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• Research topics
  – web data mining
  – semantic web
  – social media
  – web retrieval

• Web retrieval
  – distributed web retrieval
  – scalability and efficiency
  – opinion/sentiment retrieval
  – personalization

Outline of the Tutorial

• Background (35 minutes)
• Main sections
  – web crawling (75 minutes + 5 minutes Q/A)
  – indexing (75 minutes + 5 minutes Q/A)
  – query processing (90 minutes + 5 minutes Q/A)
  – caching (40 minutes + 5 minutes Q/A)
• Concluding remarks (10 minutes)
• Questions and open discussion (15 minutes)
Structure of Main Sections

- Definitions
- Metrics
- Issues and techniques
  - single computer
  - cluster of computers
  - multiple search sites
- Research problems

Background
Brief History of Search Engines

• Past
  – Before browsers
    – Gopher
  – Before the bubble
    – Altavista
    – Lycos
    – Infoseek
    – Excite
    – HotBot
  – After the bubble
    – Yahoo
    – Google
    – Microsoft

• Current
  – Global
    – Google, Bing
  – Regional
    – Yandex, Baidu

• Future
  – Facebook ?
  – …

Anatomy of a Search Engine Result Page

• Web search results ✅ Main focus of this tutorial
• Direct displays (vertical search results)
  – image
  – video
  – local
  – shopping
  – related entities
• Query suggestions
• Advertisements
Anatomy of a Search Engine Result Page

Actors in Web Search

- User’s perspective: accessing information
  - relevance
  - speed

- Search engine’s perspective: monetization
  - increase the ad revenue
  - attract more users
  - reduce the operational costs

- Advertiser’s perspective: publicity
  - attract more users
  - pay little
Search Engine Usage

![Daily Internet Activities Chart]

What Makes Web Search Difficult?

- **Size**
- **Diversity**
- **Dynamicity**

- All of these three features can be observed in
  - the Web
  - web users
What Makes Web Search Difficult?

- The Web
  - more than 180 million Web servers and 950 million host names
  - compare with almost 1 billion computers directly connect to Internet
  - the largest data repository (estimated as 100 billion pages)
  - constantly changing
  - diverse in terms of content and data formats

- Users
  - too many! (over 2.5 billion at the end of 2012)
  - diverse in terms of their culture, education, and demographics
  - very short queries (hard to understand the intent)
  - changing information needs
  - little patience (few queries posed & few answers seen)

Expectations from a Search Engine

- Crawl and index a large fraction of the Web
- Maintain most recent copies of the content in the Web
- Scale to serve hundreds of millions of queries every day
- Evaluate a typical query under several hundred milliseconds
- Serve most relevant results for a user query
Internet Growth

We observed a super-linear growth in the last decade.

The growth of the Internet accelerated with web search engines.

Web Growth

The total number of websites (logarithmic scale):

- Hostnames: 958,919,789
- Active sites: 182,138,695
Web Page Size Growth

Growth of Average Web Page Size and Number of Objects

Sources: Compendex 2007, Gomez 2008, Shazer 2013, Souders 2011

Web User Growth

Internet Growth - Usage Phases - Tech Events

Note – events shown relate to the time axis only.
Search Data Centers

- Quality and performance requirements imply large amounts of compute resources, i.e., very large data centers
- High variation in data center sizes
  - hundreds of thousands of computers
  - a few computers

Cost of Data Centers

- Data center facilities are heavy consumers of energy, accounting for between 1.1% and 1.5% of the world’s total energy use in 2010.
Financial Costs

- Costs
  - depreciation: old hardware need to be replaced
  - maintenance: failures need to be handled
  - operational: energy spending need to be reduced

Impact of Resources on Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Energy Consumption</th>
<th>Result Relevance</th>
<th>Response time</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result Relevance</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Components in a Web Search Engine

• Web crawling
• Indexing
• Query processing

Q&A
Web Crawling

- Web crawling is the process of locating, fetching, and storing the pages available in the Web.

- Computer programs that perform this task are referred to as:
  - crawlers
  - spider
  - harvesters
Web Graph

- Web crawlers exploit the hyperlink structure of the Web

Web Crawling Process

- A typical Web crawler
  - starts from a set of seed pages,
  - locates new pages by parsing the downloaded seed pages,
  - extracts the hyperlinks within,
  - stores the extracted links in a fetch queue for retrieval,
  - continues downloading until the fetch queue gets empty or a satisfactory number of pages are downloaded.
Web Crawling Process

Web Crawling

• Crawling divides the Web into three sets
  – downloaded
  – discovered
  – undiscovered
URL Prioritization

- A state-of-the-art web crawler maintains two separate queues for prioritizing the download of URLs
  - discovery queue
    - downloads pages pointed by already discovered links
    - tries to increase the coverage of the crawler
  - refreshing queue
    - re-downloads already downloaded pages
    - tries to increase the freshness of the repository

URL Prioritization (Discovery)

- Random (A, B, C, D)
- Breadth-first (A)
- In-degree (C)
- PageRank (B)
URL Prioritization (Refreshing)

