Web Searching & Indexing

CPS 116
Introduction to Database Systems

Announcements
- Homework #4 due on Thursday (Dec. 2)
- Homework #3 graded
  - Available for pick up in my office tomorrow
- Course project demo signup begins tomorrow via email
- Final exam on Friday, Dec. 10
  - More info and a brief review this Thursday

Keyword search

Google…
Web | Images | Groups | Directory
Google Search | I'm Feeling Lucky | Advanced Search | Preferences | Language

Association for Computing Machinery
Founded in 1947, ACM is the world's first educational and scientific computing society. Today, our members…

CPS 216: Advanced Database Systems (Fall 2001)
Course Information / Time and Place / Books / Resources: Staff…

The Internet Movie Database (IMDb)…
… Search the Internet Movie Database. For more search options, please visit Search central…

database AND search

What are the documents containing both "database" and "search"?

Keywords × documents

Inverted lists
- Store the matrix by rows
- For each keyword, store an inverted list
  - (keyword, doc-id-list)
  - ("database", {3, 7, 142, 857, …})
  - ("search", {3, 9, 192, 512, …})
- It helps to sort doc-id-list (why?)
- Vocabulary index on keywords
  - B*-tree or hash-based
- How large is an inverted list index?

Using inverted lists
- Documents containing "database"
  - Use the vocabulary index to find the inverted list for "database"
  - Return documents in the inverted list
- Documents containing "database" AND "search"
  - Return documents in the intersection of the two inverted lists
- OR? NOT?
  - Union and difference, respectively
What are “all” the keywords?

- All sequences of letters (up to a given length)?
- ... that actually appear in documents!
- All words in English?
- Plus all phrases?
- Alternative: approximate phrase search by proximity
- Minus all stop words
- They appear in nearly every document, e.g., a, of, the, it
- Not useful in search
- Combine words with common stems
- Example: database, databases
- They can be treated as the same for the purpose of search

Frequency and proximity

- Frequency
  - \( \left\{ \text{keyword}, \left\{ \langle \text{doc-id}, \text{number-of-occurrences} \rangle, \langle \text{doc-id}, \text{number-of-occurrences} \rangle, \ldots \right\} \right\} \)
- Proximity (and frequency)
  - \( \left\{ \text{keyword}, \left\{ \langle \text{doc-id}, \text{position-of-occurrence} \rangle, \langle \text{doc-id}, \text{position-of-occurrence} \rangle, \ldots \right\} \right\} \)
- When doing AND, check for positions that are near

Signature files

- Store the matrix by columns and compress them
- For each document, store a \( w \)-bit signature
- Each word is hashed into a \( w \)-bit value, with only \( s \) < \( w \) bits turned on
- Signature is computed by taking the bit-wise OR of the hash values of all words on the document

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hash}(\text{database}) &= 0110 \\
\text{hash}(\text{dog}) &= 1100 \\
\text{hash}(\text{cat}) &= 0010
\end{align*}
\]

\( \text{doc}_1 \text{ contains } \text{database} \) = 0110
\( \text{doc}_2 \text{ contains } \text{dog} \) = 1100
\( \text{doc}_3 \text{ contains } \text{cat} \text{ and } \text{dog} \) = 1110

- Some false positives; no false negatives

Bit-sliced signature files

- Motivation
  - To check if a document contains a word, we only need to check the bits that are set in the word’s hash value
  - So why bother retrieving all \( w \) bits of the signature?
  - Instead of storing \( n \) signature files, store \( w \) bit slices
  - Only check the slices that correspond to the set bits in the word’s hash value
  - Start from the sparse slices

- Starting to look like an inverted list again!

Inverted lists versus signatures

- Inverted lists better for most purposes (TODS, 1998)
- Problems of signature files
  - False positives
  - Hard to use because \( s, w \) and the hash function need tuning to work well
  - Long documents will likely have mostly 1’s in signatures
  - Common words will create mostly 1’s for their slices
  - Difficult to extend with features such as frequency, proximity
- Saving grace of signature files
  - Sizes are tunable
  - Good for lots of search terms
  - Good for computing similarity of documents

Ranking result pages

- A single search may return many pages
  - A user will not look at all result pages
  - Complete result may be unnecessary
- Result pages need to be ranked
- Possible ranking criteria
  - Based on content
    - Number of occurrences of the search terms
    - Similarity to the query text
  - Based on link structure
    - Backlink count
    - PageRank
  - And more…
Textual similarity

- Vocabulary: \([w_1, \ldots, w_n]\)
- IDF (Inverse Document Frequency): \([f_1, \ldots, f_m]\)
  - \(f_i = 1 / \text{the number of times } w_i \text{ appears on the Web}\)
- Significance of words on page \(p\): \([p_1 f_1, \ldots, p_n f_m]\)
  - \(p_i\) is the number of times \(w_i\) appears on \(p\)
- Textual similarity between two pages \(p\) and \(q\) is defined to be
  \[
  p_1 f_1 + \ldots + p_n f_m = q_1 r_1^2 + \ldots + q_n r_n^2
  \]
  - \(q\) could be the query text

Why weight significance by IDF?

