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Announcements

## Paper Presentations

- Please email me (ozgura@itu.edu.tr) your top 3 paper choices for presentation. Email me in advance to check if the papers are appropriate.
- Due date:03/03/201I (Thursday) - 17:00.
- You can choose from the suggested papers. But at least one of your three preferred papers should be proposed by you.
- I will try to assign you one of your three choices.
- You will have 20 minutes for presentation + 5 minutes for questions/discussion.


## Some paper suggestions

- The XML Retrieval chapter in the book.
- Dafna Shahaf and Carlos Guestrin. Connecting the dots between news articles. In KDD '10: Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining, pages 623-632, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- Turning Down the Noise in the Blogosphere, KDD2009.
, http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dshahaf/kdd2009-elarini-veda-shahaf-guestrin.pdf
- Michele Banko and Oren Etzioni. The tradeoffs between open and traditional relation extraction. In Proceedings of ACL-08: HLT, pages 28-36, Columbus, Ohio, June 2008.Association for Computational Linguistics.
-     - Science Maps: Chen, C. (2006). CiteSpace II: Detecting and visualizing emerging trends and transient patterns in scientific literature. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, 57(3), 359-377. doi: I0.1002/asi.203I7
〉 http://cluster.cis.drexel.edu/~cchen/citespace/doc/jasist2006.pdf


## Some paper suggestions

- Monika Rauch Henzinger, Finding near-duplicate web pages: a large-scale evaluation of algorithms, SIGIR, 2006, pp. 284-29I.
- Andrei Z. Broder, Identifying and filtering near-duplicate documents, CPM, 2000, pp. I-I0.
- Gunes Erkan and Dragomir R. Radev. Lexrank: Graph-based centrality as salience in text summarization. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research (JAIR), 2004.
- Qiaozhu Mei, Dengyong Zhou, Kenneth Church. Query Suggestion Using Hitting Time, Proceedings of the 16th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM'08), pages 469-478, 2008.
- Patterns of Cascading Behavior in Large Blog Graphs by J. Leskovec, M. McGlohon, C. Faloutsos, N. Glance, M. Hurst. SIAM SDM 2007.
- R.W.White and S. M. Drucker. Investigating behavioral variability in web search. In WWW'07.
- E.Agichtein, E. Brill, and S. Dumais. Improving web search ranking by incorporating user behavior information. In Proceedings of ACM SIGIR 2006.


## Some paper suggestions

- G. Cong, L.Wang, C.-Y. Lin,Y.-I. Song, and Y. Sun. Finding question-answer pairs from online forums. In Proc. 3 Ist SIGIR.
- http://research.microsoft.com/en-us/um/people/cyl/download/papers/SIGIR2008-Gao-MSRA.pdf
- Chirita, P.-A., Firan, C. S., and Nejdl,W. Personalized query expansion for the web. In SIGIR (2007), pp. 7-I4.
- Collins-Thompson, K., and Callan, J. Query expansion using random walk models. In CIKM (2005), pp. 704-7 I I.
- Pavel Calodo et al. Combining link-based and text-based methods for web document classification. CIKM 2003.


## Some paper suggestions

- Search advertising using Web relevance feedback. Broder, P. Ciccolo, M. Fontoura, E. Gabrilovich, V. Josifovski, and L. Riedel. (CIKM, 2008)
- Automatic Generation of Bid Phrases for Online Advertising. Ravi, S.; Broder, A.; Gabrilovich, E.; Josifovski, V.; Pandey, S.; Pang, B.WSDM (20|0)
- Using Landing Pages for Sponsored Search Ad Selection. Choi,Y.; Fontoura, M.; Gabrilovich, E.; Josifovski, V.; Mediano, M.; Pang, B. (WWW 20I0)
- Ganesh Ramakrishnan, Soumen Chakrabarti, Deepa Paranjpe, and Pushpak Bhattacharya. Is question answering an acquired skill? In Proceedings of the 13th international conference on World Wide Web, 2004.


## Project

- Please submit a one-page project proposal by e-mail.
- Due date: 09/03/20 I I Wednesday 17:00.
- You can choose from the list of project ideas or propose your own.
- You can work in teams of two, or individually.
- The last two weeks (06/05/20II and I3/05/20II) will be allocated for your project presentations ( 15 min . presentation +5 min. questions/discussion).


