

# Improving Term Frequency Normalization for Multi-Topical Documents, and Application to Language Modeling Approaches

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

April, 2008

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

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



# Introduction

## ❖ Highly-Performed Retrieval Models

### ◆ Combination of **TF** and IDF

- E.g.) Pivoted vector space model, probabilistic retrieval model, language modeling approaches (Approximately)

## ❖ Term-Frequency

### ◆ Naïve absolute term frequency: Not reasonable!

- Retrieval function will prefer long-length documents to short documents
- Why?
  - Researchers have identified two evidences

# ***Absolute TF: Prefer Long-Length Documents***

## **❖ Properties of Long-Length Documents**

### **◆ High term frequency (Verbosity)**

- The same term repeatedly occurs in a long-length document

The term frequency factors may be large for long documents

### **◆ More terms (Multi-topicality)**

- Long-length document has large size of vocabulary

Increasing the number of matches between a query and a long document



Enlarging the chances of retrieval of long documents in preference over shorter documents

# Term Frequency Normalization

## ❖ Vector-Space Model

- ◆ Max-TF, Cosine Normalization, etc.

## ❖ Length Normalization: Most Popular

- ◆ **Simple length-normalization** [Robertson, 94] (Okapi <BM25)

$$tfn(w; D) = tf(w; D) / len(D)$$

- ◆ **Pivoted length normalization** [Singhal, 96] (PVSM5)

- To avoid over-penalization of long-length documents


$$norm'(D) = (1 - s) + s \frac{len(D)}{avgl}$$

- Reflected to Okapi BM25 formula

# Does Length Normalization Well Works?

## Representation of Long-Length Documents:

Point in Space of Verbosity (y-axis) and Multi-Topicality (x-axis)



# Does Length Normalization Well Works?: Example

$D_2$  is **verbose document**, twice concatenation of  $D_1$

$D_1$ : Language Modeling Approach

$D_2$ : Language Modeling Approach  
Language Modeling Approach

Q: Language Modeling Approach

*Reasonable retrieval function  
should be ...*

Contents of  $D_1$  =  
Contents of  $D_2$

$$\therefore \text{Score}(Q, D_2) = \text{Score}(Q, D_1)$$

Method	Score func.	Preference
<b>Absolute TF</b>	<b>tf(w,D)</b>	<b>D2 &gt; D1</b>
<b>Normalized TF</b>	<b>tf(w,D)/len(D)</b>	<b>D2 = D1</b>

**Violate**  
**OK !**

$D_3$  is **multi-topical document**, describing a broad topic – “information retrieval model”, including “language modeling approaches” as a subtopic

$D_1$ : Language Modeling Approach

$D_3$ : Information Retrieval Model  
Language Modeling Approach

Q: Language Modeling Approach

Reasonable retrieval function should be ...

Relevant part of  $D_1$  =  
Relevant part of  $D_3$

$$\therefore \text{Score}(Q, D_3) = \text{Score}(Q, D_1)$$

Method	Score func.	Preference
Absolute TF	$\text{tf}(w, D)$	$D_3 = D_1$
Normalized TF	$\text{tf}(w, D) / \text{len}(D)$	$D_3 < D_1$

OK

Violate

# Does Previous Normalization Well Works?


- ❖ Previous Length Normalization does not Satisfy Both Constraints !

Method	Verbose document	Multi-topical document
<i>Absolute TF</i>	<b>Violate</b>	<b>OK</b>
<i>Normalized TF</i>	<b>OK</b>	<b>Violate</b>
<i>Pivoted Normalization</i>	<b>OK</b>	<b>Violate</b>

**Pivoted normalization** also does not free from this violation due to its length-normalization method

$$tfn(w; D) = tf(w; D) / (s \text{ avgl} + (1-s) \text{ len}(D))$$

$$tfn(w; D) = tf(w; D) / \text{len}(D)$$



***Our Attack:*** Multi-topical documents shouldn't be penalized in the same way for verbose documents

# ***Our Proposal: New Constraints for Term Frequency Normalization***

- ❖ **Reasonable Term Frequency Normalization should satisfy ...**
  - ◆ VNC (**Verbosity Normalization Constraint**)
    - Normalize for verbose documents!
  - ◆ TNC (**Topicality Normalization Constraint**)
    - Do not normalize for multi-topical documents!

