

# Completely-Arbitrary Passage Retrieval in Language Modeling Approach

<http://kle.postech.ac.kr>

January 16, 2008

Seung-Hoon Na, In-Su Kang, Ye-Ha Lee, Jong-Hyeok Lee

**Knowledge and Language Engineering Lab.  
Dept. of Computer Science & Engineering  
Pohang University of Science and Technology, KOREA**



# Why Passage-Based Retrieval? <sup>(1)</sup>

## ❖ Motivation: Multi-topics in a Document

- ◆ Documents are diversely distributed in lengths and topics
- ➔ Relevant snippet is very short, while document is long



*Relevant snippet*

## ❖ Traditional Document Retrieval


- ◆ Multi-topical documents tend to have long-length
  - ➔ They are penalized by length-normalization scheme
- ◆ E.g.) Pivoted length normalization
  - [Singhal. et. al., Robertson and Walker]
    - $\text{Norm-Length} = s + (1-s) / \text{avg}l$  (s is about 0.25)
    - ➔ Penalizing long-length document

# Why Passage-Based Retrieval ? (2)

## ❖ Passage-Based Retrieval

### ◆ Passage-level evidence

- Passage-level matching , rather than document-level matching



### ◆ Advantages


- Passages's lengths & # topics are more uniformly distributed than document's ones
- ➔ Fair score calculation, without suffering different lengths & different # topics of document

# Passage-Based Retrieval: Best-Matching Strategy

## ❖ Passage-level Evidence: Best Relevant Passage

$$Score_{Passg}(Q, D) = \max_{P \in SP(D)} Score(Q, P)$$

- ◆  $SP(D)$  is the pre-defined set of all possible passages in  $D$
- ◆  $Score(Q, P)$ : Retrieval model



### Passage Identification Problem:

*How we define  $SP(D)$ ? ... What type of passage is adequate for passage-based retrieval?*

# ***Previous Passage Types <sub>(1)</sub> : Semantic Passage***

## **❖ Previous Passage Types**

- ◆ Semantic passage, fixed window passage, arbitrary-length passage etc.


## **❖ Semantic Passage**

- ◆ Semantically related passage in a document
  - Linguistically, pragmatically related passage, by using structure of document E.g.) Paragraph, section, etc.
- ◆ Automatic subtopic segmentation [Hearst, 93]
  - Motivation: Documents are not written by uniform style
  - Traditional approach for topic segmentation
    - Based on content overlapping b/w previous sentences and current sentences

## Previous Passage Types <sup>(2)</sup> : Window Passage

### ❖ Fixed-Length Window Passage [Callan, SIGIR' 94]

- ◆ Break document into half-overlapping windows
- ◆ Each window becomes passage
- ◆ Passage's length is fixed to  $W$




- ◆ Characteristics
  - ➔ More query-relevant passage than semantic passage
  - ➔ No segmentation overhead: Does not require additional topic segmentation or text analysis modules

## Previous Passage Types <sup>(3)</sup> : Fixed-Length Arbitrary Passage

### ❖ Fixed-Length **Arbitrary** Passage [Kaszkiel, '01]

- ◆ Half-overlapping window  $\rightarrow W-1$  overlapping window
- ◆ Passage's length is fixed to  $W$




$\rightarrow$  More query-relevant passage than fixed-window passage

# Previous Passage Types <sup>(4)</sup>: Variable Length Arbitrary Passage

## ❖ Variable-Length **Arbitrary** Passage [Kaszkiel, 01]

- ◆ Passage's length is not fixed to  $W$ , but allow to be variable by taking to one of predefined sets of lengths
- ◆ Kaszkiel's length set:  $\{50, 100, \dots 500, 550, 600\}$ 
  - Generally,  $\mathcal{L}(W) = \{k * W\}$   
( $W$ : unit passage length,  $k$ : natural num)



# *Kaszkiel's Empirical Observation [Kaszkiel, 01]*

## ❖ **Results**

- ◆ Work: Comparison with window passage & arbitrary passage
- ◆ **Effectiveness:** Variable-length arbitrary passage > Fixed-length arbitrary passage > Fixed-length window passage

