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## Type/token distinction

- Token - an instance of a word or term occurring in a document
- Type - an equivalence class of tokens
- In June, the dog likes to chase the cat in the barn.
- 12 word tokens, 9 word types


## Problems in tokenization

- What are the delimiters? Space? Apostrophe? Hyphen?
- For each of these: sometimes they delimit, sometimes they don't.
- No whitespace in many languages! (e.g., Chinese)
- No whitespace in Dutch, German, Swedish compounds (Lebensversicherungsgesellschaftsangestellter)


## Problems with equivalence classing

- A term is an equivalence class of tokens.
- How do we define equivalence classes?
- Numbers (3/20/91 vs. 20/3/91)
- Case folding
- Stemming, Porter stemmer
- Morphological analysis: inflectional vs. derivational
- Equivalence classing problems in other languages
- More complex morphology than in English
- Finnish: a single verb may have 12,000 different forms
- Accents, umlauts


## Positional indexes

－Postings lists in a nonpositional index：each posting is just a docID
－Postings lists in a positional index：each posting is a docID and a list of positions
－Example query：＂to $\mathrm{l}_{1} \mathrm{be}_{2}$ or $_{3}$ not $_{4}$ to $0_{5} \mathrm{be}_{6}$＂
то，993427：
$\langle 1:\langle 7,18,33,72,86,231\rangle ;$
2：$\langle 1,17,74,222,255\rangle$ ；
4：$\langle 8,16,190,429,433\rangle$ ；
5：$\langle 363,367\rangle$ ；
7：$\langle 13,23,191\rangle ; \ldots\rangle$
BE， 178239 ：
〈 1：〈17，25〉；
4：$\langle 17,191,291,430,434\rangle$ ；
5：$\langle 14,19,101\rangle ; \ldots\rangle$
Document 4 is a match！

## Positional indexes

- With a positional index, we can answer phrase queries.
- With a positional index, we can answer proximity queries.


## Take-away

- Tolerant retrieval: What to do if there is no exact match between query term and document term
- Wildcard queries
- Spelling correction
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## Inverted index

For each term $t$, we store a list of all documents that contain $t$.

| BRUTUS |
| :---: | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 31 | 45 | 173 | 174 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| CAESAR |
| :---: | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 57 | 132 | $\ldots$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| CALPURNIA |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | 31 | 54 | 101 |

postings

## Dictionaries

- The dictionary is the data structure for storing the term vocabulary.
- Term vocabulary: the data
- Dictionary: the data structure for storing the term vocabulary


## Dictionary as array of fixed-width entries

- For each term, we need to store a couple of items:
- document frequency
- pointer to postings list
- ...
- Assume for the time being that we can store this information in a fixed-length entry.
- Assume that we store these entries in an array.


## Dictionary as array of fixed-width entries

| term | document <br> frequency | pointer to <br> postings list |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | a | 656,265 | $\longrightarrow$ |
| aachen | 65 | $\longrightarrow$ |  |
| $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ |  |
| mulu | 221 | $\longrightarrow$ |  |
|  | 20 bytes | 4 bytes | 4 bytes |

How do we look up a query term $q_{i}$ in this array at query time? That is: which data structure do we use to locate the entry (row) in the array where $q_{i}$ is stored?

## Data structures for looking up term

- Two main classes of data structures: hashes and trees
- Some IR systems use hashes, some use trees.
- Criteria for when to use hashes vs. trees:
- Is there a fixed number of terms or will it keep growing?
- What are the relative frequencies with which various keys will be accessed?
- How many terms are we likely to have?


