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Ranking linked data

• Links are inserted by humans.

• They are one of the most valuable judgments of a page’s importance.

• A link is inserted to denote an association. The anchor text describes the type of association.
The Web as a directed graph

Assumption 1: A hyperlink between pages denotes author perceived relevance (quality signal)

Assumption 2: The anchor of the hyperlink describes the target page (textual context)
Anchor text

• When indexing a document $D$, include anchor text from links pointing to $D$. 

Armonk, NY-based computer giant IBM announced today
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Big Blue today announced record profits for the quarter
Indexing anchor text

- Can sometimes have unexpected side effects - e.g., evil empire.

- Can boost anchor text with weight depending on the authority of the anchor page’s website
  - E.g., if we were to assume that content from cnn.com or yahoo.com is authoritative, then trust the anchor text from them
Citation analysis

• Citation frequency

• Co-citation coupling frequency
  • Co-citations with a given author measures “impact”
  • Co-citation analysis [Mcca90]

• Bibliographic coupling frequency
  • Articles that co-cite the same articles are related

• Citation indexing
  • Who is author cited by? [Garf72]

• PageRank preview: Pinsker and Narin ’60s
Incoming and outgoing links

- The popularity of a page is related to the number of incoming links
  - Positively popular
  - Negatively popular

- The popularity of a page is related to the popularity of pages pointing to them
Query-independent ordering

• First generation: using link counts as simple measures of popularity.

• Two basic suggestions:
  • Undirected popularity:
    • Each page gets a score = the number of in-links plus the number of out-links (3+2=5).
  • Directed popularity:
    • Score of a page = number of its in-links (3).
PageRank scoring

• Imagine a browser doing a random walk on web pages:
  • Start at a random page
  • At each step, go out of the current page along one of the links on that page, equiprobably

  ![Diagram of a page with links](image)
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• “In the steady state” each page has a long-term visit rate - use this as the page’s score.
Not quite enough

• The web is full of dead-ends.
  • Random walk can get stuck in dead-ends.
  • Makes no sense to talk about long-term visit rates.
Teleporting

• At a dead end, jump to a random web page.

• At any non-dead end, with probability 10%, jump to a random web page.
  • With remaining probability (90%), go out on a random link.
  • 10% - a parameter.

• Result of teleporting:
  • Now cannot get stuck locally.
  • There is a long-term rate at which any page is visited.
  • How do we compute this visit rate?
The random surfer

• The PageRank of a page is the probability that a given random “Web surfer” is currently visiting that page.

- A: 0.59
- B: 0.32
- C: 0.40

• This probability is related to the incoming links and to a certain degree of browsing randomness (e.g. reaching a page through a search engine).
Markov chains

• A Markov chain consists of $n$ states, plus an $n \times n$ transition probability matrix $P$.

• At each step, we are in exactly one of the states.

• For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, the matrix entry $P_{ij}$ tells us the probability of $j$ being the next state, given we are currently in state $i$. 

![Diagram of Markov chain transition](chart)

\[ P_{ij} \]
Transitions probability matrix

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P_{ab}</td>
<td>P_{ac}</td>
<td>P_{ad}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>P_{ba}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P_{cb}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P_{cd}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>P_{db}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Ergodic Markov chains

• A Markov chain is **ergodic** if

  • you have a path from any state to any other

  • For any start state, after a finite transient time $T_0$, the probability of being in any state at a fixed time $T > T_0$ is nonzero.

Not ergodic (even/odd).
Ergodic Markov chains

• For any ergodic Markov chain, there is a unique long-term visit rate for each state.
  • Steady-state probability distribution.

• Over a long time-period, we visit each state in proportion to this rate.

• It doesn’t matter where we start.

