

# TF-IDF and Okapi BM25

LM, session 3

# Binary Independence Models

In Bayesian classification, we rank documents by their **likelihood ratios** calculated from some probabilistic model.

The model predicts the features that a relevant or non-relevant document is likely to have.

Our first model is a unigram language model, which independently estimates the probability of each term appearing in a relevant or non-relevant document.

Any model like this, based on independent binary features  $f_i \in F$ , is called a **binary independence model**.

$$\frac{P(D|R = 1)}{P(D|R = 0)}$$

**Likelihood Ratio**

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{|F|} P(f_i|R = 1)}{\prod_{i=1}^{|F|} P(f_i|R = 0)}$$

**Binary independence Model**

# Ranking with B.I. Models

Simplifying the binary independence model leads to a ranking score which allows us to ignore terms not found in the document. This is important for efficient queries.

Let  $p_i := P(f_i | R = 1)$ ,  $q_i := P(f_i | R = 0)$ ,

$d_i \in \{0, 1\} :=$  value of  $f_i$  in doc  $D$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } \frac{P(D|R=1)}{P(D|R=0)} &= \prod_{i:d_i=1} \frac{p_i}{q_i} \cdot \prod_{i:d_i=0} \frac{1-p_i}{1-q_i} \quad \xrightarrow{=1} \\ &= \prod_{i:d_i=1} \frac{p_i}{q_i} \cdot \left( \prod_{i:d_i=1} \frac{1-q_i}{1-p_i} \cdot \prod_{i:d_i=1} \frac{1-p_i}{1-q_i} \right) \cdot \prod_{i:d_i=0} \frac{1-p_i}{1-q_i} \\ &= \prod_{i:d_i=1} \frac{p_i(1-q_i)}{q_i(1-p_i)} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{|F|} \frac{1-p_i}{1-q_i} \\ &\stackrel{\text{rank}}{=} \prod_{i:d_i=1} \frac{p_i(1-q_i)}{q_i(1-p_i)} \stackrel{\text{rank}}{=} \sum_{i:d_i=1} \log \frac{p_i(1-q_i)}{q_i(1-p_i)} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{Ranking Score}} \end{aligned}$$

# Relationship to IDF

Under certain assumptions, the ranking score is just IDF:

1. All words have a fixed uniform probability of appearing in a relevant document:  $p_i = 1/2$ .
2. Most documents containing the term are non-relevant, so  $q_i \approx df_i/D$ .
3. Most documents do not contain the term, so  $D - df_i \approx D$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \frac{p_i(1 - q_i)}{q_i(1 - p_i)} && \text{Ranking Score,} \\ & \approx \log \frac{0.5(1 - \frac{df_i}{D})}{\frac{df_i}{D}(1 - 0.5)} && \text{approximated using assumptions,} \\ & = \log \frac{1 - \frac{df_i}{D}}{\frac{df_i}{D}} \\ & = \log \frac{D}{df_i} - \frac{df_i \cdot D}{df_i \cdot D} \\ & = \log \frac{D - df_i}{df_i} \\ & \approx \log \frac{D}{df_i} && \text{becomes IDF} \end{aligned}$$

# Improving on IDF

It turns out that we can do better than IDF. To get there, we'll start by considering the contingency table of all combinations of  $d_i$  and  $R$ .

	$R = 1$	$R = 0$	Total
$d_i = 1$	$r_i$	$df_i - r_i$	$df_i$
$d_i = 0$	$R - r_i$	$D - R - df_i + r_i$	$D - df_i$
Total	$R$	$D - R$	$D$

We will estimate  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  using this table and a technique called “add- $\alpha$  smoothing,” with  $\alpha=0.5$ .

$$p_i = \frac{r_i + 0.5}{R + 1}; q_i = \frac{df_i - r_i + 0.5}{D - R + 1}$$

This leads to a slightly different ranking score:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i:d_i=1} \log \frac{p_i(1 - q_i)}{q_i(1 - p_i)} &= \sum_{i:d_i=1} \log \frac{(\text{num}(d_i = 1, R = 1) + 0.5) / (\text{num}(d_i = 0, R = 1) + 0.5)}{(\text{num}(d_i = 1, R = 0) + 0.5) / (\text{num}(d_i = 0, R = 0) + 0.5)} \\ &= \sum_{i:d_i=1} \log \frac{(r_i + 0.5) / (R - r_i + 0.5)}{(df_i - r_i + 0.5) / (D - R - df_i + r_i + 0.5)} \end{aligned}$$

# Is it better?

Let's unpack this formula to understand it better.

The numerator is a ratio of counts of relevant documents the term does and does not appear in. It's a likelihood ratio giving the amount of "evidence of relevance" the term provides.

The denominator is the same ratio, for non-relevant documents. It gives the amount of "evidence of non-relevance" for the term.

If the term is in many documents, *but most of them are relevant*, it doesn't discount the term as IDF would.

$$\log \frac{(r_i + 0.5) / (R - r_i + 0.5)}{(df_i - r_i + 0.5) / (D - R - df_i + r_i + 0.5)}$$

**A better IDF?**

# Okapi BM25

Okapi BM25 is one of the strongest “simple” scoring functions, and has proven a useful baseline for experiments and feature for ranking.

It combines:

- The IDF-like ranking score from the last slide,
- the document term frequency  $tf_{i,d}$ , normalized by the ratio of the document’s length  $dl$  to the average length  $avg(dl)$ , and
- the query term frequency  $tf_{i,q}$ .

$$\sum_{i:d_i=q_i=1} \left[ \log \left( \frac{(r_i + 0.5)/(R - r_i + 0.5)}{(df_i - r_i + 0.5)/(D - R - df_i + r_i + 0.5)} \right) \cdot \frac{tf_{i,d} + k_1 \cdot tf_{i,d}}{tf_{i,d} + k_1 \left( (1 - b) + b \cdot \frac{dl}{avg(dl)} \right)} \cdot \frac{tf_{i,q} + k_2 \cdot tf_{i,q}}{tf_{i,q} + k_2} \right]$$

**Okapi BM25**

$k_1$ ,  $k_2$ , and  $b$  are empirically-set parameters. Typical values at TREC are:

$$k_1 = 1.2$$

$$0 \leq k_2 \leq 1000$$

$$b = 0.75$$

# Example: BM25

Example query: “president lincoln”

- $tf_{president,q} = tf_{lincoln,q} = 1$
- No relevance information:  $R = r_i = 0$
- “president” is in 40,000 documents in the collection:  $df_{president} = 40,000$
- “lincoln” is in 300 documents in the collection:  $df_{lincoln} = 300$
- The document length is 90% of the average length:  $dl/avg(dl) = 0.9$
- We pick  $k_1 = 1.2$ ,  $k_2 = 100$ ,  $b = 0.75$

$tf_{president,d}$	$tf_{lincoln,d}$	BM25
15	25	20.66
15	1	12.74
15	0	5.00
1	25	18.2
0	25	15.66

**The low df term plays a bigger role.**

# Wrapping Up

---

Binary Independence Models are a principled, general way to combine evidence from many binary features (not just unigrams!)

The version of BM25 shown here is one of many in a family of scoring functions. Modern alternatives can take additional evidence, such as anchor text, into account.

Next, we'll generalize what we've learned so far into the fundamental topics of machine learning.