## ❖ **Lessons**

- ◆ As a passage is **more query-relevant**, the retrieval performance becomes better
- ➔ Passage shouldn't be pre-fixed by lengths or starting positions
- ➔ Passage's length should be query-dependently determined
- ➔ **Variable-length arbitrary passage could be more relaxed by eliminating length restriction !**

# Our Proposal: Completely-Arbitrary Passage

## ❖ Completely-Arbitrary Passage

- ◆ No any restrictions on lengths and positions
- ◆ Eliminating the remaining restriction of passage lengths by unit passage length in variable-length arbitrary passage
- ◆ Definition of passage
  - Any possible subsequent words in a document
  - e.g.) Even single-term passage can be possible
    - consisting of only single term



document


$\{1\}\{1\}\{1\}$        $\{1\}\{1\}\{1\}$   
 $\{2\}\{2\}$        $\{3\}\{3\}$   
 $\{2\}\{2\}$        $\{3\}\{3\}$

**L**: # terms in document  
 **$2^L - 1$** : Total # of passage

# Completely-Arbitrary Passage: Advantage

## ❖ Bring Proximity Effects

- ◆ Extremely short-length passage can be ranked
  - → Well-reflect proximity
- ◆ However, Kaszkiel's passage cannot well-reflect the proximity
  - Due to its length restriction of passage
    - (Passages consists of at least 50 words)



# Efficiency Issue: Finding the Best Completely-Arbitrary Passage

## ❖ Finding the Best Passage

- ◆ Passage-level evidence

$$Score_{Passg}(Q, D) = \max_{P \in \text{CompPassg}(D)} Score(Q, P)$$

- $\text{CompPassg}(D)$ : The set of completely-arbitrary passages in  $D$

## ❖ Problem

- ◆ # completely-arbitrary passages: exponentially increasing function over document's length
  - $|\text{CompPassg}(D)|: 2^L - 1$  (L: document's length)
  - ➔ Direct comparison of all passages's scores is intractable !



We use **Cover-set ranking**, instead of direct ranking

# Cover-Set Ranking (1)

## ❖ Definition of Cover

- ◆ Cover: Special passage such that all terms at boundary passage are query terms

■ ■ : Query terms



# Cover-Set Ranking (2)

## ❖ Theorem

- ◆ Let  $\text{score}(Q,P)$  be length-normalized function
  - Length-normalized function: Okapi's BM25, Pivoted vector space model, language modeling approaches (two popular smoothing)
- ◆ Then, ***"The best relevant passage among completely-arbitrary passages is always cover"***

## ❖ Finding the Best Passage = Cover Set Ranking

- ➔ Rank only covers, not all completely-arbitrary passages
- ➔ # covers:  $2^{c(Q,D)} - 1$ 
  - ➔ Much less-than  $2^{\text{Len}(D)} - 1$
- ➔ Thus, time complexity can be significantly reduced

## *Experimental Setting* (1)

### ❖ Test Collection: Six TREC English Test Collections

<i>Coll.</i>	<i>Docs</i>	<i>AvgLen</i>	<i># Terms</i>	<i># Topics</i>
TREC4-AP	158,240	156.61	268,232	49
TREC7	528,155	154.99	970,977	50
TREC8				50
WT2G	247,491	254.99	2,585,383	50
TREC9	1,692,096	165.16	13,018,003	50
TREC10				50

## **Experimental Setting (2)**

### **❖ Retrieval Method: Language Modeling Approach**

#### **◆ Document-Level Evidence**

- $Score(Q,D)$ : Dirichlet-Prior Smoothing  $\mu$

#### **◆ Passage-Level Evidence**

- $Score(Q,P)$ : Jelinek-Mercer Smoothing  $\lambda$

### **❖ Passage-Based Retrieval**

#### **◆ Linear interpolation of document-level and passage-level evidence**

- Score of document  $D$

$$- (1 - \alpha) Score(Q,D) + \alpha Score(Q,P)$$

### **❖ Parameter Tuning**

#### **◆ First determine $\mu$ (document's smoothing)**

#### **◆ Then, $\lambda$ (passage's smoothing) and interpolation parameter $\alpha$**

# Experimentation 1: Effectiveness across Query-Dependency of Passage <sup>(1)</sup>


## ❖ Experimental Goal

- ◆ How does show passage-based retrieval different effectiveness, as one control query-dependency of a passage?


