kong. Since 1992, CIKM has successfully brought together ...
[www.comp.polyu.edu.hk/conference/cikm2009](#) · [Cached page](#)

[Conference on Information and Knowledge Management \(CIKM\)](#)
 CIKM Conference on Information and Knowledge Management The Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM) provides an international forum for presentation and ...
[cikmconference.org](#) · [Cached page](#)

User's click sequence

Hard to conclude Result1 > Result3
 Probably can conclude Result3 > Result2

Evaluating pairwise relative ratings

- Pairs of the form: DocA better than DocB for a query
 - Doesn't mean that DocA relevant to query
- Now, rather than assess a rank-ordering wrt per-doc relevance assessments ...
- Assess in terms of conformance with historical pairwise preferences recorded from user clicks
- BUT!
- Don't learn and test on the same ranking algorithm
 - I.e., if you learn historical clicks from nozama and compare Sergey vs nozama on this history ...

Comparing two rankings via clicks (Joachims 2002)

Query: [support vector machines]

Ranking A

Kernel machines
SVM-light
Lucent SVM demo
Royal Holl. SVM
SVM software
SVM tutorial

Ranking B

Kernel machines
SVMs
Intro to SVMs
Archives of SVM
SVM-light
SVM software

Interleave the two rankings

This interleaving
starts with B

Kernel machines
Kernel machines
SVMs
SVM-light
Intro to SVMs
Lucent SVM demo
Archives of SVM
Royal Holl. SVM
SVM-light

...


Remove duplicate results

Kernel machines
Kernel machines
SVMs
SVM-light
Intro to SVMs
Lucent SVM demo
Archives of SVM
Royal Holl. SVM
SVM-light

...

Count user clicks

Ranking A: 3
Ranking B: 1



...

Interleaved ranking

- Present interleaved ranking to users
 - Start randomly with ranking A or ranking B to even out presentation bias
- Count clicks on results from A versus results from B
- Better ranking will (on average) get more clicks

A/B testing at web search engines

- Purpose: Test a single innovation
- Prerequisite: You have a large search engine up and running.
- Have most users use old system
- Divert a small proportion of traffic (e.g., 0.1%) to an experiment to evaluate an innovation
 - Interleaved experiment
 - Full page experiment

Facts/entities (what happens to clicks?)

Chrome File Edit View History Bookmarks Window Help

https://www.google.com/search?q=mount+everest+height&aq=0&oq=mount+everest+he&aqs=chrome..69j0l3.6626j0&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

+Prabhakar Search Images Mail Drive Calendar Sites Groups Contacts More

Google mount everest height

pragh@google.com 0 + Share

Web Images Maps Shopping News More Search tools

About 1,300,000 results (0.39 seconds)

29,029' (8,848 m)

Mount Everest, Elevation



[Mount Everest - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mount_Everest)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mount_Everest

By the same measure of base to summit, **Mount McKinley**, in Alaska, is also taller than **Everest**. Despite its **height** above sea level of only 6,193.6 m (20,320 ft), ...

[List of deaths on eight - List of people who died ... - Timeline of climbing Mount](#)

[Facts About Mt. Everest - Scholastic](https://www.scholastic.com/activities/hillary/archive/evefacts.htm)
[teacher.scholastic.com/activities/hillary/archive/evefacts.htm](https://www.scholastic.com/activities/hillary/archive/evefacts.htm)

Number of people to successfully climb **Mt. Everest**: 660. Number of

©2013 Google Map data ©2013 Google

Mount Everest

Mountain

Mount Everest is the Earth's highest mountain, with a peak at 8,848 metres above sea level and the 5th tallest mountain measured from the centre of the Earth. It is located in the Mahalangur section of the Himalayas.

Wikipedia

Elevation: 29,029' (8,848 m)

First ascent: May 29, 1953

Base: 29,029' (8,848 m)

Recap

- Benchmarks consist of
 - Document collection
 - Query set
 - Assessment methodology
- Assessment methodology can use raters, user clicks, or a combination
 - These get quantized into a *goodness measure* – Precision/NDCG etc.
 - Different engines/algorithms compared on a benchmark together with a goodness measure

User behavior

- User behavior is an intriguing source of relevance data
 - Users make (somewhat) informed choices when they interact with search engines
 - Potentially a lot of data available in search logs
- But there are significant caveats
 - User behavior data can be very noisy
 - Interpreting user behavior can be tricky
 - Spam can be a significant problem
 - Not all queries will have user behavior

Incorporating user behavior into ranking algorithm

- Incorporate user behavior features into a ranking function like BM25F
 - But requires an understanding of user behavior features so that appropriate V_j functions are used
- Incorporate user behavior features into *learned* ranking function
- Either of these ways of incorporating user behavior signals improve ranking