- Random (A, B, C, D)
- PageRank (B)
- Age (C)
- User feedback (D)
- Longevity (A)

(download time order (by the crawler)

(last update time order (by the webmaster)

(estimated average update frequency

(more intense blue color indicates larger user interest)

(more intense red color indicates higher PageRank)

Metrics

- Quality metrics
  - coverage: the percentage of the Web discovered or downloaded by the crawler
  - freshness: measure of out-datedness of the local copy of a page relative to the page's original copy on the Web
  - page importance: percentage of important or popular pages in the repository

- Performance metrics
  - throughput: content download rate in bytes per unit of time
Concepts Related to Web Crawling

- External factors
  - Site behavior
  - Social objectives
  - Spatial locality

- Quality metrics
  - Freshness
  - Coverage
  - Importance

- Web change
  - Growth
  - Link exchange
  - Throughput

- Implementation issues
  - Indexing
  - Search

- URL mapping
- Repartitioning
- Load balancing
- Scalability
- Fault tolerance
- Multi-threading
- Data structures

Crawling Architectures

- Single computer
  - CPU, RAM, and disk becomes a bottleneck
  - not scalable

- Parallel
  - multiple computers, single data center
  - scalable

- Geographically distributed
  - multiple computers, multiple data centers
  - scalable
  - reduces the network latency
Crawling Architectures

Issues in Web Crawling

• Dynamics of the Web
  – Web growth
  – content change

• Malicious intent
  – hostile sites (e.g., spider traps, infinite domain name generators)
  – spam sites (e.g., link farms)
Issues in Web Crawling

- URL normalization (a.k.a. canonicalization)
  - case-folding
  - removing leading "www strings (e.g., www.cnn.com → cnn.com)
  - adding trailing slashes (e.g., cnn.com/a → cnn.com/a/)
  - relative paths (e.g., ../index.html)

- Web site properties
  - sites with restricted content (e.g., robot exclusion),
  - unstable sites (e.g., variable host performance, unreliable networks)
  - politeness requirements

DNS Caching

- Before a web page is crawled, the host name needs to be resolved to an IP address

- Since the same host name appears many times, DNS entries are locally cached by the crawler
Multi-threaded Crawling

- Multi-threaded crawling
  - crawling is a network-bound task
  - crawlers employ multiple threads to crawl different web pages simultaneously, increasing their throughput significantly
  - in practice, a single node can run around up to a hundred crawling threads
  - multi-threading becomes infeasible when the number of threads is very large due to the overhead of context switching

Politeness

- Multi-threading leads to politeness issues
- If not well-coordinated, the crawler may issue too many download requests at the same time, overloading
  - a web server
  - an entire sub-network
- A polite crawler
  - puts a delay between two consecutive downloads from the same server (a commonly used delay is 20 seconds)
  - closes the established TCP-IP connection after the web page is downloaded from the server
Robot Exclusion Protocol

- A standard from the early days of the Web
- A file (called robots.txt) in a web site advising web crawlers about which parts of the site are accessible
- Crawlers often cache robots.txt files for efficiency purposes

| User-agent: googlebot # all services |
| Disallow: /private/ # disallow this directory |
| User-agent: googlebot-news # only the news service |
| Disallow: / # on everything |
| User-agent: * # all robots |
| Disallow: /something/ # on this directory |
| User-agent: * # all robots |
| Crawl-delay: 10 # wait at least 10 seconds |
| Disallow: /directory1/ # disallow this directory |
| Allow: /directory1/myfile.html # allow a subdirectory |
| Host: www.example.com # use this mirror |

Mirror Sites

- A mirror site is a replica of an existing site, used to reduce the network traffic or improve the availability of the original site
- Mirror sites lead to redundant crawling and, in turn, reduced discovery rate and coverage for the crawler
- Mirror sites can be detected by analyzing
  - URL similarity
  - link structure
  - content similarity
Data Structures

- Good implementation of data structures is crucial for the efficiency of a web crawler

- The most critical data structure is the “seen URL” table
  - stores all URLs discovered so far and continuously grows as new URLs are discovered
  - consulted before each URL is added to the discovery queue
  - has high space requirements (mostly stored on the disk)
    - URLs are stored as MD5 hashes
    - frequent/recent URLs are cached in memory

Parallel Web Crawling
Web Partitioning and Fault Tolerance

- **Web partitioning**
  - typically based on the MD5 hashes of URLs or host names
  - site-based partitioning is preferable because URL-based partitioning may lead to politeness issues if the crawling decisions given by individual nodes are not coordinated

- **Fault tolerance**
  - when a crawling node dies, its URLs are partitioned over the remaining nodes

Parallelization Alternatives

- **Firewall mode**
  - lower coverage
- **Crossover mode**
  - duplicate pages
- **Exchange mode**
  - communication overhead

Duplicate crawling in crossover mode
Link communicated in exchange mode
Not discovered in firewall mode
Geographically Distributed Web Crawling

- Benefits
  - higher crawling throughput
  - geographical proximity
  - lower crawling latency
  - improved network politeness
  - less overhead on routers because of fewer hops
  - resilience to network partitions
  - better coverage
  - increased availability
  - continuity of business
  - better coupling with distributed indexing/search
  - reduced data migration
Geographically Distributed Web Crawling

- Four crawling countries
  - US
  - Brazil
  - Spain
  - Turkey

- Eight target countries
  - US, Canada
  - Brazil, Chile
  - Spain, Portugal
  - Turkey, Greece

Focused Web Crawling

- The goal is to locate and download a large portion of web pages that match a given target theme as early as possible.