# *Our Work*

- ❖ **Formal Study on Language Modeling Approaches in View of VNC and TNC**

**Formalization** of VNC and TNC



**Analysis of Language Modeling Approaches (LM):**  
Two Popular Smoothing Methods



**Improving LM** such that supports better VNC & TNC

# K-Verbosity and N-Topicality

**K-Verbosity:**  $\underline{D_2}$  has K-Verbosity to  $\underline{D_1}$  ( $D_2$  is K-verbose to  $D_1$ )  
 $\leftrightarrow D_2$  is K-times concatenation of  $D_1$



## Formal Definition

$$\tau(D_1) = \tau(D_2) \ \&$$

$$tf(w; D_2) = K \ tf(w; D_1) \ \forall w \in D_1$$

$\tau(D)$

Measurement for calculating the number of topics of  $D$

$tf(w; D)$

Term frequency of  $w$  in  $D$

$len(D)$


Length of  $D$

**N-Topicality:**  $\underline{D_2}$  has N-Topicality to  $\underline{D_1}$  ( $D_2$  is N-topical to  $D_1$ )  
 $\leftrightarrow D_1$  is exactly embedded to  $D_2$

## Formal Definition

$$\tau(D_2) = N\tau(D_1) \ \&$$

$$N \frac{tf(w; D_2)}{len(D_2)} = \frac{tf(w; D_1)}{len(D_1)} \ \forall w \in D_1$$



# Verbosity Normalization Constraint & Topicality Normalization Constraint

## Verbosity Normalization Constraint (VNC):

Apply Length Normalization for Verbose Documents

*If  $D_2$  is K-verbose to  $D_1$ , then  $score(Q, D_1) = score(Q, D_2)$*

$score(Q, D)$

A similarity function between a document  $D$  and a query  $Q$

## Topicality Normalization Constraint (TNC):

Do Not Apply Length Normalization for Multi-Topical Documents

*If  $D_2$  is N-topical to  $D_1$ , then  $score(Q, D_1) = score(Q, D_2)$*

# Analysis of Language Modeling Approaches

## Jelinek-Mercer Smoothing (JM)

$$\text{Score}(Q, D) = \sum_{w \in Q} \log \left( \frac{1 - \lambda}{\lambda} \frac{P(w | \hat{\theta}_D)}{P(w | \theta_C)} + 1 \right)$$

✓ **JM satisfies VNC:** Suppose that  $D_2$  is  $K$ -verbose to  $D_1$ . Then, MLEs of two document models are the same, resulting in the same scores

✓ **JM does not satisfy TNC:** JM prefers normal documents to multi-topical documents, regardless of our definition of topicality measurement  $\tau$

## Dirichlet-Prior Smoothing (Dir)

$$\text{Score}(Q, D) = \sum_{w \in Q} \log \left( (1 - \lambda_D) \frac{P(w | \hat{\theta}_D)}{P(w | \theta_C)} + \lambda_D \right)$$

$$\lambda_D = \frac{\mu}{\text{len}(D) + \mu}$$

✓ **Dir doesn't satisfy VNC**

- For a topical query term, Dir prefer verbose docs
- For a non-topical query terms, Dir prefer normal docs

✓ **Dir doesn't satisfy TNC, but can conditionally satisfy it**


Different from JM, Dir prefers  $D_3$  to  $D_1$  or  $D_3$  to  $D_1$  in case-by-case

# Modification of Language Modeling Approaches

## ❖ Basic Idea: Pseudo-Document Sample

Calculating generative probability of query  $Q$  from model of **pseudo-document sample**, not from model of original document sample

$$Score(Q, D) \leftarrow Score(Q, Pseudo(D))$$



## ❖ Pseudo Document Sample

- ◆ Passage corresponding to query-relevant topic (JM)
- ◆ Document-length independent sample (Dir)
  - An imaginary concept, which is not really constructed at real time.