## ❖ Query-dependency of a Passage

- ◆ Can be controlled by **unit passage length  $W$** 
  - Set of possible passage's lengths:  $\mathcal{L}(W) = \{k * W\}$
- ◆  $\mathcal{L}(1)$  : Completely-arbitrary passage
- ◆  $\mathcal{L}(50)$  : Kaszkiel's variable length arbitrary passage


As  $\mathcal{L}(W)$  is larger, more relevant passage to query can be selected



# Experimentation 1: Effectiveness across Query-Dependency of Passage <sub>(2)</sub> : Title Field



# Experimentation 1: Effectiveness across Query-Dependency of Passage <sub>(2)</sub> : Description Field



# Comparison with Tao's Proximity-based Approach<sub>(1)</sub>

## ❖ Tao's Proximity Approach [Tao, SIGIR '07]

- ◆ Use minimum distance b/w query terms in document

$$\delta(Q, D) = \min_{q_1, q_2 \in Q \cap D, q_1 \neq q_2} \{Dis(q_1, q_2; D)\}$$

∴  $\delta(Q, D)$ : the minimum of cover lengths in document D

- ◆ Heuristic proximity function

- $\pi(Q, D) = \log(\alpha + \exp(-\delta(Q, D)))$

- ➔ Independent to retrieval models

- ◆ Score of document D


- $Score(Q, D) + \pi(Q, D)$  ← Tao's original proposal

- $(1-\beta) Score(Q, D) + \beta \pi(Q, D)$  ← Formula used for our test

- ◆ Parameter search:  $\beta \in 15$  values among (0.01 ~ 0.99)

- $\alpha \in 30$  values among (0.01 ~ 3.0)

# Experimentation 2: Comparison with Tao's Proximity-based Approach<sub>(2)</sub> : Title Field



# Comparison with Tao's Proximity-based Approach<sub>(3)</sub> : Title Field

↑ : Significant improve. (at 95%)  
 ¶ : Significant improve. (at 99%)

*Improvement*




Collection	Baseline	Tao's Proximity	Kaszkiel's Arbitrary Passage	Completely-Arbitrary Passage		
<b>TREC7</b>	0.1786	<b>0.1871</b>	0.1821	<b>0.1924 ¶</b>		✓
<b>TREC8</b>	0.2480	<b>0.2506↑</b>	0.2507	<b>0.2541↑</b>		✓
<b>WT2G</b>	0.3101	<b>0.3165</b>	0.3251 ¶	<b>0.3480 ¶</b>	✓	✓
<b>WT10G</b>	0.1965	<b>0.2013¶</b>	0.1951	<b>0.2110 ¶</b>	✓	✓
<b>TREC10</b>	0.1946	<b>0.1965</b>	0.1973	<b>0.2017</b>		

Significant improvement over **Tao's proximity** , or **Kaszkiel's passage**?

- ◆ Sometimes Tao's proximity fails to significantly improve baseline, while completely-arbitrary passage is successful

# Comparison with Tao's Proximity-based Approach<sub>(4)</sub> : Description Field



# Comparison with Tao's Proximity-based Approach<sub>(5)</sub>: Description Field

Clearly, Significant Improvement !!!

## ❖ Description Query



Collection	Baseline	Tao's Proximity	Kaszkiel's Arbitrary Passage	Completely-Arbitrary Passage		
<b>TREC4-AP</b>	0.2560	<b>0.2624</b> ↑	0.2573	<b>0.2706</b> ↑		✓
<b>TREC7</b>	0.1791	<b>0.1833</b>	0.1851¶	<b>0.1960</b> ↑	✓	✓
<b>TREC8</b>	0.2294	<b>0.2301</b>	0.2374	<b>0.2404</b>	✓	✓
<b>WT2G</b>	0.2854	<b>0.2888</b> ¶	0.3062¶	<b>0.3282</b> ¶	✓	✓
<b>TREC9</b>	0.1955	<b>0.1975</b>	0.2263↑	<b>0.2462</b> ¶	✓	✓
<b>TREC10</b>	0.1866	<b>0.1873</b>	0.1967	<b>0.2008</b> ¶	✓	

- ◆ Tao's method does not work well
  - ← it does not reflect query term importance

Significant improvement over Tao's proximity, & Kaszkiel's passage ?