- Example themes
  - topic (nuclear energy)
  - media type (forums)
  - demographics (kids)

- Strategies
  - URL patterns
  - referring page content
  - local graph structure
Sentiment Focused Web Crawling

- Goal: to locate and download web pages that contain positive or negative sentiments (opinionated content) as early as possible

Hidden Web Crawling

- Hidden Web: web pages that a crawler cannot access by simply following the link structure

- Examples
  - unlinked pages
  - private sites
  - contextual pages
  - scripted content
  - dynamic content
Research Problem – Passive Discovery

- URL discovery by external agents
  - toolbar logs
  - email messages
  - tweets

- Benefits
  - improved coverage
  - early discovery

Research Problem – URL Scheduling

- How to optimally allocate available crawling resources between the tasks of page discovery and refreshing

- Web master
  - create
  - modify
  - delete

- Crawler
  - discover
  - download
  - refresh
Research Problem – Web Partitioning

- Web partitioning/repartitioning: the problem of finding a Web partition that minimizes the costs in distributed Web crawling
  - minimization objectives
    - page download times
    - link exchange overhead
    - repartitioning overhead
  - constraints
    - coupling with distributed search
    - load balancing

Research Problem – Crawler Placement

- Crawler placement problem: the problem of finding the optimum geographical placement for a given number of data centers
  - geographical locations are now objectives, not constraints

- Problem variant: assuming some data centers were already built, find an optimum location to build a new data center for crawling
Research Problem – Coupling with Search

• Coupling with geographically distributed indexing/search
  – crawled data may be moved to
    – a single data center
    – replicated on multiple data centers
    – partitioned among a number of data centers
  – decisions must be given on
    – what data to move (e.g., pages or index)
    – how to move (i.e., compression)
    – how often to move (i.e., synchronization)

Research Problem – Green Web Crawling

• Goal: reduce the carbon footprint generated by the web servers while handling the requests of web crawlers

• Idea
  – crawl web sites when they are consuming green energy
    (e.g., during the day when solar energy is more available)
  – crawl web sites consuming green energy more often as an incentive to promote the use of green energy
Published Web Crawler Architectures

- Bingbot: Microsoft’s Bing web crawler
- FAST Crawler: Used by Fast Search & Transfer
- Googlebot: Web crawler of Google
- PolyBot: A distributed web crawler
- RBSE: The first published web crawler
- WebFountain: A distributed web crawler
- WebRACE: A crawling and caching module
- Yahoo Slurp: Web crawler used by Yahoo Search

Open Source Web Crawlers

- DataparkSearch: GNU General Public License.
- GRUB: open source distributed crawler of Wikia Search
- Heritrix: Internet Archive’s crawler
- ICDL Crawler: cross-platform web crawler
- Norconex HTTP Collector: licensed under GPL
- Nutch: Apache License
- Open Search Server: GPL license
- PHP-Crawler: BSD license
- Scrapy: BSD license
- Seeks: Affero general public license
- WIRE: Carlos Castillo’s PhD thesis
Key Papers


Q&A
Indexing

- Indexing is the process of converting crawled web documents into an efficiently (compressed) searchable form.

- An index is a representation for the document collection over which user queries will be evaluated.
Indexing

- Abandoned indexing techniques
  - suffix arrays
  - signature files

- Currently used indexing technique
  - inverted index (the oldest one!)

Signature File

- For a given piece of text, a signature is created by encoding the words in it
- For each word, a bit signature is computed
  - contains $F$ bits
  - $m$ out of $F$ bits is set to 1 (decided by hash functions)
- In case of long documents
  - a signature is created for each logical text block
  - block signatures are concatenated to form the signature for the entire document
Signature File

- When searching, the signature for the query keyword is OR’ed with the document signature

- Example signature with $F = 6$ and $m = 2$

  \[
  \begin{array}{ll}
  \text{document terms:} & \text{query terms:} \\
  \text{apple} & \text{apple} \\
  \text{orange} & \text{banana} \\
  \text{peach} & \text{signature} \\
  \text{10 00 10} & \text{10 00 10 (match)} \\
  \text{00 01 10} & \text{01 00 01 (no match)} \\
  \text{10 01 10} & \text{10 01 00 (false match)} \\
  \end{array}
  \]

Inverted Index

- An inverted index has two parts
  - inverted lists
    - posting entries
      - document id
      - term score
  - a vocabulary index (dictionary)
Sample Document Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc id</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pease porridge hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pease porridge cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pease porridge in the pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>pease porridge hot, pease porridge not cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pease porridge cold, pease porridge not hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>pease porridge hot in the pot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inverted Index