## Some Project Ideas

- Build a question answering system.
- Build a language identification system.
- Social network analysis from text
- Query log analysis.
- information extraction
- information extraction for biology (e.g. extracting protein interactions)
- blog analysis
- Sentiment/polarity extraction
- document duplicate and near-duplicate recognition
- clustering scientific papers by topic using citation information


## Some Project Ideas

- automatic query correction/expansion
- query completion/recommendation
- extract names of people and their descriptions from the web
- finding similar documents
- named entity recognition
- named entity disambiguation
- movie recommendations
- adversarial IR (spam)
- language modeling for IR
- Text classification/clustering
- summarization


## Recap

## Type/token distinction

-Token - an instance of a word or term occurring in a document
-Type - an equivalence class of tokens
-In June, the dog likes to chase the cat in the barn.

- 12 word tokens, 9 word types


## Problems in tokenization

-What are the delimiters? Space? Apostrophe? Hyphen?
-For each of these: sometimes they delimit, sometimes they don't.
-No whitespace in many languages! (e.g., Chinese)
-No whitespace in Dutch, German, Swedish compounds
(Lebensversicherungsgesellschaftsangestellter)

## Problems with equivalence classing

-A term is an equivalence class of tokens.
-How do we define equivalence classes?
-Numbers (3/20/91 vs. 20/3/91)

- Case folding
-Stemming, Porter stemmer
-Morphological analysis
-Equivalence classing problems in other languages
-More complex morphology than in English
-Finnish: a single verb may have 12,000 different forms
-Accents, umlauts


## Skip pointers

Brutus


Caesar


## Positional indexes

-Postings lists in a nonpositional index: each posting is just a docID
-Postings lists in a positional index: each posting is a docID and a list of positions
-Example query: "to ${ }_{1} \mathrm{be}_{2}$ or $_{3}$ not $_{4}$ to ${ }_{5} \mathrm{be}_{6}{ }^{\text {" }}$ TO, 993427:

- 1: «7, 18, 33, 72, 86, 231»; 2: «1, 17, 74, 222, 255»; 4: «8, 16, 190, 429, 433»;
5: «363, 367»; 7: «13, 23, 191»; ... 〕
BE, 178239:

```
    -1: (17, 25);
    4: «17, 191, 291, 430, 434〉;
    5: «14, 19, 101»; . . > Document 4 is a match!
```


## Positional indexes

-With a positional index, we can answer phrase queries. -With a positional index, we can answer proximity queries.

## Today's Lecture

-Tolerant retrieval: What to do if there is no exact match between query term and document term
-Wildcard queries
-Spelling correction

## Dictionaries

## Inverted index

For each term $t$, we store a list of all documents that contain $t$.

| BRUTUS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\rightarrow$| 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 31 | 45 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| CAESAR |
| :---: | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 57 | 132 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| CALPURNIA |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 31 | 54 | 101 |

## Dictionaries

-The dictionary is the data structure for storing the term vocabulary.
-Term vocabulary: the data
-Dictionary: the data structure for storing the term vocabulary

## A naïve dictionary

- An array of struct:

| term | document <br> frequency | pointer to <br> postings list |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| a 656,265 $\longrightarrow$ <br> aachen 65 $\longrightarrow$ <br> $\ldots$ $\ldots$ $\ldots$ <br> zulu 221 $\longrightarrow$ |  |  |
| char[20] | int | Postings * |
| 20 bytes | $4 / 8$ bytes | $4 / 8$ bytes |

- How do we store a dictionary in memory efficiently?
- How do we quickly look up elements at query time?


## Data structures for looking up term

-Two main classes of data structures: hashes and trees
-Some IR systems use hashes, some use trees.
-Criteria for when to use hashes vs. trees:
-Is there a fixed number of terms or will it keep growing?
-What are the relative frequencies with which various keys will be accessed?
-How many terms are we likely to have?