# Conclusion <sup>(1)</sup>

## ❖ Proposal Idea

- ◆ Completely-arbitrary passage
  - Extremely increase degree of query-dependence, by allowing all subsequence words as candidate passage
    - Passage with single term is possible
- ◆ Cover-Set Ranking
  - Effectively implementation for applying completely-arbitrary passage

## ❖ Experimental Result

- ◆ Better than existing state-of-art methods such as
  - Tao's proximity and Kaszkiel's arbitrary passage, especially for verbose type of query

# **Conclusion <sub>(2)</sub>: Remaining Works**

## **❖ Extension**

- ◆ Retrieval model: Apply our passage type to Okapi's BM25
- ◆ Passage-level feedback
  - Some results will be presented in poster session at this conference
- ◆ Applying Asian test collections (NTCIR)

## **❖ Efficient Approximation Method**

- ◆ Develop a more efficient approximation for ranking completely-arbitrary passage

## **❖ Towards Multiple Passage ?**

- ◆ Use top N passages, than the best passage
  - But, our preliminary experimentation does not show good results

**Thank you for listening !**

# Experimentation 1: Effectiveness across Query-Dependency of Passage <sub>(2)</sub> : Result

## ❖ Title Field (keyword query)

↑: Significant improve. (at 95%)  
¶: Significant improve. (at 99%)

<i>Coll.</i>	<i>Base</i>	<i>W=1</i>	<i>W=3</i>	<i>W=5</i>	<i>W=10</i>	<i>W=50</i>
<b>TREC7</b>	0.1786	<b>0.1924</b> ↑	0.1899	0.1874	0.1855	<b>0.1821</b>
<b>TREC8</b>	0.2480	<b>0.2541</b> ↑	0.2525	0.2517	0.2516	<b>0.2507</b>
<b>WT2G</b>	0.3101	<b>0.3480</b> ¶	0.3449¶	0.3387¶	0.3342↑	<b>0.3251</b> ¶
<b>TREC9</b>	0.1965	<b>0.2110</b> ¶	0.2082¶	0.2069↑	0.2042	<b>0.1951</b>
<b>TREC10</b>	0.1946	<b>0.2017</b> ↑	0.2012	0.2003	0.1980	<b>0.1973</b>

↓  
**Completely-Arbitrary  
Passage**

↓  
**Kaszkiel's Arbitrary  
Passage**

# Experimentation 1: Effectiveness across Query-Dependency of Passage <sub>(3)</sub> : Result

## ❖ Description Field (Shot verbose query)

<i>Coll.</i>	<i>Base</i>	<i>W=1</i>	<i>W=3</i>	<i>W=5</i>	<i>W=10</i>	<i>W=50</i>
<b>TREC4-AP</b>	0.2560	<b>0.2706</b> ↑	0.2680↑	0.2672¶	0.2647↑	<b>0.2573</b>
<b>TREC7</b>	0.1791	<b>0.1960</b> ↑	0.1930	0.1895	0.1877	<b>0.1851</b>
<b>TREC8</b>	0.2294	<b>0.2404</b>	0.2409	0.2411	0.2401	<b>0.2374</b>
<b>WT2G</b>	0.2854	<b>0.3282</b> ¶	0.3257	0.3236	0.3170	<b>0.3062</b>
<b>TREC9</b>	0.1955	<b>0.2462</b> ¶	0.2436¶	0.2443¶	0.2397¶	<b>0.2263</b> ↑
<b>TREC10</b>	0.1866	<b>0.2008</b> ¶	0.2005	0.2033	0.1999	<b>0.1967</b>

- ◆ Overall, as  $\mathcal{L}(W)$  is larger, passage-based retrieval is better  
→ **Completely-arbitrary passage** > **Variable-length arbitrary passage**