The PageRank of Web page $i$ corresponds to the probability of being at page $i$ after an infinite random walk across all pages (i.e., the stationary distribution).
PageRank

• The rank of a page is related to the number of incoming links of that page and the rank of the pages linking to it.

\[ PR(A) = (1 - d) + d \cdot \left[ \frac{PR(B)}{OL(B)} + \frac{PR(C)}{OL(C)} \right] \]
PageRank: formalization

- The RandomSurfer model assumes that the pages with more inlinks are visited more often.

\[
p_i = (1 - d) + d \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \frac{L_{ij}}{c_j} \right) p_j
\]

where \( L_{ij} \) is the link matrix, \( c_j \) is the number of links of page, and \( p_j \) is the PageRank of that page.
Transitions probability matrix

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & B & C & D \\
\hline
A & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
B & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
C & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
D & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & B & C & D \\
\hline
A & 0 & P_{ab} & P_{ac} & P_{ad} \\
B & P_{ba} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
C & 0 & 0 & P_{cc} & P_{cd} \\
D & 0 & P_{db} & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]
Example

- Consider three Web pages:

\[
p_i = (1 - d) + d \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left( \frac{L_{ij}}{c_j} \right) p_j
\]

- The transition matrix \( \frac{L_{ij}}{c_j} \) is:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0.5 & 0.5 \\
1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
PageRank: issues and variants

• How realistic is the random surfer model?
  • What if we modeled the back button? [Fagi00]
  • Surfer behavior sharply skewed towards short paths [Hube98]
  • Search engines, bookmarks & directories make jumps non-random.

• Biased Surfer Models
  • Weight edge traversal probabilities based on match with topic/query (non-uniform edge selection)
  • Bias jumps to pages on topic (e.g., based on personal bookmarks & categories of interest)
Topic Specific Pagerank [Have02]

• Conceptually, we use a random surfer who teleports, with ~10% probability, using the following rule:
  • Selects a category (say, one of the 16 top level categories) based on a query & user-specific distribution over the categories
  • Teleport to a page uniformly at random within the chosen category

• Sounds hard to implement: can’t compute PageRank at query time!
Query classification

Query category = 90% sports + 10% health
Topic Specific PageRank - Implementation

- **offline**: Compute pagerank distributions wrt individual categories
  - Query independent model as before
  - Each page has multiple pagerank scores – one for each category, with teleportation only to that category

- **online**: Distribution of weights over categories computed by query context classification
  - Generate a dynamic pagerank score for each page - weighted sum of category-specific pageranks
Example

• Consider a query on a given set of Web pages with the following graph:

• The query has 90% probability of being about Sports.
• The query has 10% probability of being about Health.
Non-uniform Teleportation

Sports teleportation

Health teleportation
Interpretation

\[ pr = (0.9 \text{ PR}_{\text{sports}} + 0.1 \text{ PR}_{\text{health}}) \] gives you:
90% sports teleportation, 10% health teleportation
Hyperlink-Induced Topic Search (HITS) - Klei98

• In response to a query, instead of an ordered list of pages each meeting the query, find two sets of inter-related pages:
  • *Hub pages* are good lists of links on a subject.
    • e.g., “Bob’s list of cancer-related links.”
  • *Authority pages* occur recurrently on good hubs for the subject.

• Best suited for “broad topic” queries rather than for page-finding queries.

• Gets at a broader slice of common *opinion*. 
The hope

Long distance telephone companies
High-level scheme

• Extract from the web a base set of pages that could be good hubs or authorities.

• From these, identify a small set of top hub and authority pages;
  • iterative algorithm.
Base set and root set

• Given text query (say browser), use a text index to get all pages containing browser.
  • Call this the root set of pages.

• Add in any page that either
  • points to a page in the root set, or
  • is pointed to by a page in the root set.

• Call this the base set.
Distilling hubs and authorities

• Compute, for each page $x$ in the base set, a **hub score** $h(x)$ and an **authority score** $a(x)$.

• Initialize: for all $x$, $h(x) \leftarrow 1$; $a(x) \leftarrow 1$;

• Iteratively update all $h(x)$, $a(x)$;

• After iterations
  • output pages with highest $h()$ scores as top hubs
  • highest $a()$ scores as top authorities.
Iterative update

• Repeat the following updates, for all $x$:

\[
a(x) \leftarrow \sum_{y \rightarrow x} h(y)
\]

\[
h(x) \leftarrow \sum_{x \rightarrow y} a(y)
\]
How many iterations?

• Claim: relative values of scores will converge after a few iterations:
  • in fact, suitably scaled, h() and a() scores settle into a steady state!

• We only require the relative orders of the h() and a() scores - not their absolute values.

• In practice, ~5 iterations get you close to stability.
Summary

• Global relevance of an edge in a graph

• Link directions are important

• A few iterations should be enough (you just want to compute the rank of pages, not the absolute value of relevance)

• There are other way to distinguish the type of relevance