## Hashes

-Each vocabulary term is hashed into an integer.
-Try to avoid collisions
-At query time, do the following: hash query term, resolve collisions, locate entry in fixed-width array
-Pros: Lookup in a hash is faster than lookup in a tree.
-Lookup time is constant.
-Cons
-no way to find minor variants (resume vs. résumé)
-no prefix search (all terms starting with automat)
-need to rehash everything periodically if vocabulary
keeps growing

Tree: binary tree


## Tree: B-tree



- Definition: Every internal nodel has a number of children in the interval $[a, b]$ where $a, b$ are appropriate natural numbers, e.g., $[2,4]$.


## Trees

- Simplest: binary tree
- More usual: B-trees
- Trees require a standard ordering of characters and hence strings ... but we standardly have one
- Pros:
, Solves the prefix problem (terms starting with hyp)
- Cons:
- Slower: $O(\log M)$ [and this requires balanced tree]
- Rebalancing binary trees is expensive
- But B-trees mitigate the rebalancing problem


## Wild-card queries

## Wildcard queries

"mon*: find all docs containing any term beginning with mon
-Easy with B-tree dictionary: retrieve all terms t in the range: $\mathrm{mon} \leq \mathrm{t}$
< moo
-*mon: find all docs containing any term ending with mon
-Maintain an additional tree for terms backwards
-Then retrieve all terms t in the range: nom $\leq \mathrm{t}<$ non
-Result: A set of terms that are matches for wildcard query
-Then retrieve documents that contain any of these terms

## How to handle * in the middle of a term

-Example: c*sar

- We could look up c* and *sar in the B-tree and intersect the two term sets.
-Expensive
-Alternative: permuterm index
-Basic idea: Rotate every wildcard query, so that the * occurs at the end.
-Store each of these rotations in the dictionary, say, in a B-tree


## Permuterm $\rightarrow$ term mapping



## Permuterm index

-For HELLO, we've stored: hello\$, ello\$h, llo\$he, lo\$hel, and o\$hell
-Queries
-For X, look up X\$ (hello -> hello\$)
-For X*, look up X*\$ (hel* -> hel*\$)
-For *X, look up X\$* (*lo -> lo\$*)
-For *X*, look up X* (*I* -> II*)
-For $\mathrm{X}^{*} \mathrm{Y}$, look up $\mathrm{Y} \$ \mathrm{X}^{*}$ (hel*o -> o\$hel*)

## Processing a lookup in the permuterm index

-Rotate query wildcard to the right
-Use B-tree lookup as before
-Problem: Permuterm more than quadruples the size of the dictionary compared to a regular B-tree. (empirical number)

## $k$-gram indexes

-More space-efficient than permuterm index

- Enumerate all character $k$-grams (sequence of $k$ characters) occurring in a term
-2-grams are called bigrams.
- Example: from 'April is the cruelest month' we get the bigrams: $\$ a \operatorname{ap}$ pr ri il $l \$ \$ i$ is $s \$ \$ t$ th he e $\$ \$ c$ cr ru ue el le es st $t \$ \$ m$ mo on $n t h \$$ -\$ is a special word boundary symbol, as before.
-Maintain an inverted index from bigrams to the terms that contain the bigram


## Postings list in a 3-gram inverted index



## $k$-gram (bigram, trigram, . . . ) indexes

-Note that we now have two different types of inverted indexes
-The term-document inverted index for finding documents based on a query consisting of terms
-The $k$-gram index for finding terms based on a query consisting of $k$ grams

## Processing wildcarded terms in a bigram index

"Query mon* can now be run as: \$m AND mo AND on
"Gets us all terms with the prefix mon...
". . . but also many "false positives" like MOON.
-We must postfilter these terms against query.
-Surviving terms are then looked up in the term-document inverted index.

