Assignment 1: Information Retrieval

Chin Zhe Jing 22221970

1. In class, we briefly discussed pre-processing techniques such as stemming, stop-word removal and thesaurus construction. Given a text document, suggest any three additional pre-processing techniques that may be used. Explain the approach and outline the potential benefit of the approach. (10 marks)

The below 3 additional pre-processing techniques are suggested:

1. Lower Casing is to convert all the words in the text to be lower case. As words are having the same meaning disregard the letter case, so in order to avoid words like: Damaged and damaged being categorised as 2 different words and increasing the dimensionality, we could apply lower casing to the text.
2. Tokenization is to break the text into smaller units as they are more easily being assigned meaning hence helping the machine to understand the whole text better. It would also help in frequency counting of the words and the position of them being frequently appeared.
3. We should remove the punctuations in text as most of them are meaningless and removing them could remove some of the noise in the data. However, we should take note on the contraction words as removing the punctuation from them could possibly create noise for the model.
4. Given the following small sample document collection:
   1. D1: Shipment of gold damaged in a fire , length = 7 words
   2. D2: Delivery of silver arrived in a silver truck
   3. D3: Shipment of gold arrived in a truck

Calculate the term weightings for terms in D1. Show your workings and state any assumptions you make. (10 marks)

Assume: Lower casing is applied.

wi ,j = fi,j × 2( )

with,

fi,j = Tf = occurrence of word / total words

N = number of documents = 3

=occurrence of term in given set of documents

Shipment : = 2, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × 2 ( ) = 0.0836

Of: = 3, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × 2 ( ) = 0

Gold: = 2, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × 2 ( ) = 0.0836

Damaged: = 1, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × 2 ( ) = 0.2264

In: = 3, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × 2 ( ) = 0

A: = 3, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × 2 ( ) = 0

Fire: = 1, fi,j = 1/7

wi ,j = 1/7 × log( ) = 0.2264

Based on the calculations, we can conclude that the term “Damaged” and “Fire” is more important in getting a more related results.

1. In class we discussed the document collection as term-document matrix, where each cell in the matrix indicates the usefulness of term i in describing document j. We also discussed how we could evaluate the similarity of a query and document.

Outline a suitable indexing structure to store the information in the matrix (note that matrix is sparse). (10 marks)

We could index the information in the matrix in key-value pairs (dictionary). For each term, keep only documents that consist that term and has weight > 0. Hence comparison between query and documents could be done by simply retrieving the term IDs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Term - document | Term - query |
| {  T1: [  D1: 0.03,  D2: 0.1,  D3: 0.002,  D100: 0.833  ],  T2: [  D2: 0.54  ],  T3: [  D1: 0.67,  D100: 0.34  ]  } | {  T1: 0.03,  T2: 0.442,  T3: 0.23  } |

Outline at a high level, in pseudo-code, an algorithm to calculate the similarity of a document to a query. (10 marks)

This algorithm calculate the similarity of a document to a query.

Assume: Terms extracted from query and there will be at least and more than 1 term

Similarity(Wiq, Wid, doc\_id):

Input: Wiq: key-value pairs of weight of term in query (refer to indexing structure above)

Wid: key-value pairs of weight of term in all documents (refer to indexing structure above)

doc\_id: ID of the document

Declare:

Wiq\_Wid = []

Wiq\_square = []

Wid\_square = []

Foreach *key, value* in Wiq:

If *key* in Wid\_keys:

If *value* = 0 or Wid[*key*][doc\_id] = 0

then continue to the next *key, value*

Else:

Append *value* \* Wid[*key*][doc\_id] to Wiq\_Wid

Append *value* ^2 to Wiq\_square

Append Wid[*key*][doc\_id] ^2 to Wid\_ square

Return the similarity with sum(Wiq\_Wid) / (sum(Wiq\_square) \* sum(Wid\_square))