# Modification of Jelinek-Mercer Smoothing<sup>(1)</sup>

## ❖ Pseudo document

- ◆ Corresponding to query-relevant passage
  - Length is in proportion to  $\text{len}(D)/\tau(D)$ 
    - Divided by # topics in  $D$
  - $\text{tf}(w, \text{Pseudo}(D))$  for query term  $w$ :  $\text{tf}(w, D)$ 
    - Since  $\text{Pseudo}(D)$  is maximally relevant part in  $D$
- ◆ Thus,

$$P(w | \text{Pseudo}(D)) \propto \frac{\text{tf}(w; D)}{\text{len}(D) / \tau(D)} = \frac{\tau(D) \text{tf}(w; D)}{\text{len}(D)}$$

# Modification of Jelinek-Mercer Smoothing<sup>(2)</sup>

$$P(w | Pseudo(D)) = K \frac{\tau(D) tf(w; D)}{len(D)} = K\tau(D)P(w | D)$$



Applying standard Jelinek-Mercer smoothing: Introducing  $\lambda_0$

$$Score(Q, D) = \sum_{w \in Q} \log \left( \frac{(1 - \lambda_0) K \tau(D) P(w | \hat{\theta}_D)}{\lambda_0 P(w | \theta_C)} + 1 \right)$$



Select  $\lambda$  such that  $(1 - \lambda_0)K : \lambda_0 = (1 - \lambda) : \lambda$   
※ Roughly assume that  $K$  is determined depending on document  $D$

$$Score(Q, D) = \sum_{w \in Q} \log \left( \frac{(1 - \lambda) \tau(D) P(w | \hat{\theta}_D)}{\lambda P(w | \theta_C)} + 1 \right)$$

# Modification of Dirichlet-Prior Smoothing<sup>(1)</sup>

❖ **Our goal: Modifying Dir such that satisfies VNC**

❖ **Note:**

- ◆ Only the change of the length makes different models, since the smoothed model -  $P(w/D)$  – depends on the document length.

❖  **$\omega(D)$ : Average verbosity of document D**

- ◆ Defined as  $len(D)/\tau(D)$

❖ **Pseudo-Document**

- ◆ MLE of pseudo doc is in proportion to MLE of original doc
- ◆ But, using **compressed length**: Length is divided by average verbosity of  $D$

➤ *Length of Pseudo Document :=  $len(D)/\omega(D)$*

# Modification of Dirichlet-Prior Smoothing<sup>(2)</sup>

## ❖ Term Frequency of Pseudo Document

$$tf(w; Pseudo(D)) = tf(w; D) / \omega(D)$$

Definition of  $\omega(D)$

Standard Dirichlet-Prior smoothing: using  $\mu$

$$P(w | Pseudo(D)) = \frac{\tau(D)}{\tau(D) + \mu} P(w | D) + \frac{\mu}{\tau(D) + \mu} P(w | C)$$

*No longer that document-specific smoothing parameter is dependent to  $len(D)$*

**Can satisfy VNC !**

# VNC & TNC: Modified Language Modeling Approaches

Notations: **JMV**, **JMV2** ( $\leftarrow$ JM), **DirV**( $\leftarrow$ Dir)

<i>Constr.</i>	<i>VNC</i>	<i>TNC</i>
JM	Yes	No
Dir	No	Cond
<b>JMV, JMV2</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>DirV</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Cond</b>

※ **JMV2**: Further Refinement of JMV to Provide Reliable Parameter Sensitivity for Verbose Type of Queries

- ❖ **Modified versions (JMV, JMV2, DirV) satisfy VNC & TNC better, than previous versions !**
  - ◆ JMV additionally satisfy TNC !
  - ◆ DirV additionally satisfy VNC !

# Topic Measurement: $\tau(D)$

## ❖ Vocabulary Size $v(D) = |D|$

- ◆ The number of unique terms in a given document
- ◆ But, it cannot discriminate the mainly topical terms from the causally-occurred terms

## ❖ Information Quantity (Our Choice): Entropy-driven

$$\epsilon(D) = \exp\left(-\sum_w P(w|D) \log P(w|D)\right)$$

$P(w|\underline{D})$ : MLE of document  $D$

- ◆ Vocabulary size is upper bound of information quantity

$$1 \leq \epsilon(D) \leq v(D) = |D|$$

## ❖ Preliminary Experimental Results

- ◆ Information quantity is slightly better than vocabulary size !

