

## Query



## Incidence vectors

- So we have a $0 / 1$ vector for each term.
- To answer query: take the vectors for Brutus, Caesar and Calpurnia (complemented) $\rightarrow$ bitwise $A N D$.
- 110100 AND 110111 AND $101111=$ 100100.


## Answers to query

- Antony and Cleopatra, Act III, Scene ii
- Agrippa [Aside to DOMITIUS ENOBARBUS]: Why, Enobarbus,

When Antony found Julius Caesar dead,
He cried almost to roaring; and he wept
When at Philippi he found Brutus slain.

- Hamlet, Act III, Scene ii
- Lord Polonius:I did enact Julius Caesar I was killed i' the

Capitol; Brutus killed me.

## Bigger corpora

- Consider $n=1 \mathrm{M}$ documents, each with about 1 K terms.
- Avg 6 bytes/term incl spaces/punctuation -6 GB of data.
- Say there are $m=500 \mathrm{~K} \underline{\text { distinct }}$ terms among these.


## Can't build the matrix

- 500 K x 1 M matrix has half-a-trillion 0 's and 1's.
- But it has no more than one billion 1's. - matrix is extremely sparse.
- What's a better representation?


## Inverted index

- Documents are parsed to extract words and these are saved with the Document ID.




## Two conflicting forces

- A term like Calpurnia occurs in maybe one doc out of a million - would like to store this pointer using $\log _{2} 1 \mathrm{M} \sim 20$ bits.
- A term like the occurs in virtually every doc, so 20 bits/pointer is too expensive.
- Prefer 0/1 vector in this case.


## Postings file entry

- Store list of docs containing a term in increasing order of doc id.
- Brutus: 33,47,154,159,202 ...
- Consequence: suffices to store gaps. - 33,14,107,5,43 ...
- Hope: most gaps encoded with far fewer than 20 bits.


## Variable encoding

- For Calpurnia, use ~20 bits/gap entry.
- For the, use $\sim 1$ bit/gap entry.
- If the average gap for a term is $G$, want to use $\sim \log _{2} G$ bits/gap entry.


## $\gamma$ codes for gap encoding

## Eength Offset

- Represent a gap $G$ as the pair <length,offset>
- length is in unary and uses $\left\lfloor\log _{2} G\right\rfloor+1$ bits to specify the length of the binary encoding of
- offset $=G-2^{\left\lfloor\log _{2} G\right\rfloor}$
- e.g., 9 represented as 1110001 .
- Encoding $G$ takes $2\left\lfloor\log _{2} G\right\rfloor+1$ bits.


## What we've just done

- Encoded each gap as tightly as possible, to within a factor of 2 .
- For better tuning (and a simple analysis) need some handle on the distribution of gap values.


## Rough analysis based on Zipf

- Most frequent term occurs in $n$ docs
- $n$ gaps of 1 each.
- Second most frequent term in $n / 2$ docs - $n / 2$ gaps of 2 each ...
- $k$ th most frequent term in $n / k$ docs
$-n / k$ gaps of $k$ each - use $2 \log _{2} k+1$ bits for each
$n / k$ gaps of $k$ each - use $2 \log _{2} k+1$ bits for each
gap;
net of $\sim(2 n / k) \cdot \log _{2} k$ bits for $k$ th most frequent
- $n / k$ gaps of $k$ each - use $2 \log _{2} k+1$ bits for each
gap;
- net of $\sim(2 n / k) . \log _{2} k$ bits for $k$ th most frequent term.


## Zipf's law

- The $k$ th most frequent term has frequency proportional to $1 / k$.
- Use this for a crude analysis of the space used by our postings file pointers.


## Sum over $k$ from 1 to 500 K

- Do this by breaking values of k into groups: group $i$ consists of $2^{i-1} \leq k<2^{i}$.
- Group $i$ has $2^{i-1}$ components in the sum,, Work out each contributing at most $(2 n i) / 2^{i-1}$. $r_{\text {aleutat }}^{\text {Wout }}$
- Summing over $i$ from 1 to 19 , we get a net estimate of $340 \mathrm{Mbits} \sim 45 \mathrm{MB}$ for our index.