## Hashes

- Each vocabulary term is hashed into an integer.
- Try to avoid collisions
- At query time, do the following: hash query term, resolve collisions, locate entry in fixed-width array
- Pros: Lookup in a hash is faster than lookup in a tree.
- Lookup time is constant.
- Cons
- no way to find minor variants (resume vs. résumé)
- no prefix search (all terms starting with automat)
- need to rehash everything periodically if vocabulary keeps growing


## Trees

- Trees solve the prefix problem (find all terms starting with automat).
- Simplest tree: binary tree
- Search is slightly slower than in hashes: $O(\log M)$, where $M$ is the size of the vocabulary.
- $O(\log M)$ only holds for balanced trees.
- Rebalancing binary trees is expensive.
- B-trees mitigate the rebalancing problem.
- B-tree definition: every internal node has a number of children in the interval $[a, b]$ where $a, b$ are appropriate positive integers, e.g., $[2,4]$.

Binary tree


B-tree
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## Wildcard queries

- mon*: find all docs containing any term beginning with mon
- Easy with B-tree dictionary: retrieve all terms $t$ in the range: mon $\leq t<$ moo
- *mon: find all docs containing any term ending with mon
- Maintain an additional tree for terms backwards
- Then retrieve all terms $t$ in the range: nom $\leq t<$ non
- Result: A set of terms that are matches for wildcard query
- Then retrieve documents that contain any of these terms


## How to handle ${ }^{*}$ in the middle of a term

- Example: m*nchen
- We could look up m* and *nchen in the B-tree and intersect the two term sets.
- Expensive
- Alternative: permuterm index
- Basic idea: Rotate every wildcard query, so that the * occurs at the end.
- Store each of these rotations in the dictionary, say, in a B-tree


## Permuterm index

- For term HELLO: add hello\$, ello\$h, llo\$he, lo\$hel, and o\$hell to the B-tree where $\$$ is a special symbol


## Permuterm $\rightarrow$ term mapping



## Permuterm index

- For HELLO, we've stored: hello\$, ello\$h, llo\$he, lo\$hel, and o\$hell
- Queries
- For X, look up X\$
- For $\mathrm{X}^{*}$, look up \$ $\mathrm{X}^{*}$
- For *X, look up X\$*
- For * $X^{*}$, look up $X^{*}$
- For $\mathrm{X}^{*} \mathrm{Y}$, look up $\mathrm{Y} \$ \mathrm{X}^{*}$
- Example: For hel*o, look up o\$hel*
- Permuterm index would better be called a permuterm tree.
- But permuterm index is the more common name.


## Processing a lookup in the permuterm index

- Rotate query wildcard to the right
- Use B-tree lookup as before
- Problem: Permuterm more than quadruples the size of the dictionary compared to a regular B-tree. (empirical number)


## $k$-gram indexes

- More space-efficient than permuterm index
- Enumerate all character $k$-grams (sequence of $k$ characters) occurring in a term
- 2-grams are called bigrams.
- Example: from April is the cruelest month we get the bigrams: \$ap pr ri il $1 \$ \$ i$ is s\$\$t the e\$ \$c cr ru ue el le es st $t \$ \$ m$ mo on nt $h \$$
- \$ is a special word boundary symbol, as before.
- Maintain an inverted index from bigrams to the terms that contain the bigram


## Postings list in a 3-gram inverted index



## k-gram (bigram, trigram, ...) indexes

- Note that we now have two different types of inverted indexes
- The term-document inverted index for finding documents based on a query consisting of terms
- The $k$-gram index for finding terms based on a query consisting of k-grams


## Processing wildcarded terms in a bigram index

- Query mon* can now be run as: \$m AND mo AND on
- Gets us all terms with the prefix mon...
- ... but also many "false positives" like mOON.
- We must postfilter these terms against query.
- Surviving terms are then looked up in the term-document inverted index.
- k-gram index vs. permuterm index
- $k$-gram index is more space efficient.
- Permuterm index doesn't require postfiltering.


