3-1: Scoring, Term Weighting and the Vector Space Model

Relevance = Similarity

- Assumptions
  - Query and document are represented similarly
  - A query can be regarded as a “document”
  - Relevance(d,q) $\propto$ similarity(d,q)
- $R(q) = \{d \in C | f(d,q) > \theta\}$, $f(q,d) = \Delta(Rep(q), Rep(d))$
- Key issues
  - How to represent query/document?
  - How to define the similarity measure Δ?

Vector Space Model

- Represent a doc/query by a term vector
  - Term: basic concept, e.g., word or phrase
  - Each term defines one dimension
  - N terms define a high-dimensional space
  - Element of vector corresponds to term weight
  - E.g., $d=(x_1,\ldots,x_N)$, x_i is “importance” of term i
- Measure relevance by the distance between the query vector and document vector in the vector space

VS Model: illustration



What the VS model doesn’t say

- How to define/select the “basic concept”
  - Concepts are assumed to be orthogonal
- How to assign weights
  - Weight in query indicates importance of term
  - Weight in doc indicates how well the term characterizes the doc
- How to define the similarity/distance measure

How to Assign Weights?

- Very very important!
- Why weighting
  - Query side: Not all terms are equally important
  - Doc side: Some terms carry more information about contents
- How?
  - Two basic heuristics
    - TF (Term Frequency) = Within-doc-frequency
    - IDF (Inverse Document Frequency)
  - TF normalization

Score for a document given a query

$$\text{Score}(q,d) = \sum_{t \in q \cap d} \text{tf.idf}_{t,d}$$

- There are many variants
  - How “tf” is computed (with/without logs)
  - Whether the terms in the query are also weighted
  - …

Binary → count → weight matrix

	Antony and Cleopatra	Julius Caesar	The Tempest	Hamlet	Othello	Macbeth
Antony	5.25	3.18	0	0	0	0.35
Brutus	1.21	6.1	0	1	0	0
Caesar	8.59	2.54	0	1.51	0.25	0
Calpurnia	0	1.54	0	0	0	0
Cleopatra	2.85	0	0	0	0	0
mercy	1.51	0	1.9	0.12	5.25	0.88
worser	1.37	0	0.11	4.15	0.25	1.95

Each document is now represented by a real-valued vector of tf-idf weights $\in \mathbb{R}^{|V|}$

Documents as vectors

- So we have a |V|-dimensional vector space
- Terms are axes of the space
- Documents are points or vectors in this space
- Very high-dimensional: tens of millions of dimensions when you apply this to a web search engine
- These are very sparse vectors - most entries are zero.

Queries as vectors

- Key idea 1: Do the same for queries: represent them as vectors in the space
- Key idea 2: Rank documents according to their proximity to the query in this space
- proximity = similarity of vectors
- proximity ≈ inverse of distance
- Recall: We do this because we want to get away from the you're-either-in-or-out Boolean model.
- Instead: rank more relevant documents higher than less relevant documents

Formalizing vector space proximity

- First cut: distance between two points
  - (= distance between the end points of the two vectors)
- Euclidean distance?
- Euclidean distance is a bad idea . . .
- . . . because Euclidean distance is large for vectors of different lengths.

Formalizing vector space proximity

- First cut: distance between two points
  - (= distance between the end points of the two vectors)
- Euclidean distance?
- Euclidean distance is a bad idea . . .
- . . . because Euclidean distance is large for vectors of different lengths.

Why distance is a bad idea

The Euclidean distance between $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{d_2}$ is large even though the distribution of terms in the query $\vec{q}$ and the distribution of terms in the document $\vec{d_2}$ are very similar.



Use angle instead of distance

- Thought experiment: take a document *d* and append it to itself. Call this document *d*′.
- "Semantically" d and d′ have the same content
- The Euclidean distance between the two documents can be quite large
- The angle between the two documents is 0, corresponding to maximal similarity.

- Key idea: Rank documents according to angle with query.

From angles to cosines

- The following two notions are equivalent.
  - Rank documents in decreasing order of the angle between query and document
  - Rank documents in increasing order of cosine(query,document)
- Cosine is a monotonically decreasing function for the interval [0^o, 180^o]

From angles to cosines



- But how – *and why* – should we be computing cosines?

Length normalization

- A vector can be (length-) normalized by dividing each of its components by its length – for this we use the L_2 norm:

$$\|\vec{x}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_i x_i^2}$$

- Dividing a vector by its L_2 norm makes it a unit (length) vector (on surface of unit hypersphere)
- Effect on the two documents d and d′ (d appended to itself) from earlier slide: they have identical vectors after length-normalization.
  - Long and short documents now have comparable weights

Similarity

- This is a measure of the angle between two unit vectors:

- similarity = cos(a,b) = dotproduct(a,b) / (norm(a) * norm(b))

  = a.b / ||a|| * ||b||

[Definition: if a = (a1,a2,...,an) and b = (b1,b2,...,bn) then a.b = Sum(a1*b1 + a2*b2 + ... + an*bn) and ||a|| = sqrt(a1^2 + a2^2 + ... + an^2) and ||b|| = sqrt(b1^2 + b2^2 + ... + bn^2).]