- $k$-gram index vs. permuterm index
- $k$-gram index is more space efficient.
-Permuterm index doesn't require postfiltering.
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Bunu mu demek istediniz? münchen En iyi 2 sonuç gösterildi
muenchen.de - Munich Germany Bavaria bavarian german Q - [Bu sayfanın çevirisini yap ]
25 Feb 2011 ... 2011 Portal München Betriebs-GmbH \& Co. KG Ein Service der
Landeshauptstadt München und der Stadtwerke München GmbH.
Tourism - Traffic and Transport - City Life - Christmas Market
www.muenchen.de/home/60093/Homepage.html - Önbellek - Benzer
Munich - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia Q - [ Bu sayfanın çevirisini yap ]
Munich (German: München, pronounced ['mrnçən] ( listen); Austro-Bavarian: Minga) is the capital city of Bavaria (Bayern), Germany. It is located on the ...
History - Geography - Demographics - Politics
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Munich - Ónbellek - Benzer

## $\mathbf{m}^{*}$ nchen için sonuçlar

muenchen de - Offizielles Stadtportal für München Q - [ Bu sayfanın çevirisini yap ]
Jetzt zu M-Ökostrom wechseln und bis zu $60 €$ Wechselbonus kassieren. Hier online sparen! www.swm.de/oekostrom - Top Videos ...
Veranstaltungen \& Tickets - Tourismus - Stadtplan - Stellenangebote, Jobs www.muenchen.de/ - Önbellek - Benzer

But this is not entirely true.Try [pythag*] and [ $m$ *nchen]
Why doesn't Google fully support wild card queries?

## Processing wildcard queries in the termdocument index

-Problem 1: we must potentially execute a large number of Boolean queries.
-Most straightforward semantics: Conjunction of disjunctions
-For [gen* universit*]: geneva university OR geneva université OR genève university OR genève université OR general universities OR
-Very expensive
-Problem 2: Users hate to type. If you encourage "laziness" people will respond!
-If abbreviated queries like [pyth* theo*] for [pythagoras' theorem] are allowed, users will use them a lot.
-This would significantly increase the cost of answering queries.


Search
Type your search terms, use '*' if you need to.
E.g., Alex* will match Alexander.

## Spelling correction

## Spelling correction

-Two principal uses
-Correcting documents being indexed
-Correcting user queries
-Two different methods for spelling correction
-Isolated word spelling correction

- Check each word on its own for misspelling
-Will not catch typos resulting in correctly spelled
words, e.g., I flew form Heathrow to Narita.
-Context-sensitive spelling correction
-Look at surrounding words
-Can correct form/from error above


## Document correction

- Especially needed for OCR’ed documents
- Correction algorithms are tuned for this: rn/m
- Can use domain-specific knowledge
- E.g., OCR can confuse O and D more often than it would confuse O and I (adjacent on the QWERTY keyboard, so more likely interchanged in typing).
- But also: web pages and even printed material has typos
- But often we don't change the documents but aim to fix the query-document mapping


## Query mis-spellings

- Our principal focus here
- E.g., the query Albert Einstain
- We can either
- Retrieve documents indexed by the correct spelling, OR
- Return several suggested alternative queries with the correct spelling
- Did you mean ...?
- C

0
8 http://www.google.com.tr/search?hl=tr\&client=firefox-a\&hs=Dws\&rls=org.mozilla\%3Aen-US\%3Aofficial\&channel=s\&q=albert+einstain\&

ค. Most Visited Getting Started in Latest Headlines

- albert einstain - Google'da Ara

Web Görseller Haberler Ceviri Bloglar Gerçekzamanlı Gmail Diğer v


## Isolated word correction

- Fundamental premise - there is a lexicon from which the correct spellings come
- Two basic choices for this
- A standard lexicon such as
- Webster's English Dictionary
- An "industry-specific" lexicon - hand-maintained
- The lexicon of the indexed corpus
- E.g., all words on the web
- All names, acronyms etc.
- (Including the mis-spellings)


## Isolated word correction

- Given a lexicon and a character sequence Q , return the words in the lexicon closest to Q
- What's "closest"?
- We'll study several alternatives
- Edit distance (Levenshtein distance)
- Weighted edit distance
- n-gram overlap


## Edit distance

-The edit distance between string $s_{1}$ and string $s_{2}$ is the minimum number of basic operations that convert $s_{1}$ to $s_{2}$.
-Levenshtein distance: The admissible basic operations are insert, delete, and replace (Edit distance usually refers to Levenshtein distance)
-Levenshtein distance dog-do: 1 (delete g)
-Levenshtein distance cat-cart: 1 (insert r)
-Levenshtein distance cat-cut: 1 (replace a with u)
-Levenshtein distance cat-act: 2 (replace c with a, replace a with c)
-Damerau-Levenshtein distance cat-act: 1 (transpose c with a)
-Damerau-Levenshtein includes transposition as a fourth possible operation.
-Hamming distance: only allows substitution (only applies to strings of the same length).