## Exercise

- Google has very limited support for wildcard queries.
- For example, this query doesn't work very well on Google: [gen* universit*]
- Intention: you are looking for the University of Geneva, but don't know which accents to use for the French words for university and Geneva.
- According to Google search basics, 2010-04-29: "Note that the * operator works only on whole words, not parts of words."
- But this is not entirely true. Try [pythag*] and [m*nchen]
- Exercise: Why doesn't Google fully support wildcard queries?


## Processing wildcard queries in the term-document index

- Problem 1: we must potentially execute a large number of Boolean queries.
- Most straightforward semantics: Conjunction of disjunctions
- For [gen* universit*]: geneva university OR geneva université OR genève university OR genève université OR general universities OR...
- Very expensive
- Problem 2: Users hate to type.
- If abbreviated queries like [pyth* theo*] for [pythagoras' theorem] are allowed, users will use them a lot.
- This would significantly increase the cost of answering queries.
- Somewhat alleviated by Google Suggest
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## Spelling correction

- Two principal uses
- Correcting documents being indexed
- Correcting user queries
- Two different methods for spelling correction
- Isolated word spelling correction
- Check each word on its own for misspelling
- Will not catch typos resulting in correctly spelled words, e.g., an asteroid that fell form the sky
- Context-sensitive spelling correction
- Look at surrounding words
- Can correct form/from error above


## Correcting documents

- We're not interested in interactive spelling correction of documents (e.g., MS Word) in this class.
- In IR, we use document correction primarily for OCR'ed documents. (OCR = optical character recognition)
- The general philosophy in IR is: don't change the documents.


## Correcting queries

- First: isolated word spelling correction
- Premise 1: There is a list of "correct words" from which the correct spellings come.
- Premise 2: We have a way of computing the distance between a misspelled word and a correct word.
- Simple spelling correction algorithm: return the "correct" word that has the smallest distance to the misspelled word.
- Example: informaton $\rightarrow$ information
- For the list of correct words, we can use the vocabulary of all words that occur in our collection.
- Why is this problematic?


## Alternatives to using the term vocabulary

- A standard dictionary (Webster's, OED etc.)
- An industry-specific dictionary (for specialized IR systems)
- The term vocabulary of the collection, appropriately weighted


## Distance between misspelled word and "correct" word

- We will study several alternatives.
- Edit distance and Levenshtein distance
- Weighted edit distance
- k-gram overlap


## Edit distance

- The edit distance between string $s_{1}$ and string $s_{2}$ is the minimum number of basic operations that convert $s_{1}$ to $s_{2}$.
- Levenshtein distance: The admissible basic operations are insert, delete, and replace
- Levenshtein distance dog-do: 1
- Levenshtein distance cat-cart: 1
- Levenshtein distance cat-cut: 1
- Levenshtein distance cat-act: 2
- Damerau-Levenshtein distance cat-act: 1
- Damerau-Levenshtein includes transposition as a fourth possible operation.


## Levenshtein distance: Computation

|  |  | $f$ | $a$ | $s$ | $t$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $c$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $a$ | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| $t$ | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| $s$ | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

## Levenshtein distance: Algorithm

```
LevenshteinDistance \(\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)\)
1 for \(i \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
2 do \(m[i, 0]=i\)
3 for \(j \leftarrow 0\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
4 do \(m[0, j]=j\)
5 for \(i \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{1}\right|\)
6 do for \(j \leftarrow 1\) to \(\left|s_{2}\right|\)
7 do if \(s_{1}[i]=s_{2}[j]\)
\(8 \quad\) then \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]\}\)
9 else \(m[i, j]=\min \{m[i-1, j]+1, m[i, j-1]+1, m[i-1, j-1]+1\}\)
10 return \(m\left[\left|s_{1}\right|,\left|s_{2}\right|\right]\)
```

Operations: insert (cost 1 ), delete (cost 1 ), replace ( cost 1$)$, copy ( $\operatorname{cost} 0)$
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```
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## Levenshtein distance: Example

|  |  | f |  | a |  | S |  | t |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| c | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| a | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| t | 3 | 3 | 3 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| s | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

