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## Part A

## [18 marks]

Short answers and explanations.

1. (2 marks) Explain the difference between an information retrieval system and a search engine.
$\square$
2. (2 marks) Why is tf•idf a good weighting scheme? Why are inverse document frequencies (idf weights) expected to improve IR performance when added to term frequencies $(t f)$ ? (Remember that the idf value for a term is the number of documents where it appears).
3. (2 marks) Explain what is the difference between relevance feedback and the pseudorelevance feedback. Which one do you think would achieve better retrieval performance. Why?
$\square$
4. (2 marks) In IR systems, a possible pre-processing step is stemming the words.

Do you think the performance of the system (the average precision) would be higher with or without stemming? Why?
$\square$
5. (3 marks) Compute the edit distance between the following strings. Remember that the edit distance is the minimum number of deletions, insertions and substitutions needed to transform the first string into the second.
How would you normalize the score? Why is the normalization needed?
String 1: abracadabra
String 2: nabucodor
6. (2 marks) Below is a sample robot META tag in the HEAD section of an HTML document. Explain what this tag means.

<meta name = "robots" content = "index,nofollow">
Consider a very small collection C that consists in the following three documents:
d1: "red green rainbow"
d2: "red green blue"
d3: "yellow rainbow"
For all the documents, calculate the $t f$ scores for all the terms in C. Assume that the words in the vectors are ordered alphabetically. Ignore idf values and normalization by maximum frequency.

Given the following query: "blue green rainbow", calculate the $t f$ vector for the query, and compute the score of each document in C relative to this query, using the cosine similarity measure. (Don't forget to compute the lengths of the vectors).

What is the final order in which the documents are presented as result to the query?

## Part C

## [4 marks]

Assume that you are given a query vector $\mathrm{q}=(2,0,3,1,0)$, three documents identified as relevant by a user: $\mathrm{d} 1, \mathrm{~d} 2, \mathrm{~d} 3$, and two irrelevant documents: $\mathrm{d} 4, \mathrm{~d} 5$.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{d} 1=(3,1,2,1,0) & \mathrm{d} 4=(1,3,0,1,2) \\
\mathrm{d} 2=(4,1,3,2,2) & \mathrm{d} 5=(0,4,0,2,2) \\
\mathrm{d} 3=(1,0,5,0,3) &
\end{array}
$$

Compute the modified query, using the Ide regular method. Remember that the Ide regular method is given by the formula:

$$
\vec{q}_{m}=\alpha \vec{q}+\beta \sum_{\forall \vec{d}_{j} \in D_{r}} \vec{d}_{j}-\gamma \sum_{\forall \vec{d}_{j} \in D_{n}} \vec{d}_{j}
$$

where $D r$ is the set of the known relevant and $D n$ is the set of irrelevant documents. Use equal weight for the original query, the relevant documents, and the irrelevant ones, $\alpha=\beta=\gamma=1$.

| q' |  |
| :--- | :--- |

Given a query $q$, where the relevant documents are d1, d3, d6, d7, d10, d12, d13 an IR system retrieves the following ranking: $\mathrm{d} 2, \mathrm{~d} 6, \mathrm{~d} 5, \mathrm{~d} 8, \mathrm{~d} 3, \mathrm{~d} 12, \mathrm{~d} 11, \mathrm{~d} 14, \mathrm{~d} 7, \mathrm{~d} 13$.

1. What are the precision and recall for this ranking at each retrieved document?

|  | Recall | Precision |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| d2 |  |  |
| d 6 |  |  |
| d 5 |  |  |
| d 8 |  |  |
| d 3 |  |  |
| d 12 |  |  |
| d 11 |  |  |
| d 14 |  |  |
| d 7 |  |  |
| d 13 |  |  |

2. Interpolate the precision scores at 11 recall levels.

Remember that the interpolated precision at the $j$-th standard recall level is the maximum known precision at any recall level between the $j$-th and $(j+1)$-th level: $P\left(r_{j}\right)=\max _{r_{j} \leq r \leq r_{j+1}} P(r)$

| Recall | Interpolated Precision |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0 \%$ |  |
| $10 \%$ |  |
| $20 \%$ |  |
| $30 \%$ |  |
| $40 \%$ |  |
| $50 \%$ |  |
| $60 \%$ |  |
| $70 \%$ |  |
| $80 \%$ |  |
| $90 \%$ |  |
| $100 \%$ |  |

3. Why is interpolation of precision scores necessary when evaluating an IR system?
$\square$
4. What is the value of the R -precision? (the precision at first $R$ retrieved documents where $R$ is the total number of relevant documents)

| R-Precision |  |
| :--- | :--- |

5. Assume we have two users that judged the documents before the search. The first user knew before the search that $\mathrm{d} 3, \mathrm{~d} 6, \mathrm{~d} 7, \mathrm{~d} 10$, are relevant to the query, and the second user knew that d1, d3, d12 are relevant to the query, what is the coverage ratio and the novelty ratio for these two users? (Remember that the coverage ratio is the proportion of relevant items retrieved out of the total relevant documents known to a user prior to the search. The novelty ratio is the proportion of retrieved items, judged relevant by the user, of which they were previously unaware.)

|  | Coverage ratio | Novelty ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| User 1 |  |  |
| User 2 |  |  |

Consider the following web pages and the set of web pages they link to:
Page A points to pages $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$, and D .
Page $B$ points to pages A and C.
Page $C$ points to page $D$.
Page D points to page A.
E. 1. Run the Hubs and Authorities algorithms on this subgraph of pages. Show the authority and hub scores for each page for two iterations. Present the results in the order A,B,C,D,E. To simplify the calculation, do not normalize the scores.

Remember that the Hubs and Authorities algorithms can be described in pseudo-code as:
Initialize for all $p \in S: a_{p}=h_{p}=1$
For $\mathrm{i}=1$ to No_iterations:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { For all } p \in S: & a_{p}=\sum_{q: q \rightarrow p} h_{q} & \text { (update authority scores) } \\
\text { For all } p \in S: & h_{p}=\sum_{q: p \rightarrow q} a_{q} & \text { (update hub scores) }
\end{array}
$$

E.2. For the same graph, run the PageRank algorithm for three iterations.

Remember that one way to describe the algorithm is:
$\mathbf{P R}(A)=(1-d)+\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{P R}(T 1) / \mathbf{C}(T 1)+\ldots+$ PR(Tn)/C(Tn))
where $\mathrm{T} 1 \ldots \mathrm{Tn}$ are the pages that point to a page A (the incoming links), d is damping factor (usually $\mathrm{d}=0.85$, you can consider it 1 for simplicity), $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{A})$ is number of links going out of a page A and PR(A) is the PageRank of a page A. NOTE: the sum of all pages' PageRank is 1 (but you can ignore the normalization step for simplicity).