## Levenshtein distance: Computation

|  |  | $f$ | $a$ | $s$ | $t$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $c$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $a$ | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| $t$ | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| $s$ | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

## Levenshtein distance: Algorithm

LevenshteinDistance $\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$
1 for $i \leftarrow 0$ to $\left|s_{1}\right|$
2 do $m[i, 0]=i$
3 for $j \leftarrow 0$ to $\left|s_{2}\right|$
4 do $m[0, j]=j$
5 for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $\left|s_{1}\right|$
6 do for $j \leftarrow 1$ to $\left|s_{2}\right|$
7 do if $s_{1}[i]=s_{2}[j]$
8 then $m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]\}$
9 else $m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]+1\}$
10 return $m\left[\left|s_{1}\right|,\left|s_{2}\right|\right]$
Operations: insert (cost 1 ), delete (cost 1 ), replace (cost 1 ), copy (cost 0)

## Levenshtein distance: Algorithm

LevenshteinDistance $\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$

```
1 for \(i \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
2 do \(m[i, 0]=i\)
3 for \(j \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
4 do \(m[0, j]=j\)
5 for \(i \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
6 do for \(j \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
7 do if \(s_{1}[i]=s_{2}[j]\)
\(8 \quad\) then \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]\}\)
9 else \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]+1\}\)
10 return \(m\left[\left|s_{1}\right|,\left|s_{2}\right|\right]\)
Operations: insert (cost 1 ), delete (cost 1 ), replace ( \(\operatorname{cost} 1\) ), copy
(cost 0)
```


## Levenshtein distance: Algorithm

LevenshteinDistance $\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$
$1 \quad$ for $i \leftarrow 0$ to $\left|s_{1}\right|$
2 do $m[i, 0]=i$
3 for $j \leftarrow 0$ to $\left|s_{2}\right|$
4 do $m[0, j]=j$
5 for $i \leftarrow 1$ to $\left|s_{1}\right|$
6 do for $j \leftarrow 1$ to $\left|s_{2}\right|$
7 do if $s_{1}[i]=s_{2}[j]$
8 then $m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]\}$
9 else $m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]+1\}$
10 return $m\left[\left|s_{1}\right|,\left|s_{2}\right|\right]$
Operations: insert (cost 1), delete (cost 1), replace (cost 1), copy (cost 0)

## Levenshtein distance: Algorithm

```
LevenshteinDistance \(\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)\)
    \(1 \quad\) for \(i \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
    2 do \(m[i, 0]=i\)
    3 for \(j \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
    4 do \(m[0, j]=j\)
    5 for \(i \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
    6 do for \(j \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
        do if \(s_{1}[i]=s_{2}[j]\)
        then \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]\}\)
                            else \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]+1\}\)
    10 return \(m\left[\left|s_{1}\right|,\left|s_{2}\right|\right]\)
    Operations: insert (cost 1 ), delete (cost 1\()\), replace (cost 1 ), copy
(cost 0)
```


## Levenshtein distance: Algorithm

```
LevenshteinDistance \(\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)\)
    1 for \(i \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
    2 do \(m[i, 0]=i\)
    3 for \(j \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
    4 do \(m[0, j]=j\)
    5 for \(i \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
    6 do for \(j \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
    7 do if \(s_{1}[i]=s_{2}[j]\)
    \(8 \quad\) then \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]\}\)
    9
    else \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]+1\}\)
    10 return \(m\left[\left|s_{1}\right|,\left|s_{2}\right|\right]\)
    Operations: insert (cost 1 ), delete (cost 1 ), replace (cost 1 ), copy
(cost 0)
```


## Levenshtein distance: Example

|  |  | f |  | a |  | s |  | t |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| c | 1 <br> 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| a | - 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| t | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| $s$ | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | $\frac{3}{2}$ | 3 | 3 |