## Each cell of Levenshtein matrix

| cost of getting here from <br> my upper left neighbor <br> (copy or replace) | cost of getting here <br> from my upper neighbor <br> (delete) |
| :--- | :--- |
| cost of getting here from <br> my left neighbor (insert) | the minimum of the <br> three possible "move- <br> ments"; the cheapest <br> way of getting here |

## Levenshtein distance: Example

|  |  | f |  | a |  | S |  | t |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| c | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| a | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| t | 3 | 3 | 3 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| s | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

## Dynamic programming (Cormen et al.)

- Optimal substructure: The optimal solution to the problem contains within it subsolutions, i.e., optimal solutions to subproblems.
- Overlapping subsolutions: The subsolutions overlap. These subsolutions are computed over and over again when computing the global optimal solution in a brute-force algorithm.
- Subproblem in the case of edit distance: what is the edit distance of two prefixes
- Overlapping subsolutions: We need most distances of prefixes 3 times - this corresponds to moving right, diagonally, down.


## Weighted edit distance

- As above, but weight of an operation depends on the characters involved.
- Meant to capture keyboard errors, e.g., $m$ more likely to be mistyped as $n$ than as $q$.
- Therefore, replacing $m$ by $n$ is a smaller edit distance than by $q$.
- We now require a weight matrix as input.
- Modify dynamic programming to handle weights


## Using edit distance for spelling correction

- Given query, first enumerate all character sequences within a preset (possibly weighted) edit distance
- Intersect this set with our list of "correct" words
- Then suggest terms in the intersection to the user.
- $\rightarrow$ exercise in a few slides


## Exercise

(1) Compute Levenshtein distance matrix for OSLO - SNOW




























|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| I | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 3 } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 | ? |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| I | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 3 } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |




|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 2 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| I | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 3 | 4 | 4 4 |
| - | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 4 } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 | 5 |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 3 |
| s | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 3 |
| 1 | 3 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - |  | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 |



|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 2 | 4 | 5 <br> 3 |
| s | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| I | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 4 } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 |

How do I read out the editing operations that transform OSLO into SNOW?


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | insert | ${ }^{*}$ | w |



| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | o | o |
| 1 | insert | $*$ | w |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| I | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 2 } \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 3 | 5 |


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | replace | l | n |
| 0 | (copy) | o | o |
| 1 | insert | * | w |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | 0 |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| o | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 1 <br> 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| I | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 4 <br> 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 | 5 |


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | (copy) | s | s |
| 1 | replace | l | n |
| 0 | (copy) | o | o |
| 1 | insert | * | w |


|  |  | s |  | n |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | w |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| s | 2 | 1 <br> 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| - | - 4 <br> 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  | 4 | 4 | 5 |


| cost | operation | input | output |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | delete | - | * |
| 0 | (copy) | s | s |
| 1 | replace | I | n |
| 0 | (copy) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| 1 | insert | * | w |

## Outline
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## Spelling correction

- Now that we can compute edit distance: how to use it for isolated word spelling correction - this is the last slide in this section.
- k-gram indexes for isolated word spelling correction.
- Context-sensitive spelling correction
- General issues


## k-gram indexes for spelling correction

- Enumerate all $k$-grams in the query term
- Example: bigram index, misspelled word bordroom
- Bigrams: bo, or, rd, dr, ro, oo, om
- Use the $k$-gram index to retrieve "correct" words that match query term $k$-grams
- Threshold by number of matching $k$-grams
- E.g., only vocabulary terms that differ by at most $3 k$-grams


## k-gram indexes for spelling correction: bordroom



## Context-sensitive spelling correction

- Our example was: an asteroid that fell form the sky
- How can we correct form here?
- One idea: hit-based spelling correction
- Retrieve "correct" terms close to each query term
- for flew form munich: flea for flew, from for form, munch for munich
- Now try all possible resulting phrases as queries with one word "fixed" at a time
- Try query "flea form munich"
- Try query "flew from munich"
- Try query "flew form munch"
- The correct query "flew from munich" has the most hits.
- Suppose we have 7 alternatives for flew, 20 for form and 3 for munich, how many "corrected" phrases will we enumerate?


