Lab Class IR

Exercise 1 : Abstract Ranking Model

We introduced an abstract model of ranking, where documents and queries are represented by features.

(a) What are advantages of representing documents and queries by features?

(b) What are disadvantages?

Exercise 2 : Abstract Ranking Model

Documents can easily contain thousands of non-zero features. Why is it important that queries have only a few non-zero features?

Exercise 3 : Inverted Index

Indexes are not necessary to search documents. Your web browser, for instance, has a "Find" function in it that searches text without using an index. Also the UNIX tool `grep` does not use an index.

(a) When should you use an inverted index for text search?

(b) What are some advantages of using an inverted index? What are some disadvantages?

Exercise 4 : Inverted Index

We have seen many different ways to store document information in inverted lists of different kinds.

(a) What kind of inverted lists might you build if you needed a very small index?

(b) What kind would you build if you needed to find mentions of cities, like Los Angeles or São Paulo?

Exercise 5 : Wildcard indexing

How may a search engine that uses an n-gram inverted index be modified to support these wildcards:

- Token-Wildcard *?* that can match any token (e.g., *to ? or not to be*)
- Character-Wildcard * that can match any character in a token (e.g., *in*m*ion* should match among others *information*)

Which components need to be changed and how?

Exercise 6 : Term-document matrices & inverted indices

The term-document matrix in Table 1 contains documents `Antony and Cleopatra, Julius Caesar, ...` and terms `Antony, Brutus, ....`

(a) Using set retrieval, which documents are returned for the following queries?

- q_1 : `Antony`

Table 1: Term-Document Matrix of Shakespearean plays. Cell entries denote term weights $w_{i,j} = tf(t_i, d_j)$ (i.e., term-frequency)

	Antony and Cleopatra	Julius Caesar	The Tempest	Hamlet	Othello	$\cdots$
Antony	382	128	0	0	0	
Brutus	4	379	0	1	0	
Caesar	289	272	0	2	1	
Calpurnia	0	16	0	0	0	
Cleopatra	271	0	0	0	0	
$\vdots$						$\ddots$

- q_2 : `Antony` $\wedge$ `Caesar` (i.e., conjunctive multi-term query)
- q_3 : (`Antony` $\vee$ `Caesar`) $\wedge$ ($\neg$`Calpurnia`) (i.e., disjunctive multi-term query)

(b) Do you see any shortcomings of this representation?

(c) How would the corresponding space efficient inverted index look like?

Exercise 7 : Index configurations

Match query types to optimal index configurations for ranked retrieval.

Query types	Index configurations
• Single-term queries (A)	• Postlists ordered by document ID (D)
• Disjunctive multi-term queries (B)	• Postlists ordered by document quality (E)
• Conjunctive multi-term queries:	• Postlists ordered by term weight (F)
– Boolean AND queries (C1)	• Positional indexing (G)
– Proximity queries (C2)	
– Phrase queries (C3)	

Exercise 8 : Inverted indices

(a) Describe all components of the inverted index shown in Table 2.

(b) In what order are the postings arranged, and which query types are better or worse suited to this ordering?

(c) Compute the collection of documents relevant to $q = t_1 \wedge t_2$ (i.e., perform the list intersection operation for terms t_1 and t_2).

Exercise 9 : Merge indices

Merge indices from Table 3 and 4.

Table 2: Inverted index of Shakespearean plays.

T	Postings							
t_1	(d_2, $w_{1,2}$, len, skip)	(d_4, $w_{1,4}$)	(d_8, $w_{1,8}$)	(d_{16}, $w_{1,16}$, skip)	(d_{19}, $w_{1,19}$)	(d_{23}, $w_{1,23}$)	(d_{28}, $w_{1,28}$, skip)	NIL
t_2	(d_1, $w_{2,1}$, len, skip)	(d_2, $w_{2,2}$)	(d_3, $w_{2,3}$)	(d_5, $w_{2,5}$, skip)	(d_8, $w_{2,8}$)	(d_{41}, $w_{2,41}$)	(d_{51}, $w_{2,51}$, skip)	NIL
⋮								

Table 3: Inverted index 1.

T	Postings				
t_1	(d_4, $w_{1,4}$, len, skip)	(d_{19}, $w_{1,29}$)	(d_{23}, $w_{1,23}$)	(d_{28}, $w_{1,28}$, skip)	(d_{50}, $w_{1,50}$)	...
⋮						

Table 4: Inverted index 2.

T	Postings				
t_1	(d_2, $w_{1,2}$, len, skip)	(d_8, $w_{1,8}$)	(d_{16}, $w_{1,16}$)	(d_{41}, $w_{1,41}$, skip)	(d_{77}, $w_{1,77}$)	...
⋮						