Dictionary | Inverted lists
---         | ---

cold       | (2, 1) (4, 1) (5, 1)
hot         | (1, 1) (4, 1) (5, 1) (6, 1)
in          | (3, 1) (6, 1)
not        | (4, 1) (6, 1)
pease      | (1, 1) (2, 1) (3, 1) (4, 2) (5, 2) (6, 1)
porridge   | (1, 1) (2, 1) (3, 1) (4, 2) (5, 2) (6, 1)
pot        | (3, 1) (6, 1)
the        | (3, 1) (6, 1)
Inverted Index

- Additional data structures
  - position lists: list of all positions a term occurs in a document
  - document array: document length, PageRank, spam score, …
- Sections
  - title, body, header, anchor text (inbound, outbound links)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pease</th>
<th>doc freq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(1, 1) (2, 1) (3, 1) (4, 2) (5, 2) (6, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metrics

- Quality metrics
  - spam rate: fraction of spam pages in the index
  - duplicate rate: fraction of exact or near duplicate web pages present in the index
- Performance metrics
  - compactness: size of the index in bytes
  - deployment cost: time and effort it takes to create and deploy a new inverted index from scratch
  - update cost: time and space overhead of updating a document entry in the index
Indexing Documents

- Index terms are extracted from documents after some processing, which may involve
  - tokenization
  - stopword removal
  - case conversion
  - stemming

original text: Living in America
applying all: liv america
in practice: living in america

Duplicate Detection

- Detecting documents with duplicate content
  - exact duplicates (solution: computing/comparing hash values)
  - near duplicates (solution: shingles instead of hash values)
Features: Relevance Signals

- Offline computed features
  - content: spam score, domain quality score
  - web graph: PageRank, HostRank
  - usage: click count, CTR, dwell time

- Online computed features
  - query-document similarity: tf-idf, BM25
  - term proximity features

PageRank

- A link analysis algorithm that assigns a weight to each web page indicating its importance
- Iterative process that converges to a unique solution
- Weight of a page is proportional to
  - number of inlinks of the page
  - weight of linking pages
- Other algorithms
  - HITS
  - SimRank
  - TrustRank
Spam Filtering

• Content spam
  - web pages with potentially many popular search terms and with little or no useful information
  - goal is to match many search queries to the page content and increase the traffic coming from search engines

• Link spam
  - a group of web sites that all link to every other site in the group
  - goal is to boost the PageRank score of pages and make them more frequently visible in web search results
Spam Filtering

- PageRank is subject to manipulation by link farms

Top 10 PageRank sites

- http://godaddy.com
- http://twitter.com
- http://facebook.com
- http://blogger.com
- http://google.com
- http://mys.godaddy.com
- http://adobe.com
- http://community.godaddy.com
- http://wordpress.org
- http://youtube.com

Inverted List Compression

- Benefits
  - reduced space consumption
  - reduced transfer costs
  - increased posting list cache hit rate

- Gap encoding
  - original: 17 18 28 40 44 47 56 58
  - gap encoded: 17 1 10 12 4 3 9 2
    gaps
Inverted List Compression

- Techniques
  - Unary encoding
  - Gamma encoding
  - Delta encoding
  - Variable byte encoding
  - Golomb encoding
  - Rice encoding
  - PforDelta encoding
  - Interpolative encoding

    gap: 1000
    unary: 11111111...11111110 (999 ones)
    gamma: 111111110:111101000
    delta: 1110:010:111101000
    vbe: 00000111 11101000

Document Identifier Reordering

- Goal: reassign document identifiers so that we obtain many small d-gaps, facilitating compression

- Example
  - old lists: L1: 1 3 6 8 9 L2: 2 4 5 6 9 L3: 3 6 7 9
  - mapping: 1→1 2→9 3→2 4→7 5→8 6→3 7→5 8→6 9→4
  - new lists: L1: 1 2 3 4 6 L2: 3 4 7 8 9 L3: 2 3 4 5
  - old d-gaps: 2 3 2 1 2 1 1 3 3 1 2
  - new d-gaps: 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 1 1 1 1
Document Identifier Reordering

- Techniques
  - sorting URLs alphabetically and assigning ids in that order
    - idea: pages from the same site have high textual overlap
    - simple yet effective
    - only applicable to web page collections
  - clustering similar documents
    - assigns nearby ids to documents in the same cluster
  - traversal of document similarity graph
    - formulated as the traveling salesman problem

Index Construction

- Equivalent to computing the transpose of a matrix
- In-memory techniques do not work well with web-scale data
- Techniques
  - two-phase
    - first phase: read the collection and allocate a skeleton for the index
    - second phase: fill the posting lists
  - one-phase
    - keep reading documents and building an in-memory index
    - each time the memory is full, flush the index to the disk
    - merge all on-disk indexes into a single index in a final step
Index Maintenance

• Grow a new (delta) index in the memory; each time the memory is full, flush the in-memory index to disk
  - no merge
    - flushed index is written to disk as a separate index
    - increases fragmentation and query processing time
    - eventually requires merging all on-disk indexes or rebuilding
  - incremental indexing
    - each inverted list contains additional empty space at the end
    - new documents are appended to the empty space in the list
  - merging delta index
    - immediate merge: maintains only one copy of the index on disk
    - selective merge: maintains multiple generations of the index on disk

