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Training Data Sets

• Data Collections
  – Billions of documents
  – Thousands of queries

• Ideal, in theory; infeasible, in practice...
  – Extract features from all query-document pairs
  – Judge each document with respect to each query
    • Extensive human effort
  – Train over all query-document pairs
Training Data Sets

• Train the ranking function over a subset of the complete collection

• Few queries with many document judged vs. many queries with few documents judged
  – Better to train over many queries with few judged documents [Yilmaz and Robertson ’09]

• How should we select document?
Training Data Sets

• Machine Learning (Active Learning)
  – Iterative process
  – Tightly coupled with the learning algorithm

• IR Evaluation
  – Many test collections already available
  – Efficient and effective techniques to construct test collections
    • Intelligent way of selecting documents
    • Inferences of effectiveness metrics
Duality between LTR and Evaluation

- This work: Explore duality between Evaluation and Learning-to-Rank
  - Employ techniques used for efficient and effective test collection construction to construct training collections
Duality between LTR and Evaluation

• Can test collection construction methodologies be used to construct training collections?

• If yes, which one of these methodologies is better?

• What makes a training set better than the other?
Methodology

• Depth-100 pool (as the complete collection)

• Select subsets of documents from the depth-100 pool
  – Using different document selection methodologies

• Train over the different training sets
  – Using a number of learning-to-rank algorithms

• Test the performance of the resulting ranking functions
  – Five fold cross validation
Data Sets

• Data from TREC 6, 7 and 8
  – Document corpus: TREC Discs 4 and 5
  – Queries: 150 queries; ad-hoc tracks
  – Relevance judgments: depth-100 pools

• Features from each query-document pair
  – 22 features; subset of LETOR features
    (BM25, Language Models, TF-IDF, ...)
Document Selection Methodologies

• Select subsets of documents
  – Subset size varying from 6% to 60%

1. Depth-k pooling

2. InfAP (uniform random sampling)
3. StatAP (stratified random sampling)
4. MTC (greedy on-line algorithm)

5. LETOR (top-k by BM25; current practice)
6. Hedge (greedy on-line algorithm)
Document Selection Methodologies

- **Precision**: fraction of selected documents that are relevant
- **Discrepancy**: symmetrized KL divergence between documents’ language models
LTR Algorithms

• Train over the different data sets

1. Regression (classification error)
2. Ranking SVM (AUC)
3. RankBoost (pairwise preferences)
4. RankNet (probability of correct order)
5. LambdaRank (nDCG)
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Observations (1)

• Some Learning-to-Rank algorithms are robust to document selection methodologies
  – LambdaRank vs. RankBoost
Observations (2)

• Near-optimal performance with 1%-2% of complete collection (depth-100 pool)
  – No significant differences at greater % (t-test)
  – Number of features matter [Taylor et.al ‘06]
Observations (3)

- Selection methodology matters
  - Hedge (worst performance)
  - Depth-k pooling and statAP (best performance)
  - LETOR-like (neither most efficient nor most effective)
Relative Importance on Effectiveness

• Learning-to-Rank algorithm vs. document selection methodology
  – 2-way ANOVA model

• Variance decomposition over all data sets
  – 26% due to document selection
  – 31% due to LTR algorithm

• Variance decomposition (small data sets, <10%)
  – 44% due to document selection
  – 31% due to LTR algorithm
What makes one training set better than another?

• Different methods have different properties
  – Precision
  – Recall
  – Similarities between relevant documents
  – Similarities between relevant and non-relevant documents
  – ...

• Model selection
What makes one training set better than another?

• Different methods have different properties
  – Precision
  – Recall
  – Similarities between relevant documents
  – Similarities between relevant and non-relevant documents
  – ...

• Model selection
  – Linear model (adjusted $R^2 = 0.99$)
What makes one training set better than another?
What makes one training set better than another?
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Conclusions

• Some LTR algorithms are robust to document selection methodologies

• For those not, selection methodology matters
  – Depth-k pooling, stratified sampling

• Harmful to select too many relevant docs
• Harmful to select relevant and non-relevant docs that are too similar