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## The Task

Goal 1: Spelling robustness - return correct results even if the user mistyped the query
Goal 2: Precision - return as few as possible irrelevant results

## Difficulties

- User queries are corrected word by word
- Spelling robustness means more complex search queries and more irrelevant matches
- Include the word the user actually meant
- Include as few as possible additional words in the search query
- Results have to be delivered quickly


## Agenda

- Matching
- Ranking


## Lucene's FuzzyQuery (4.x)

- Enables spelling robustness per term
- Searches for top-n terms per user term
- Requires an indexed field as dictionary
- Dictionary comes for free
- Ranks terms by Levenshtein Distance


## What is the Problem?

- By default 50 candidates per term
- Slow query execution
- Inaccurate
- High memory footprint due to CompiledAutomaton
- Candidates sorted by Levenshtein Distance
- Limited customizability due to a lack of information


## How do we solve it?

- Build a custom dictionary and store it in a Lucene FST (Finite State Transducer)
- Meta information can be stored for each term
- No automaton compilation needed
- Flexibility for how to rank candidates



## FST Based Solution

- Spelling corrections ordered using the meta information stored in the FST
- Flexibility on what information to store
- Additional effort to build the FST
- FSTs are intersected with the automaton representing the user term


## How Automaton Intersection Works
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## Implementation

- Intersecting FST with plain Automaton inspired by lucene-suggest's FSTUtil
- Optimizations to reduce object allocations
- No prefix matching
- Each match triggers a hit collector
- Terms scored by their meta information and Levenshtein distance


# Performance ("Avenue Franklin D. Roosevelt") 

FuzzyQuery

- Building automatons
- <1ms
- Compiling automatons
- 2 ms
- Finding terms
- 23ms
- Total
- 26ms

FST Intersection

- Building automatons
- <1ms
- Compiling automatons
- Not needed
- Finding terms
- 12ms
- Total
- 13ms


## Agenda

- Matching
- Ranking


## Term Similarity

- Levenshtein distance minimum number of single-character insertions, deletions or substitutions

Berlin $\rightarrow$ Belgien

$$
\text { Berlin } \rightarrow \text { Belin } \rightarrow \text { Belgin } \rightarrow \text { Belgien }
$$

## Term Similarity

- Phonetic algorithms
words encoded by their pronounciation
- Metaphone (Double Metaphone, Metaphone 3) for English and Germanic languages

Tchaikovsky $\rightarrow$ XKFS
Chaikowski $\rightarrow$ XKFS or XKSK
Chaykovsky $\rightarrow$ XKFS

## Choosing best spelling corrections

Features that we store:

- Term frequency
- Term geo location

Features that we compute:

- Edit distance
- Phonetic distance
- Common typos
- First letter rule


## Choosing best spelling corrections

- Ranking function to score spelling candidates
- Linear weighted function over all the features

$$
f(t)=\sum_{i \in \text { features }} w_{i} * f_{i}
$$

- Train weights
- Take top-n spelling corrections ( $\mathrm{n} \ll 50$ )


## Terms and spelling corrections ("Rue Chance Mailly Clichy")
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## Term co-occurence ("Rue Chance Mailly Clichy")



## Term co-occurence

Features that we store:

- Term co-occurence likelihood
- Same language
- Same context


## Dense subgraph



## Densest at most k subgraph problem

- Extract the subgraph with at most $k$ vertices and maximal density
- NP-complete
- Various definitions of density
- Various approximation algorithms available


## Choosing density function

- Classical definition

$$
f(S)=\frac{\text { number of edges }}{\text { number of nodes }}
$$

- For weighted graphs $f(S)=\frac{\text { number of edges }}{\sum \text { node weights }}$
- Our case

$$
f(S)=f\left(\sum_{S} w_{s}, \sum_{E} w_{e}, N\right)
$$

## Choosing minimum degree vertex

- Classical definition number of edges
- For weighted graphs averaged number of edges


## Greedy 2-approximation algorithm

```
Graph(E, V)
density function f(V), minimum degree vertex selection function min(S)
S = V
while (S not empty) {
    v = min(S)
    remove v from S
    compute f(S)
}
return max f(S)
```

M Charikar. Greedy approximation algorithms for finding dense components in a graph. 2000

## Final Result



## Conclusions

Using FST + Automaton has many advantages:

- performance
- meta information stored for each term
- flexible term ranking

Using ranking/filtering techniques

- minimizes number of terms actually searched for
- comes at a cost of time


## Do you have any questions?
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