## Context-sensitive spelling correction

- The "hit-based" algorithm we just outlined is not very efficient.
- More efficient alternative: look at "collection" of queries, not documents


## General issues in spelling correction

- User interface
- automatic vs. suggested correction
- Did you mean only works for one suggestion.
- What about multiple possible corrections?
- Tradeoff: simple vs. powerful UI
- Cost
- Spelling correction is potentially expensive.
- Avoid running on every query?
- Maybe just on queries that match few documents.
- Guess: Spelling correction of major search engines is efficient enough to be run on every query.


## Exercise: Understand Peter Norvig's spelling corrector

```
import re, collections
def words(text): return re.findall('[a-z]+', text.lower())
def train(features):
    model = collections.defaultdict(lambda: 1)
    for f in features:
        model[f] += 1
    return model
NWORDS = train(words(file('big.txt').read()))
alphabet = 'abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz'
def edits1(word):
    splits = [(word[:i], word[i:]) for i in range(len(word) + 1)]
    deletes = [a + b[1:] for a, b in splits if b]
    transposes = [a + b[1] + b[0] + b[2:] for a, b in splits if len(b) gt 1]
    replaces = [a + c + b[1:] for a, b in splits for c in alphabet if b]
    inserts = [a + c + b for a, b in splits for c in alphabet]
    return set(deletes + transposes + replaces + inserts)
def known_edits2(word):
    return set(e2 for e1 in edits1(word) for e2 in
    edits1(e1) if e2 in NWORDS)
def known(words): return set(w for w in words if w in NWORDS)
def correct(word):
    candidates = known([word]) or known(edits1(word)) or
    known_edits2(word) or [word]
    return max(candidates, key=NWORDS.get)
```


## Outline

(2) Dictionaries
(3) Wildcard queries
(4) Edit distance
(5) Spelling correction
(6) Soundex

## Soundex

- Soundex is the basis for finding phonetic (as opposed to orthographic) alternatives.
- Example: chebyshev / tchebyscheff
- Algorithm:
- Turn every token to be indexed into a 4-character reduced form
- Do the same with query terms
- Build and search an index on the reduced forms


## Soundex algorithm

(1) Retain the first letter of the term.
(2) Change all occurrences of the following letters to '0' (zero): A, E, I, O, U, H, W, Y
(3) Change letters to digits as follows:

- B, F, P, V to 1
- C, G, J, K, Q, S, X, Z to 2
- D,T to 3
- L to 4
- $\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{N}$ to 5
- R to 6
(9) Repeatedly remove one out of each pair of consecutive identical digits
(5) Remove all zeros from the resulting string; pad the resulting string with trailing zeros and return the first four positions, which will consist of a letter followed by three digits


## Example: Soundex of HERMAN

- Retain H
- ERMAN $\rightarrow$ ORMON
- ORMON $\rightarrow 06505$
- $06505 \rightarrow 06505$
- $06505 \rightarrow 655$
- Return H655
- Note: HERMANN will generate the same code


## How useful is Soundex?

- Not very - for information retrieval
- Ok for "high recall" tasks in other applications (e.g., Interpol)
- Zobel and Dart (1996) suggest better alternatives for phonetic matching in IR.


## Exercise

- Compute Soundex code of your last name


## Take-away

- Tolerant retrieval: What to do if there is no exact match between query term and document term
- Wildcard queries
- Spelling correction


## Resources

- Chapter 3 of IIR
- Resources at http://ifnlp.org/ir
- Soundex demo
- Levenshtein distance demo
- Peter Norvig's spelling corrector