- The smaller the angle, the more similar are the two vectors.

cosine(query,document)

$$\cos(\vec{q},\vec{d}) = \frac{\overbrace{\vec{q}\bullet\vec{d}}^{\text{Dot product}}}{|\vec{q}||\vec{d}|} = \underbrace{\frac{\vec{q}}{|\vec{q}|}\bullet\frac{\vec{d}}{|\vec{d}|}}_{\text{Unit vectors}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|V|} q_i d_i}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{|V|} q_i^2}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{|V|} d_i^2}}$$

q_i is the tf-idf weight of term *i* in the query
d_i is the tf-idf weight of term *i* in the document

$\cos(\vec{q},\vec{d})$ is the cosine similarity of $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{d}$ … or, equivalently, the cosine of the angle between $\vec{q}$ and $\vec{d}$.

Cosine similarity illustrated



Cosine similarity amongst 3 documents

How similar are the novels

SaS: *Sense and Sensibility*

PaP: *Pride and Prejudice*, and

WH: *Wuthering Heights*?

term	SaS	PaP	WH
affection	115	58	20
jealous	10	7	11
gossip	2	0	6
wuthering	0	0	38

Term frequencies (counts)

Note: To simplify this example, we don’t do idf weighting.

3 documents example contd.

Log fre

term	SaS	PaP	WH
affection	3.06	2.76	2.30
jealous	2.00	1.85	2.04
gossip	1.30	0	1.78
wuthering	0	0	2.58

After le

term	SaS	PaP	WH
affection	0.789	0.832	0.524
jealous	0.515	0.555	0.465
gossip	0.335	0	0.405
wuthering	0	0	0.588

cos(SaS,PaP) ≈

$0.789 \times 0.832 + 0.515 \times 0.555 + 0.335 \times 0.0 + 0.0 \times 0.0$

≈ 0.94

cos(SaS,WH) ≈ 0.79

cos(PaP,WH) ≈ 0.69

Why do we have cos(SaS,PaP) > cos(SaS,WH)?

Computing cosine scores

```
COSINESCORE(q)
float Scores[N] = 0
float Length[N]
for each query term t
do calculate w_{t,q} and fetch postings list for t
    for each pair(d, tf_{t,d}) in postings list
    do Scores[d] += w_{t,d} × w_{t,q}
Read the array Length
for each d
do Scores[d] = Scores[d]/Length[d]
return Top K components of Scores[]
```

tf-idf weighting has many variants

Term frequency		Document frequency		Normalization	
n (natural)	$\mathrm{tf}_{t,d}$	n (no)	1	n (none)	1
l (logarithm)	$1 + \log(\mathrm{tf}_{t,d})$	t (idf)	$\log \frac{N}{\mathrm{df}_t}$	c (cosine)	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{w_1^2+w_2^2+\ldots+w_M^2}}$
a (augmented)	$0.5 + \frac{0.5 \times \mathrm{tf}_{t,d}}{\max_t(\mathrm{tf}_{t,d})}$	p (prob idf)	$\max\{0, \log \frac{N-\mathrm{df}_t}{\mathrm{df}_t}\}$	u (pivoted unique)	$1/u$
b (boolean)	$\begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathrm{tf}_{t,d} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$			b (byte size)	$1/\mathit{CharLength}^{\alpha}$, $\alpha < 1$
L (log ave)	$\frac{1+\log(\mathrm{tf}_{t,d})}{1+\log(\mathrm{ave}_{t \in d}(\mathrm{tf}_{t,d}))}$				

Columns headed ‘n’ are acronyms for weight schemes.

Why is the base of the log in idf immaterial?

Weighting may differ in queries vs documents

- Many search engines allow for different weightings for queries vs. documents
- SMART Notation: denotes the combination in use in an engine, with the notation *ddd.qqq*, using the acronyms from the previous table
- A very standard weighting scheme is: lnc.ltc
- Document: logarithmic tf (l as first character), no idf and cosine normalization
- Query: logarithmic tf (l in leftmost column), idf (t in second column), no normalization …

A bad idea?

tf-idf example: lnc.ltc

Document: *car insurance auto insurance*
Query: *best car insurance*

Term	Query						Document				Prod
	tf-raw	tf-wt	df	idf	wt	n'lize	tf-raw	tf-wt	wt	n'lize	
auto	0	0	5000	2.3	0	0	1	1	1	0.52	0
best	1	1	50000	1.3	1.3	0.34	0	0	0	0	0
car	1	1	10000	2.0	2.0	0.52	1	1	1	0.52	0.27
insurance	1	1	1000	3.0	3.0	0.78	2	1.3	1.3	0.68	0.53

Exercise: what is *N*, the number of docs?

Doc length $= \sqrt{1^2 + 0^2 + 1^2 + 1.3^2} \approx 1.92$

Score = 0+0+0.27+0.53 = 0.8

Summary – vector space ranking

- Represent the query as a weighted tf-idf vector
- Represent each document as a weighted tf-idf vector
- Compute the cosine similarity score for the query vector and each document vector
- Rank documents with respect to the query by score
- Return the top K (e.g., K = 10) to the user

Resources for this lecture

- Introduction to Information Retrieval, chapter 6
- Lecture slides of Christopher Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan and Hinrich Schütze