## Caveats

- This is not the entire space for our index:
- does not account for dictionary storage;
- as we get further, we'll store even more stuff in the index.
- Assumes Zipf's law applies to occurrence of terms in docs.
- All gaps for a term taken to be the same.
- Does not talk about query processing.


## Issues with index we just built

- How do we process a query?
- What terms in a doc do we index?
- All words or only "important" ones?
- Stopword list: terms that are so common that they're ignored for indexing.
- e.g., the, a, an, of, to ...
- language-specific.

Repeat postings size calculation if 100 most frequent terms are not indexed

## Issues in what to index

Cooper's concordance of Wordsworth was published in 1911. The applications of full-text retrieval are legion: they include résumé scanning, litigation support and searching published journals on-line.

- Cooper's vs. Cooper vs. Coopers.
- Full-text vs. full text vs. $\{$ full, text $\}$ vs. fulltext.
- Accents: résumé vs. resume.


## Punctuation

- Ne'er: use language-specific, handcrafted "locale" to normalize.
- State-of-the-art: break up hyphenated sequence.
- U.S.A. vs. $\boldsymbol{U S A} \boldsymbol{A}$ - use locale.
- a.out



## Case folding

- Reduce all letters to lower case
- proper nouns - from language module
- e.g., General Motors
- Fed vs. fed
- SAIL vs sail


## Thesauri and soundex

- Handle synonyms and homonyms
- Hand-constructed equivalence classes
- e.g., car $=$ automobile
- your $\rightarrow$ you're
- Index such equivalences, or expand query?
- More later ...


## Spell correction

- Look for all words within (say) edit distance 3 (Insert/Delete/Replace) at query time - e.g., Alanis Morisette
- Spell correction is expensive and slows the query (upto a factor of 100 )
- Invoke only when index returns zero matches.
- What if docs contain mis-spellings?


## Stemming

- Reduce terms to their roots before indexing
- language dependent
- e.g., automate(s), automatic, automation all reduced to automat.
for example compressed and compression are both accepted as equivalent to compress.
for exampl compres and compres are both accept as equival to compres.


## Porter's algorithm

- Commonest algorithm for stemming English
- Conventions +5 phases of reductions
- phases applied sequentially
- each phase consists of a set of commands
- sample convention: Of the rules in a compound command, select the one that applies to the longest suffix.

So far: terms are the units of search

- What about phrases?
- Proximity: Find Gates NEAR Microsoft.
- Need index to capture position information in docs.
- Zones in documents: Find documents with (author = Ullman) AND (text contains automata).


## Evidence accumulation

- 1 vs. 0 occurrence of a search term
- 2 vs. 1 occurrence
-3 vs. 2 occurrences, etc.
- Need term frequency information in docs


## Ranking search results

- Boolean queries give inclusion or exclusion of docs.
- Need to measure proximity from query to each doc.
- Whether docs presented to user are singletons, or a group of docs covering various aspects of the query.


## Clustering and classification

- Given a set of docs, group them into clusters based on their contents.
- Given a set of topics, plus a new doc $D$, decide which topic(s) $D$ belongs to.


## The web and its challenges

- Unusual and diverse documents
- Unusual and diverse users, queries, information needs
- Beyond terms, exploit ideas from social networks
- link analysis, clickstreams ...


## Course administrivia

- Course URL:
http://www.stanford.edu/class/cs347
- TA's:Taher Haveliwala, Brent Miller, Sriram Raghavan
- Grading:
- $30 \%$ from midterm
- $40 \%$ from final
- $30 \%$ from group project.


## Group project

- Groups of 4-5
- Strongly encouraged to build apps, not search engines
- Strongly encouraged to use one of the local corpora
- Short and not onerous on programming
- Details to be updated on course page
- Lead: Brent Miller; Discussion 4/11TBA


## Class schedule

- Lectures MW 1250-205pm, Thornton 102
- April 11 - guest lecture by Dr. Andrei Broder, Chief Scientist at Altavista
- Apr 30 - mid-term in class
- May 23 onwards - Distributed Databases, Sriram Raghavan lecturing


## Resources for today's lecture

- Managing Gigabytes, Chapter 3.
- Modern Information Retrieval, Chapter 7.2
- Porter's stemmer: http//www.sims.berkeley.edu/~hearst/irbook/porter.html
- Shakespeare: http://www.theplays.org