- Without IDF weighting, the similarity measure would be dominated by the stop words
- “the” occurs frequently on the Web, so its occurrence on a particular page should be considered less significant
- “engine” occurs infrequently on the Web, so its occurrence on a particular page should be considered more significant

Problems with content-based ranking

- Many pages containing search terms may be of poor quality or irrelevant
  - Example: a page with just a line “search engine”
- Many high-quality or relevant pages do not even contain the search terms
  - Example: Google homepage
- Page containing more occurrences of the search terms are ranked higher; spamming is easy
  - Example: a page with line “search engine” repeated many times

Backlink

- A page with more backlinks is ranked higher
- Intuition: Each backlink is a “vote” for the page’s importance
- Based on local link structure; still easy to spam
  - Create lots of pages that point to a particular page

Google’s PageRank

- Main idea: Pages pointed by high-ranking pages are ranked higher
  - Definition is recursive by design
  - Based on global link structure; hard to spam
- Naïve PageRank
  - \(N(p)\): number of outgoing links from page \(p\)
  - \(B(p)\): set of pages that point to \(p\)
  - \(\text{PageRank}(p) = \sum_{q \in B(p)} \frac{\text{PageRank}(q)}{N(q)}\)
  - Each page \(p\) gets a boost of its importance from each page that points to \(p\)
  - Each page \(q\) evenly distributes its importance to all pages that \(q\) points to

Calculating naïve PageRank

- Initially, set all PageRank’s to 1; then evaluate
  \(\text{PageRank}(p) \leftarrow \sum_{q \in B(p)} \frac{\text{PageRank}(q)}{N(q)}\)
  repeatedly until the values converge (i.e. a fixed point is reached)
Random surfer model

- A random surfer
  - Starts with a random page
  - Randomly selects a link on the page to visit next
  - Never uses the “back” button

- PageRank(p) measures the probability that a random surfer visits page p

Problems with the naïve PageRank

- Dead end: a page with no outgoing links
  - A dead end causes all importance to “leak” eventually out of the Web
- Spider trap: a group of pages with no links out of the group
  - A spider trap will eventually accumulate all importance of the Web

Practical PageRank

- d: decay factor
- PageRank(p) =
  \[ d \cdot \sum_{q \in B(p)} \left( \frac{\text{PageRank}(q)}{N(q)} \right) + (1 - d) \]

- Intuition in the random surfer model
  - A surfer occasionally gets bored and jumps to a random page on the Web instead of following a random link on the current page

Google (1998)

- Inverted lists in practice contain a lot of context information
  - Type-weight: depends on the type of the occurrence
    - For example, large font weights more than small font
  - Count-weight: depends on the number of occurrences
    - Increases linearly first but then tapers off
  - For multiple search terms, nearby occurrences are matched together and a proximity measure is computed
    - Closer proximity weights more

Trie: a string index

- A tree with edges labeled by characters
- A node represents the string obtained by concatenating all characters along the path from the root

- Compact trie: replace a path without branches by a single edge labeled by a string

Suffix tree

Index all suffixes of a large string in a compact trie
  - Can support arbitrary substring matching
  - Internal nodes have fan-out ≥ 2 (except the root)
  - No two edges out of the same node can share the same first character

To get linear space
  - Instead of inlining the string labels, store pointers to them in the original string
  - Bad for external memory
Patricia trie, Pat tree, String B-tree

A Patricia trie is just like a compact trie, but
- Instead of labeling each edge by a string, only label by the first character and the string length
- Leaves point to strings
  - Faster search (especially for external memory) because of inlining of the first character
  - But must validate answer at leaves for skipped characters
- A Pat tree indexes all suffixes of a string in a Patricia trie
- A String B-tree uses a Patricia trie to store and compare strings in B-tree nodes

Summary

- General tree-based string indexing tricks
  - Trie, Patricia trie, String B-tree
- Two general ways to index for substring queries
  - Index words: inverted lists, signature files
  - Index all suffixes: suffix tree, Pat tree, suffix array (not covered)
- Web search and information retrieval go beyond substring queries
  - IDF, PageRank, …