# Experimental Setting

## ❖ Test Collection: Five TREC English Test Collections

<i>Coll.</i>	<i>Docs</i>	<i>AvgLen</i>	<i># Terms</i>	<i># Topics</i>
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

## ❖ Query Topics: Three Types

- ◆ SK(Title), SV(Desc.), LV(Title+Desc.+Narr. )


## ❖ Comparison of Best Performances

- ◆ Select the best smoothing parameter for each collection
  - $\mu \in \{100, 500, 1000, 1500, \dots, 30000\}$
  - $\lambda \in \{0.01, 0.03, \dots, 0.97, 0.99\}$

# Experimental Results: Short Keyword (SK)

❖ **MAP**

0.3500  
0.3000  
0.2500  
0.2000  
0.1500  
0.1000  
0.0500  
0.0000



**DirV & JMV2 slightly improves Dir for SK**

# Detailed Results: Short Keyword (SK)

Significant improvement over Dir  
(↑: 95%, ¶: 99%)

## ❖ MAP & Pr@10


Coll.	MAP			Pr@10		
	Dir	DirV	JMV2	Dir	DirV	JMV2
TREC7	0.1786	0.1835	0.1825	0.3980	<b>0.4180</b> ↑	0.4100
TREC8	0.2481	0.2492	<b>0.2505</b> ↑	0.4460	<b>0.4740</b> ↑	<b>0.4700</b> ↑
WT2G	0.3101	0.3125	<b>0.3278</b> ¶	0.4660	0.4840	0.4920
TREC9	0.2038	0.2040	0.2068	0.2560	0.2780	0.2780
TREC10	0.1950	<b>0.2049</b> ↑	0.2091	0.3060	0.3300	0.3300

- ◆ MAP: DirV and JMV2 significantly improves Dir only for test collections – TREC8, WT2G, TREC10
- ◆ Pr@10: Producing large performance increase in number
  - Significant only for TREC7, TREC8

# Experimental Results: Short Verbose (SV)

❖ **MAP**

0.3500  
0.3000  
0.2500  
0.2000  
0.1500  
0.1000  
0.0500  
0.0000



**DirV & JMV2 significantly improves Dir**

# Detailed Results: Short Verbose (SV)

Significant improvement over Dir  
(↑: 95%, ¶: 99%)


## ❖ MAP & Pr@10

<i>Coll.</i>	<i>MAP</i>			<i>Pr@10</i>		
	<i>Dir</i>	<i>DirV</i>	<i>JMV2</i>	<i>Dir</i>	<i>DirV</i>	<i>JMV2</i>
<b>TREC7</b>	0.1790	<b>0.1967¶</b>	<b>0.1926↑</b>	0.4120	<b>0.4420</b>	0.4440
<b>TREC8</b>	0.2294	<b>0.2393¶</b>	<b>0.2354↑</b>	0.4120	<b>0.4380</b>	0.4400
<b>WT2G</b>	0.2854	<b>0.3103¶</b>	<b>0.3112¶</b>	0.4220	<b>0.4840↑</b>	<b>0.4900¶</b>
<b>TREC9</b>	0.1990	<b>0.2336¶</b>	<b>0.2245¶</b>	0.2860	<b>0.3260¶</b>	<b>0.3160↑</b>
<b>TREC10</b>	0.1865	0.2248	<b>0.2133↑</b>	0.3500	<b>0.3820</b>	0.3700

- ◆ MAP: DirV and JMV2 significantly improvement over Dir
  - **TREC7, TREC8, WT2G, TREC9, TREC10**
- ◆ Pr@10: Performance difference is large in number
  - Significant improvement for WT2G, TREC9

# Experimental Results: Long Verbose (LV)

❖ MAP



# Detailed Results: Long Verbose (LV)

Significant improvement over Dir  
(↑: 95%, ¶: 99%)


## ❖ MAP & Pr@10

Coll.	MAP			Pr@10		
	Dir	DirV	JMV2	Dir	DirV	JMV2
TREC7	0.2209	<b>0.2348¶</b>	0.2250	0.4420	<b>0.4720↑</b>	<b>0.4800↑</b>
TREC8	0.2598	<b>0.2621¶</b>	0.2500	0.4660	0.4780	0.4480
WT2G	0.2863	<b>0.3267¶</b>	0.3263¶	0.4240	<b>0.4800¶</b>	<b>0.4820¶</b>
TREC9	0.2468	<b>0.2581¶</b>	0.2494	0.3160	<b>0.3540¶</b>	0.3220
TREC10	0.2347	<b>0.2640</b>	0.2555	0.4040	0.4340	0.4340

