

Relevance Models

Berlin Chen 2005

References:

1. W. B. Croft and J. Lafferty (Editors). *Language Modeling for Information Retrieval*. Chapter 2, July 2003
2. V. Lavrenko and W.B. Croft, "Relevance-Based Language Models" ACM SIGIR 2001

Introduction

- Probabilistic Models (e.g., Robertson and Sparck Jones, 1976)
 - Ranking docs by the odds of their being observed in the relevant class

$$SIM(Q, D) \approx \frac{P(D|R_Q)}{P(D|\bar{R}_Q)}$$

- Explicitly model the class/concept of relevance
- Language Modeling Approaches
 - View documents themselves as models and queries as strings of text (observations) randomly sampled from these models

$$SIM(Q, D) \approx P(Q|D) \approx \prod_{q_n \in Q} P(q_n|D) \quad \text{bag-of-words assumption}$$

- E.g., as the HMM, TMM, PLSA, mentioned previously
 - Quite several probability estimation techniques were proposed

Relevance Models (RM)

- A convergence of ideas from classical probabilistic approaches and language modeling approaches
 - Explicit model the class R of relevant documents
 - Describe **unigram** generative models for a set of text samples(in the relevant class” $P(w|R)$
 - Documents are randomly drawn from such a class

RM: Ranking Approaches

- Probability Ratio (given that $D = d_1 \cdots d_n$)

$$\frac{P(D|R)}{P(D|N)} = \frac{P(d_1 \cdots d_n | R)}{P(d_1 \cdots d_n | N)} \approx \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n P(d_i | R)}{\prod_{i=1}^n P(d_i | N)} \approx \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n P(d_i | R)}{\prod_{i=1}^n P(d_i | C)}$$

- Higher score is better (more relevant)

- R : the relevant class

- N : the non-relevant class

- C : the document collection or corpus

($|R|$ is small $\Rightarrow |N| \approx |C|$, all measured in terms of word number)


- $P(d_i | R)$ or $P(w | R)$ can be estimated from a set of training examples or from the query alone (a focus of much active research)

(Inspired by the probability ranking principle)

RM: Ranking Approaches (cont.)

- Cross-Entropy

$$P(R \| D) = - \sum_{w \in V} P(w | R) \log P(w | D)$$

 vocabulary

- Lower score (≥ 0) is better (more relevant)

- The negation of this ranking approach is equivalent to “query-likelihood” language-modeling approach (a special case of the cross-entropy approach itself ?)

- Suppose $P(w | R)$ is the relative frequency of w in the query Q

- $$P(R \| D) \approx \sum_{w \in V} P(w | Q) \log P(w | D) = \sum_{w \in V} \frac{C(w, Q)}{|Q|} \log P(w | D)$$
$$= \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{w \in V} \log P(w | D)^{C(w, Q)} = \frac{1}{|Q|} \log \prod_{w \in V} P(w | D)^{C(w, Q)}$$
$$= \frac{1}{|Q|} \log P(Q | D)$$

RM: Estimation from a Set of Examples

- Given that we have perfect knowledge of the entire relevant class R

$$\begin{aligned} P(w|R) &= \sum_{D \in \text{Collection}} P(w, D|R) \\ &= \sum_{D \in \text{Collection}} \frac{P(w|D, R)P(D|R)}{\text{conditional independence assumption}} \\ &= \sum_{D \in \text{Collection}} \frac{P(w|D)P(D|R)}{\text{conditional independence assumption}} \\ &= \sum_{D \in \text{Collection}} P_{ML}(w|D)P(D|R) \end{aligned}$$

– Where

$$P_{ML}(w|D) = \frac{C(w, D)}{|D|} \quad P(D|R) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|R|} & \text{if } D \in R \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

no. of documents in R

RM: Estimation from a Set of Examples (cont.)

- Probability smoothing by simple interpolation

$$P_{smooth}(w|D) = \lambda_D P_{ML}(w|D) + (1 - \lambda_D)P(w)$$

where

$$P(w) = \sum_{D \in C} P_{ML}(w|D) \cdot \frac{1}{|C|}$$

no. of documents in the collection

- Which is also equivalent to adjust document posterior probability

$$P_{smooth}(D|R) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1 - \lambda_D)}{|C|} + \frac{\lambda_D}{|R|} & \text{if } D \in R \\ \frac{(1 - \lambda_D)}{|C|} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$