## Each cell of Levenshtein matrix

| cost of getting here from <br> my upper left neighbor <br> (copy or replace) | cost of getting here <br> from my upper neighbor <br> (delete) |
| :--- | :--- |
| cost of getting here from <br> my left neighbor (insert) | the minimum of the three <br> possible "movements"; <br> the cheapest way of getting <br> here |

## Levenshtein distance: Example



## Dynamic programming

-Optimal substructure: The optimal solution to the problem contains within it subsolutions, i.e., optimal solutions to subproblems.
-Overlapping subsolutions: The subsolutions overlap. These subsolutions are computed over and over again when computing the global optimal solution in a brute-force algorithm.
"Subproblem in the case of edit distance: what is the edit distance of two prefixes
"Overlapping subsolutions: We need most distances of prefixes 3 times

- this corresponds to moving right, diagonally, down.


## Weighted edit distance

-As above, but weight of an operation depends on the characters involved.
-Meant to capture keyboard errors, e.g., $m$ more likely to be mistyped as $n$ than as $q$.
-Therefore, replacing $m$ by $n$ is a smaller edit distance than by $q$.
-We now require a weight matrix as input.
-Modify dynamic programming to handle weights

## Using edit distance for spelling correction

-Given query, first enumerate all character sequences within a preset (possibly weighted) edit distance
-Intersect this set with our list of "correct" words
-Then suggest terms in the intersection to the user.
$\rightarrow$ exercise in a few slides

## Exercise

(1)Compute Levenshtein distance matrix for OSLO - SNOW
(2) What are the Levenshtein editing operations that transform cat into catcat?
































|  |  | s |  | n |  | - |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| $s$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |



|  |  | s |  | n |  | - |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | $\frac{4}{2}$ | 4 | 5 |
| $s$ | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | $\frac{4}{3}$ |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | , |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s |   <br>  2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |

How do I read out the editing operations that transform OSLO into SNOW?




| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | o | o |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | w |



| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | replace | I | n |
| 0 | (copy) | $\circ$ | 0 |
| 1 | insert | + | w |



| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | s | s |
| 1 | replace | I | n |
| 0 | (copy) | o | o |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | w |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | o |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 22 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 0 |  <br>  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | delete | o | ${ }^{*}$ |
| 0 | (copy) | s | s |
| 1 | replace | I | n |
| 0 | (copy) | o | o |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | w |


|  |  | c |  | a |  | t |  | c |  | a |  | t |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| c | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | $\frac{3}{1}$ | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| a | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 6 |
| t | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 |



| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | insert | ${ }^{*}$ | c |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | a |
| 1 | insert | * | t |
| 0 | (copy) | c | c |
| 0 | (copy) | a | a |
| 0 | (copy) | t | t |



| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | c | c |
| 1 | insert | * | a |
| 1 | insert | * | t |
| 1 | insert | * | c |
| 0 | (copy) | a | a |
| 0 | (copy) | t | t |


|  |  | c |  | a |  | t |  | c |  | a |  | t |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| c | - 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | $\frac{7}{5}$ |
| a | - 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| t | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 |


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | c | c |
| 0 | (copy) | a | a |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | t |
| 1 | insert | * | c |
| 1 | insert | * | a |
| 0 | (copy) | t | t |


|  |  | C |  | a |  | t |  | C |  | a |  | t |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 |
| C | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 |
| a | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| t | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 |


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | c | c |
| 0 | (copy) | a | a |
| 0 | (copy) | t | t |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | c |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | a |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | t |

## Spelling correction

-Now that we can compute edit distance: how to use it for isolated word spelling correction.

- $k$-gram indexes for isolated word spelling correction.
-Context-sensitive spelling correction
-General issues


## Edit distance to all dictionary terms?

- Given a (mis-spelled) query - do we compute its edit distance to every dictionary term?
- Expensive and slow
- Alternative?
- How do we cut the set of candidate dictionary terms?
- One possibility is to use n-gram overlap for this
- This can also be used by itself for spelling correction.


## n-gram overlap

- Enumerate all the n-grams in the query string as well as in the lexicon
- Use the n-gram index (recall wild-card search) to retrieve all lexicon terms matching any of the query $n$-grams
- Threshold by number of matching n-grams
- Variants - weight by keyboard layout, etc.