Inverted Index Partitioning/Replication

• In practice, the inverted index is
  - partitioned on thousands of computers in a large search cluster
    - reduces query response times
    - allows scaling with increasing collection size
  - replicated on tens of search clusters
    - increases query processing throughput
    - allows scaling with increasing query volume
    - provides fault tolerance
Inverted Index Partitioning

- Two alternatives for partitioning an inverted index
  - term-based partitioning
    - $T$ inverted lists are distributed across $P$ processors
    - each processor is responsible for processing the postings of a mutually disjoint subset of inverted lists assigned to itself
    - single disk access per query term
  - document-based partitioning
    - $N$ documents are distributed across $P$ processors
    - each processor is responsible for processing the postings of a mutually disjoint subset of documents assigned to itself
    - multiple (parallel) disk accesses per query term

Term-Based Index Partitioning

- cold
  - P1
- hot
  - P1
- in
  - P1
- not
  - P2
- pease
  - P2
- porridge
  - P2
- pot
  - P3
- the
  - P3
### Document-Based Index Partitioning

```
cold (2, 1) P1
hot (1, 1)
in
not
pease (1, 1) (2, 1)
porridge (1, 1) (2, 1)
pot
the
```

### Comparison of Index Partitioning Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Document-based</th>
<th>Term-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space consumption</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of disk accesses</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrency</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational load imbalance</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. posting list I/O time</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of index building</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance cost</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inverted Index Partitioning

- In practice, document-based partitioning is used
  - simpler to build and update
  - low inter-query-processing concurrency, but good load balance
  - low throughput, but high response time
  - high throughput is achieved by replication
  - easier to maintain
  - more fault tolerant

- Hybrid techniques are possible (e.g., term partitioning inside a document sub-collection)

Parallel Index Creation

- Possible alternatives for creating an inverted index in parallel
  - message passing paradigm
    - doc-based: each node builds a local index using its documents
    - term-based: posting lists are communicated between the nodes
  - MapReduce framework

![Parallel Index Creation Diagram]

Mapper

Reducer

D1: A B C

D2: E B D

D3: B C

Mapper

Mapper

Reducer

Reducer

A: D1
B: D1
C: D1

A: D1
B: D1 D2 D3
C: D1 D3

A: D1
B: D1
C: D3

A: D1
B: D2
C: D2

A: D1
B: D2
C: D2

D: D2
Static Index Pruning

- Idea: to create a small version of the search index that can accurately answer most search queries
- Techniques
  - term-based pruning
  - doc-based pruning
- Result quality
  - guaranteed
  - not guaranteed
- In practice, caching does the same better

Tiered Index

- A sequence of sub-indexes
  - former sub-indexes are small and keep more important documents
  - later sub-indexes are larger and keep less important documents
  - a query is processed selectively only on the first \( n \) tiers
- Two decisions need to be made
  - tiering (offline): how to place documents in different tiers
  - fall-through (online): at which tier to stop processing the query
Tiered Index

- Tiering strategy is based on some document importance metric
  - PageRank
  - click count
  - spam score
- Fall-through strategy
  - query the next index until there are enough results
  - query the next index until search result quality is good
  - predict the next tier's result quality by machine learning

Document Clustering

- Documents are clustered
  - similarity between documents
  - co-click likelihood
- A separate index is built for each document cluster
Document Clustering

- A query is processed on the indexes associated with the most similar \( n \) clusters
- Reduces the workload
- Suffers from the load imbalance problem
  - query topic distribution may be skewed
  - certain indexes have to be queried much more often

Scaling Up

Adapted from Moffat and Zobel, 2004.
Multi-site Architectures

- Centralized
- Replicated
- Partitioned

Research Problem – Indexing Architectures

- Replicated
- Pruned
- Clustered
- Tiered

- Missing research
  - a thorough performance comparison of these architectures that includes all possible optimizations
  - scalability analysis with web-scale document collections and large numbers of nodes
Research Problem – Off-network Popularity

• Traditional features
  - statistical analysis
  - link analysis
  - proximity
  - spam
  - clicks
  - session analysis

• Off-network popularity
  - social signals
  - network

Key Papers

• Scholer, Williams, Yiannis, and Zobel, "Compression of inverted indexes for fast query evaluation", SIGIR, 2002.
Q&A

Query Processing
Query Processing

- Query processing is the problem of generating the best-matching answers (typically, top 10 documents) to a given user query, spending the least amount of time.

- Our focus: creating 10 blue links as an answer to a user query.

Web Search

- Web search is like a sorting problem!
- But we only need the top results (partial evaluation).

[Diagram showing user queries and results from web search]
Metrics

- Quality metrics
  - relevance: the degree to which returned answers meet user’s information need.

- Performance metrics
  - latency: the response time delay experienced by the user
  - peak throughput: number of queries that can be processed per unit of time without any degradation on other metrics

Measuring Relevance

- It is not always possible to know the user’s intent and his information need

- Commonly used relevance metrics in practice
  - recall
  - precision
  - DCG
  - NDCG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ranking 1</th>
<th>Ranking 2</th>
<th>Optimal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1+0.63+0.5=2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDCG</td>
<td>1/2.13</td>
<td>0.63/2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Estimating Relevance

- How to estimate the relevance between a given document and a user query?

