1) a) Raw term frequency doesn't account for how by the document is in terms of the humber of words.

'In addition, stop words will occur more frequently but they should be equally likely among most documents in the corpus. Therefore, a better measure would be the term-frequency-inverse document frequency which reflects how important a word is with respect to other documents in the corpus. Usually, the cosine simunilarity is used rather than the dot product because the magnitude doesn't matter. So cosine simunilarity normalizes the document length of the two vectors that we are comparing.

b) Suppose the corpus that me're interested in has X instances of the term. Originally if $IDF = log \frac{N}{|A \in D: t \in J_3|} = log \frac{N}{B}$

then now IDF = log B+x, so the IDF would decrease since the term is now more common in the carpus since we made a copy of d.

Relevant 5 Not Retrieved N = 10 =

Rank as follows $\frac{5}{10} + \frac{5}{10}$ $\frac{5}{10} + \frac{5}{10} + \frac{5}{10}$ $\frac{5}{$

d) i) CG = 5 $IDCG = 1+1+\frac{1}{2g_2^3}+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2g_2^5}=3.562$ ii) $DCG = 1+1+\frac{1}{2g_2^5}+\frac{1}{2g_2^5}=3.264$ $NDCG = \frac{3.264}{3.562}=0.916$

2)
$$V = P(A=1 | V) = P(X=1 | V) = P(V=1 | V$$

D) e) Changing the A value in sample #0 would hear that p(N=1|A=0) would change so the p(N=1/A=0) result would rhange.

P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhange. P(V=1|A:0,K=1,L=0) psult would rhan

g) The events A, L, K may not be completely independent. For example, maybe messages that are shorter than 10 words are more likely to contain on attachment because the content is in the attachment so that the messages simply refer to the documents. So if event A & L are dependent, then the independence assumption p(A,L,KIV) = p(AIV)p(LIV)p(KIV) is not completely solid

3) a)
$$l = \rho(X = \{x_1 ... x_n\}) = \frac{u^{x_1}e^{-u}}{x_1!} \cdot \frac{u^{x_2}e^{-u}}{x_2!} \cdot \frac{u^{x_n}e^{-u}}{x_n!}$$

$$l = \frac{u^{\{x_1\}e^{-u}}}{\|X_1!\|} \Rightarrow l = \log l = \sum x_i \log u - \ln l \log e - \log \|X_i!\|$$

$$l = \log u \, Z x_i - n \, u - \log \|X_i!\|$$

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial u} = \frac{\sum x_i}{u} - n = 0 \Rightarrow u = \frac{\sum x_i}{n},$$

$$\text{Best parameter is sample average}$$

$$l = \rho(U = \{u_1, ... u_n\}) = \lambda e^{-\lambda u_1} \cdot \lambda e^{\lambda u_2} \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda e^{\lambda u_n}$$

$$l = \lambda^n e^{-\lambda \xi u_i}$$

b)
$$l = \rho(U = \{U_1, ..., U_n\}) = \lambda e^{-\lambda u_1} \cdot \lambda e^{\lambda u_2} \cdot \lambda e^{\lambda u_n}$$

$$l = \lambda^n e^{-\lambda z_1 u_1}$$

$$l = \log l = n \log \lambda - \lambda z_1 u_1 \log e^{-\lambda u_1}$$

$$\frac{\partial l}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{n}{\lambda} - z_1 u_1 = 0 \Rightarrow |\hat{\lambda}| = \frac{n}{z_1 u_1}|$$