## Example with trigrams

- Suppose the text is november
- Trigrams are nov, ove, vem, emb, mbe, ber.
- The query is december
- Trigrams are dec, ece, cem, emb, mbe, ber.
- So 3 trigrams overlap (of 6 in each term)
- How can we turn this into a normalized measure of overlap?


## One option - Jaccard coefficient

- A commonly-used measure of overlap
- Let $X$ and $Y$ be two sets; then the J.C. is

$$
|X \cap Y| /|X \cup Y|
$$

- Equals I when $X$ and $Y$ have the same elements and zero when they are disjoint
- $X$ and $Y$ don't have to be of the same size
- Always assigns a number between 0 and I
- Now threshold to decide if you have a match
, E.g., if J.C. > 0.8, declare a match


## Matching trigrams

Consider the query lord - we wish to identify words matching 2 of its 3 bigrams (lo, or, rd)


Standard postings "merge" will enumerate ...

## Context-sensitive spell correction



## Context-sensitive correction

- Need surrounding context to catch this.
- First idea: retrieve dictionary terms close (in weighted edit distance) to each query term
- Now try all possible resulting phrases with one word "fixed" at a time
- flew from Istanbul Ataturk Airport
- fled form Istanbul Ataturk Airport
- flea form Istanbul Ataturk Airport
- Hit-based spelling correction: Suggest the alternative that has lots of hits.


## Exercise

- Suppose that for "flew form Istanbul Ataturk Airport" we have 7 alternatives for flew, 20 for form, 3 for Istanbul, 2 for Ataturk, and 3 for airport.
How many "corrected" phrases will we enumerate in this scheme?


## Another approach

- Break phrase query into a conjunction of biwords (Lecture 2).
- Look for biwords that need only one term corrected.
- Enumerate phrase matches and ... rank them!


## General issues in spell correction

中 We enumerate multiple alternatives for "Did you mean?"

- Need to figure out which to present to the user
- Use heuristics
- The alternative hitting most docs
- Query log analysis + tweaking
- For especially popular, topical queries
- Spell-correction is computationally expensive
- Avoid running routinely on every query?
- Run only on queries that matched few docs


## Soundex

## Soundex

- Class of heuristics to expand a query into phonetic equivalents
- Language specific - mainly for names
, E.g., chebyshev $\rightarrow$ tchebycheff


## Soundex - typical algorithm

- Turn every token to be indexed into a 4-character reduced form
- Do the same with query terms
- Build and search an index on the reduced forms
b (when the query calls for a soundex match)


## Soundex - typical algorithm

I. Retain the first letter of the word.
2. Change all occurrences of the following letters to '0' (zero): 'A', E', 'I', 'O', 'U', 'H', 'W', 'Y'.
3. Change letters to digits as follows:

B, F, P, V $\rightarrow$ I
C, G, J, K, Q, S, X, Z $\rightarrow 2$
D,T $\rightarrow 3$
$\mathrm{L} \rightarrow 4$
$\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N} \rightarrow 5$
$R \rightarrow 6$
4. Remove all pairs of consecutive digits.
5. Remove all zeros from the resulting string.
6. Pad the resulting string with trailing zeros and return the first four positions, which will be of the form <uppercase letter> <digit> <digit> <digit>.

## Example: Soundex of HERMAN

-Retain H

- ERMAN $\rightarrow$ ORMON
- ORMON $\rightarrow 06505$
-06505 $\rightarrow 06505$
- $06505 \rightarrow 655$
-Return H655
-Note: HERMANN will generate the same code


## Soundex

- Soundex is the classic algorithm, provided by most databases (Oracle, Microsoft, ...)
- How useful is soundex?
- Not very - for information retrieval
- Okay for "high recall" tasks, though biased to names of certain nationalities


## What queries can we process?

- We have
- Positional inverted index with skip pointers
- Wild-card index
- Spell-correction
- Soundex
- Queries such as
(SPELL(moriset) /3 toron*to) OR SOUNDEX(chaikofski)
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- http://www.merriampark.com/ld.htm
- Nice reading on spell correction:
- Peter Norvig: How to write a spelling corrector
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- Soundex Algorith demo:
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