- Alternative models for score computation
  - vector-space model
  - statistical models
  - language models

- They all pretty much boil down to the same thing

Example Scoring Function

- Notation
  - $q$: a user query
  - $d$: a document in the collection
  - $t$: a term in the query
  - $N$: number of documents in the collection
  - $tf(t,d)$: number of occurrences of the term in the document
  - $df(t)$: number of documents containing the term
  - $|d|$: number of unique terms in the document

- Commonly used scoring function: tf-idf

$$s(q,d) = \sum_{t \in q} w(t,d) \times \log \frac{N}{df(t)}$$

$$w(t,d) = \frac{tf(t,d)}{|d|}$$
Score Computation (using an accumulator array)

Efficient Score Computation (using a min heap)
Design Alternatives in Ranking

- Document matching
  - conjunctive (AND) mode
    - the document must contain all query terms
    - higher precision, lower recall
  - disjunctive (OR) mode
    - document must contain at least one of the query terms
    - lower precision, higher recall

Design Alternatives in Ranking

- Inverted list organizations
  - increasing order of document ids
  - decreasing order of weights in postings
    - sorted by term frequency
    - sorted by score contribution (impact)
      - within the same impact block, sorted in increasing order of document ids

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>doc id ordered</th>
<th>weight ordered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 3 5 7 8 10</td>
<td>3 7 8 2 5 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 0.5 0.1 0.4 0.3 0.1</td>
<td>0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Alternatives in Ranking

- Traversal order
  - term-at-a-time (TAAT)
  - document-at-a-time (DAAT)

- Weights stored in postings
  - term frequency
    - suitable for compression
  - normalized term frequency
    - no need to store the document length array
    - not suitable for compression
  - precomputed score
    - no need to store the idf value in the vocabulary
    - no need to store the document length array
    - not suitable for compression
Design Alternatives in Ranking

- In practice
  - AND mode: faster and leads to better results in web search
  - doc-id sorted lists: enables compression
  - document-at-a-time list traversal: enables better optimizations
  - term frequencies: enables compression

Scoring Optimizations

- Skipping
  - list is split into blocks linked with pointers called skips
  - store the maximum document id in each block
  - skip a block if it is guaranteed that sought document is not within the block
  - gains in decompression time
  - overhead of skip pointers
Scoring Optimizations

• Dynamic index pruning
  - store the maximum possible score contribution of each list
  - compute the maximum possible score for the current document
  - compare with the lowest score in the heap
  - gains in scoring and decompression time

Scoring Optimizations

• Early termination
  - stop scoring documents when it is guaranteed that neither document can make it into the top k list
  - gains in scoring and decompression time
Snippet Generation

- Search result snippets (a.k.a., summary or abstract)
  - important for users to correctly judge the relevance of a web page to their information need before clicking on its link

- Snippet generation
  - a forward index is built providing a mapping between pages and the terms they contain
  - snippets are computed using this forward index and only for the top 10 result pages
  - efficiency of this step is important
  - entire page as well as snippets can be cached

Parallel Query Processing

- Query processing can be parallelized at different granularities
  - parallelization within a search node (intra-query parallelism)
  - multi-threading within a search node (inter-query parallelism)
  - parallelization within a search cluster (intra-query parallelism)
  - replication across search clusters (inter-query parallelism)
  - distributed across multiple data centers
Query Processing Architectures

• Single computer
  - not scalable in terms of response time

• Search cluster
  - large search clusters (low response time)
  - replicas of clusters (high query throughput)

• Multiple search data centers
  - reduces user-to-center latencies

Query Processing in a Data Center

• Multiple node types
  - frontend, broker, master, child
Parallel Query Processing (central broker)

Parallel Query Processing (pipelined)
Query Processing on a Search Node

- Two-phase ranking
  - simple ranking
    - linear combination of query-dependent and query-independent scores potentially with score boosting
    - main objective: efficiency
  - complex ranking
    - machine learned
    - main objective: quality

Machine Learned Ranking

- Many features
  - term statistics (e.g., BM25)
  - term proximity
  - link analysis (e.g., PageRank)
  - spam detection
  - click data
  - search session analysis

- Popular learners used by commercial search engines
  - neural networks
  - boosted decision trees
Machine Learned Ranking

- Example: gradient boosted decision trees
  - chain of weak learners
  - each learner contributes a partial score to the final document score

  \[
  (z_{l}, s_{l}) \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow (z_{l}, s_{l}) \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow T_{M-1} \rightarrow (z_{l}, s_{l}) \rightarrow T_M \rightarrow (z_{l}, s_{l})
  \]

- Assuming
  - 1000 trees
  - an average tree depth of 10
  - 100 documents scored per query
  - 1000 search nodes

- Expensive
  - \(1000 \times 10 \times 100 = 1\) million operations per query and per node
  - around \(1\) billion comparison for the entire search cluster