- ◆ MAP: DirV significantly improve Dir
  - TREC7, TREC8, WT2G, TREC9  
(But, JMV2 is significant for WT2G)
- ◆ Pr@10: Performance difference is large in number  
→ **DirV is clearly improved method over Dir**

# Performance Curve: Short Verbose


❖ WT2G



*Optimal parameters for JMV, JMV2 are always found b/w 0.7 and 0.95 for all collections and all types of queries !*

# Performance Curve: Short Verbose

❖ TREC9  
(WT10G)



# Summary of Result<sup>(1)</sup>

## ❖ **New Term Frequency Normalization**

- ◆ Attack previous term frequency normalization
  - Multi-topical documents should be differently handled
- ◆ Formalizing two constraints for term frequency normalization
  - VNC, TNC

## ❖ **Analysis of Language Modeling Approaches**

- ◆ JM & Dir do not satisfy VNC & TNC well
  - JM satisfies only VNC, & Dir does not satisfy even VNC

## ❖ **Modifying Smoothing Methods**

- ◆ **JMV, JMV2, DirV**: Satisfy VNC or TNC better than JM or Dir

## Summary of Result<sup>(2)</sup>

### ❖ Experimental Result: Remarkable!

- ◆ JMV2 and DirV can significantly improve the baseline (Dir), especially for verbose type of queries !!

### ❖ Significance of Our Result

- ◆ **Dir**: regarded as the state-of-the art method in language modeling approaches
  - **Dir's strange low-performance over verbose queries**
    - Dir is unreasonably less-performed for Verbose query than keyword query, in the same query topic
- ◆ **JMV2 & DirV**: Successful for verbose type of queries !
  - ➔ Resolving Dir's strange low-performance in term frequency normal

**Thank you for listening !**

# Comparison with Fang's Constraints [Fang, SIGIR'04]


- ❖ **Fang's Constraints for TF: TF-LNC, LNC1 and LNC2**
  - ◆ LNC2 is highly relevant to VNC

## Length Normalization Constraint (LNC2) [Fang, 04]

Let  $q$  be a query.

If  $\forall k > 1, |d_1| = k \cdot |d_2|$  and  $c(w, d_1) = k \cdot c(w, d_2)$

then  $f(d_1, q) \geq f(d_2, q)$



33

- ◆ Fang's motivation of LNC2
  - To avoid over-penalizing long documents
- ◆ VNC is a more specific constraint than LNC2
  - VNC  $\rightarrow$  LNC2, not vice versa.
- ◆ TNC is a new constraint which is not connected to Fang's any constraints (LNC1, LNC2, TF-LNC, etc.)

# Caution! Our Pre-assumption on Constraint for Multi-Topical Document

$$\therefore \text{Score}(Q, D_3) = \text{Score}(Q, D_1)$$

- ◆ Here, someone may argue
  - Partially relevant documents should be lower-ranked than fully relevant ones: i.e.)  $\text{Score}(Q, D_3) < \text{Score}(Q, D_1)$  !!!

*We think*

This viewpoint may be correct only if document retrieval is final goal

## ❖ Generalized Viewpoint on Document Retrieval

Document retrieval **is not a ultimate goal but a fundamental (basic) component** for intelligent retrieval system  
E.g.) Q/A, and opinion retrieval

Post-processing **will eliminate irrelevant contents from retrieved partially-relevant documents** E.g.) Summarizing, relevance feedback

*Thus, partially relevant documents are equivalently important to fully relevant ones*

# ***Conclusion : Remaining Works***

## **❖ Extension**

- ◆ Modify Okapi or PVSM such that support VNC or TNC better

## **❖ Deriving Fully Axiomatic Approach**

- ◆ Inspired by Fang's work

## **❖ Empirical Verification on Partial-Relevance**

- ◆ By examining distribution of Relevance Judgment in TREC
  - How many partially relevant docs are really marked by S, A ?  
(among four decision type of S, A, B and C)