Machine Learned Ranking

- Document-ordered traversal (DOT)
  - scores are computed one document at a time over all scorers
  - an iteration of the outer loop produces the complete score information for a partial set of documents

  \[
  (d_{k}^{(S)}) \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow (d_{k}^{(S)}) \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow T_{M-1} \rightarrow (d_{k}^{(S)}) \rightarrow T_M \rightarrow (d_{k}^{(S)})
  \]

- Disadvantages
  - poor branch prediction because a different scorer is used in each inner loop iteration
  - poor cache hit rates in accessing the data about scorers (for the same reason)
**Machine Learned Ranking**

- **Scorer-ordered traversal (SOT)**
  - scores are computed one score at a time over all documents
  - an iteration of the outer loop produces the partial score information for the complete set of documents

- **Disadvantages**
  - memory requirement (feature vectors of all documents need to be kept in memory)
  - poor cache hit rates in accessing features as a different document is used in each inner loop iteration

---

**Machine Learned Ranking**

- **Early termination**
  - idea: place predictive functions between scorers
  - predict during scoring whether a document will enter the final top $k$ and
  - quit scoring, accordingly
Multi-site Web Search Architecture

Key points
- multiple, regional data centers (sites)
- user-to-center assignment
- local web crawling
- partitioned web index
- partial document replication
- query processing with selective forwarding

Multi-site Distributed Query Processing

- Local query response time
  - $2 \times$ user-to-site latency
  - local processing time
- Forwarded query response time
  - local query response time
  - $2 \times$ site-to-site latency
  - non-local query processing time
Query Forwarding

- Problem
  - selecting a subset of non-local sites which the query will be forwarded to

- Objectives
  - reducing the loss in search quality w.r.t. to evaluation over the full index
  - reducing average query response times and/or query processing workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Result quality</th>
<th>Response time</th>
<th>Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True positive</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False positive</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True negative</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False negative</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Machine-Learned Query Forwarding

- Two-phase forwarding decision
  - pre-retrieval classification
    - query features
    - user features
  - post-retrieval classification
    - result features

- The post-retrieval classifier is consulted only if the confidence of the pre-retrieval classifier is not high enough
- This enables overlapping local query processing with remote processing of the query
Web Search Response Latency

- Constituents of response latency
  - user-to-center network latency
  - search engine latency time
    - query features
    - caching
    - current system workload
  - page rendering time in the browser

Response Latency Prediction

- Problem: Predict the response time of a query before processing it on the backend search system
- Useful for making query scheduling decisions
- Solution: Build a machine learning model with many features
  - number of query terms
  - total number of postings in inverted lists
  - average term popularity
  - …
Impact of Response Latency on Users

- Impact of latency on the user varies depending on
  - context: time, location
  - user: demographics
  - query: intent

A/B test by Google and Microsoft

Persistent Impact of Post-header Delay
Research Problem – Energy Savings

- Observation: electricity prices vary across data centers and depending the time of the day
- Idea: forward queries to cheaper search data centers to reduce the electricity bill under certain constraints

Research Problem – Green Search Engines

- Goal: reduce the carbon footprint of the search engine
- Query processing
  - shift workload from data centers that consume brown energy to those green energy
  - constraints:
    - response latency
    - data center capacity
Open Source Search Engines

- DataparkSearch: GNU general public license
- Lemur Toolkit & Indri Search Engine: BSD license
- Lucene: Apache software license
- mnoGoSearch: GNU general public license
- Nutch: based on Lucene
- Seeks: Affero general public license
- Sphinx: free software/open source
- Terrier Search Engine: open source
- Zettair: open source

Key Papers

Key Papers
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Caching

- Cache: quick-access storage system
  - may store data to eliminate the need to fetch the data from a slower storage system
  - may store precomputed results to eliminate redundant computation in the backend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main backend</th>
<th>Cache</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speed</td>
<td>slower</td>
<td>faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workload</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td>larger</td>
<td>smaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
<td>cheaper</td>
<td>more expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freshness</td>
<td>more fresh</td>
<td>more stale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caching

- Often appears in a hierarchical form
  - OS: registers, L1 cache, L2 cache, memory, disk
  - network: browser cache, web proxy, server cache, backend database

- Benefits
  - reduces the workload
  - reduces the response time
  - reduces the financial cost

Metrics

- Quality metrics
  - freshness: average staleness of the data served by the cache

- Performance metrics
  - hit rate: fraction of total requests that are answered by the cache
  - cost: total processing cost incurred to the backend system
Caching

- Items preferred for caching
  - more popular over time
  - more recently requested

Query Frequency

- Skewed distribution in query frequency
  - Few queries are issued many times (head queries)
  - Many queries are issued rarely (tail queries)
  - Low correlation between the term distributions in the queries and the Web
Inter-Arrival Time

- Skewed distribution in query inter-arrival time
  - low inter-arrival time is for many queries
  - high inter-arrival time for few queries

Caches Available in a Web Search Engine

- Main caches
  - result
  - score
  - intersection
  - posting list
  - document
Caching Techniques

• Static caching
  – built in an offline manner
  – prefers items that are accessed often in the past
  – periodically re-deployed
• Dynamic caching
  – maintained in an online manner
  – prefers items that are recently accessed
  – requires removing items from the cache (eviction)
• Static/dynamic caching
  – shares the cache space between a static and a dynamic cache

Static/Dynamic Caching

- Static cache (capacity: 2)
  - A, D
  - B, C
  - E

- Dynamic cache (capacity: 3)
  - A
  - C
  - F
  - D
  - G

Current Cache:
- A, C, D, F, G

Most frequent:
- A
- C
- E

Most recent:
- D
- B
- E
- A
- F

Static cache was built: A, D
Now: A, C, D, F, G
Techniques Used in Caching

• Admission: items are prevented from being cached

• Prefetching: items are cached before they are requested

• Eviction: items are removed from the cache when it is full

Admission

• Idea: certain items may be prevented from being cached forever or until confidence is gained about their popularity

• Example admission criteria
  – query length
  – query frequency

Minimum frequency threshold for admission: 2
Maximum query length for admission: 4

Query stream: ABC IJKMN ABC ABC XYZ Q XYZ

Query cache

Result cache
Prefetching

- Idea: certain items can be cached before they are actually requested if there is enough confidence that they will be requested in the near future.
- Example use case: result page prefetching

Requested: page 1
Prefetch: page 2 and page 3

Eviction

- Goal: remove items that are not likely to lead to a cache hit from the cache to make space for items that are more useful.
- Ideal policy: evict the item that will be requested in the most distant future.
- Policies: FIFO, LFU, LRU, SLRU
- Most common: LRU
Result Cache Freshness

- In web search engines
  - index is continuously updated or re-built
  - result caches are almost infinite capacity
  - staleness problem

Flushing

- Naïve solution: flushing the cache at regular time intervals
Time-to-Live (TTL)

- Common solution: setting a time-to-live value for each item
- TTL strategies
  - fixed: all items are associated with the same TTL value
  - adaptive: a separate TTL value is set for each item

![Graph showing TTL strategies and their impact on backend query traffic rate and cache performance.]

Result Cache Freshness

- Case I: True positive
  - Results are served by the backend
  - Fresh results
  - No redundant computation
- Case II: False positive
  - Results are served by the backend
  - Fresh results
  - Redundant computation
- Case III: True negative
  - Results are served by the cache
  - Fresh results
  - No redundant computation
- Case IV: False negative
  - Results are served by the cache
  - Stale results
  - No redundant computation
Advanced Solutions

- Cache invalidation: the indexing system provides feedback to the caching system upon an index update so that the caching system can identify the stale results
  - hard to implement
  - incurs communication and computation overheads
  - highly accurate

Advanced Solutions

- Cache refreshing: stale results are predicted and scheduled for re-computation in idle cycles of the backend search system
  - easy to implement
  - little computational overhead
  - not very accurate
Result Cache Refreshing Architecture

SEARCH ENGINE

SEARCH CLUSTER BACKEND

SEARCH CLUSTER FRONTEND

QUERY PREFETCHING MODULE

Impact on a Production System

Hit rate

Time

Hit rate

Time

Hit rate

Time
Result Caching on Multi-site Search Engines

- **Strategies**
  - Local: each search site caches results of queries issued to itself
    - redundant processing of the same query when issued to different sites
  - Global: all sites cache results of all queries
    - overhead of transferring cached query results to all remote sites
  - Partial: query results are cached on relevant sites only
    - trade-off between the local and global approaches
  - Pointer: remote sites maintain only pointers to the site that cached the query results
    - reduces the redundant query processing overhead

Research Problem - Financial Perspective

- **Past work optimizes**
  - hit rate
  - backend workload
- **Optimizing financial cost**
  - result degradation
  - staleness
  - current query traffic
  - peak sustainable traffic
  - current electricity price

![Graph showing query throughput and cost over time with different TTL settings](image)
Key Papers

- Cambazoglu, Junqueira, Plachouras, Banachowski, Cui, Lim, and Bridge, “A refreshing perspective of search engine caching”, WWW, 2010.
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Concluding Remarks

Summary

• Presented a high-level overview of important scalability and efficiency issues in large-scale web search

• Provided a summary of commonly used metrics

• Discussed a number of potential research problems in the field

• Provided references to available software and key research works in literature
**Observations**

- Unlike past research, the current research on scalability is mainly driven by the needs of commercial search engine companies.

- Scalability of web search engines is likely to be a research challenge for some more time (at least, in the near future).

- Lack of hardware resources and large datasets render scalability research quite difficult, especially for researchers in academia.

**Suggestions to Newcomers**

- Follow the trends in the Web, user bases, and hardware parameters to identify the real performance bottlenecks.

- Watch out newly emerging techniques whose primary target is to improve the search quality and think about their impact on search performance.

- Re-use or adapt existing solutions in more mature research fields, such as databases, computer networks, and distributed computing.

- Know the key people in the field (the community is small) and follow their work.
### Important Surveys/Books

- **Web search engine scalability and efficiency**

- **Web crawling**

- **Indexing**

- **Query processing**