



Graph-Based Methods for Multilingual Text and Web Mining

Mark Last

Department of Information Systems Engineering

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

In cooperation with

Horst Bunke (University of Bern)

Abraham Kandel, Adam Schenker (University of South Florida)

Alex Markov, Marina Litvak, Guy Danon (Ben-Gurion University)

E-mail: mlast@bgu.ac.il

Home Page: <u>http://www.bgu.ac.il/~mlast/</u>

Text Mining Day 2009 at BGU, May 25, 2009

Agenda

- Introduction and Motivation
- Graph-Based Representations of Text and Web Documents
- Graph-Based Categorization and Clustering Algorithms
- The Hybrid Approach to Web Document Categorization
- Graph-Based Keyword Extraction
- Summary

INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION



The Vector-Space Model (Salton *et al.*, 1975)

- A text document is considered a "bag of words (terms / features)"
 - Document $d_j = (w_{1j}, ..., w_{|T|j})$ where $T = (t_1, ..., t_{|T|})$ is set of terms (features) that occurs at least once in at least one document (*vocabulary*)
 - Term: *n*-gram, single word, noun phrase, keyphrase, etc.
 - Term weights: binary, frequency-based, etc.
 - Meaningless ("stop") words are removed
 - Stemming operations may be applied
 - Leaders => Leader
 - Expiring => expire
- The ordering and position of words, as well as document logical structure and layout, are completely ignored

Advantages of the Vector-Space Model

(based on Joachims, 2002)

- A simple and straightforward representation for English and other languages, where words have a clear delimiter
- Most weighting schemes require a single scan of each document
- A fixed-size vector representation makes unstructured text accessible to most classification algorithms (from decision trees to SVMs)
- Consistently good results in the information retrieval domain (mainly, on English corpora)

Limitations of the Vector-Space Model

Text documents

- Ignoring the word position in the document
- Ignoring the ordering of words in the document

• Web Documents

Ignoring the information contained in HTML tags (e.g., document sections)

Multilingual documents

- Word separation may be tricky in some languages (e.g., Latin, German, Chinese, etc.)
- No comprehensive evaluation on large non-English corpora



GRAPH-BASED REPRESENTATIONS OF TEXT AND WEB DOCUMENTS

Introduced in Schenker et al., 2005

Relevant Definitions

(Based on Bunke and Kandel, 2000)

•A (labeled) graph G is a 4-tuple $G = (V, E, \alpha, \beta)$ Where

V is a set of nodes (vertices), $E \subseteq V \times V$ is a set of edges connecting the nodes, α is a function labeling the nodes and β is a function labeling the edges.



•Node and edge IDs are omitted for brevity

•Graph size: /G/=/V/+/E/Prof. Mark Last (BGU)

The Graph-Based Model of Web Documents – Basic Ideas

- At most one node for each unique term in a document
 If a word *B* follows a word *A*, there is a directed edge from *A* to *B*
 - Unless the words are separated by certain punctuation marks (periods, question marks, and exclamation points)
- Stop words are removed
- Graph size may be limited by including only the most frequent terms
 - Stemming
 - Alternate forms of the same term (singular/plural, past/present/future tense, etc.) are conflated to the most frequently occurring form
- Several variations for node and edge labeling (see the next slides)

The Standard Representation

Edges are labeled according to the document section where the words are followed by each other

- Title (TI) contains the text related to the document's title and any provided keywords (meta-data);
- Link (L) is the "anchor text" that appears in clickable hyper-links on the document;
- Text (TX) comprises any of the visible text in the document (this includes anchor text but not title and keyword text)



Prof. Mark Last (BGU)

The Simple Representation

The graph is based only the visible text on the page (title and meta-data are ignored)
Edges are not labeled





Other Representations

• The *n*-distance Representation

 Look up to *n* terms ahead and connect the succeeding terms with an edge that is labeled with the distance between them (*n*)

The n-simple Representation

Look up to *n* terms ahead and connect the succeeding terms with an unlabeled edge

The Absolute Frequency Representation

- Each node and edge is labeled with an absolute frequency measure
- The Relative Frequency Representation
 - Each node and edge is labeled with a relative frequency measure



Graph Based Document Representation Example –Source: <u>www.cnn.com</u>, 24/05/2005



<u>lraq bomb: Four dead, 110</u> <u>wounded</u>

A car bomb has exploded outside a popular Baghdad restaurant, killing three Iraqis and wounding more than 110 others, police officials said. Earlier an aide to the office of Iraqi Prime Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari and his driver were killed in a drive-by shooting.

FULL STORY

Graph Based Document Representation - Parsing

title <!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitiona <!-- saved from url=(0023)http://edition.cnn.com/ --> <HTML lang=en><HEAD<</pre>TITLE>CNN.com International <META http-equiv=content-type content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1"> <META http-equiv=refresh content=1800><LINK href="/" rel=Start><LINK</pre> link <DIV class=cnnSectionT1 style="PADDING-RIGHT: 6px; PADDING-LEFT: 6px; PADDING-BOTTOM: PADDING-TOP: 3px"> <H2>Iraq bomb: Four dead, 110 wounded</H2> <P>A car bomb has exploded outside a popular Baghdad restaurant, kulling three Iraqis and wounding more than 110 others, police officials said. Earlier an aide to the office of Iragi Prime Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari and his driver were killed in a drive-by shooting.</P> <P×A class=cnntllink href="http://edition.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/meast/05/23/iranh+ml"spill_t STORY</P> text

Graph Based Document Representation - Preprocessing

TITLE

CNN.com International

Stop word removal

Text

A car bomb exploded outside a popular Baghdad restaurant, killing three Iraqis and wounding more than 110 others, police officials said. Earlier an aide to the office of Iraqi Prime Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari and his driver were killing in a drive-by shooting.

Stemming

Links

Iraq bomb: Four dead, 110 wound FULL STORY.

Graph Based Document Representation - Preprocessing

TITLE CNN.com International

Text

car bomb has exploded outside a popular Baghdad restaurant, killing thee Iraqis and wounding more than 110 , police officials said. Earlier an aide to the office of Iraqis Prime Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari and his driver were killing in a driver shooting.

Links

Iraqis bomb: Four dead, 110 wounding. FULL STORY.

Standard Graph Based Document Representation



Simple Graph Based Document Representation



Based on Schenker et al., 2005

GRAPH-BASED CATEGORIZATION AND CLUSTERING ALGORITHMS

"Lazy" Document Categorization with Graph-Based Models

• The Basic *k*-Nearest Neighbors (*k*-NN) Algorithm

- Input: a set of labeled training documents, a query document d, and a parameter k defining the number of nearest neighbors to use
- Output: a label indicating the category of the query document d
- Step 1. Find the k nearest training documents to d according to a distance measure
- Step 2. Select the category of d to be the category held by the majority of the k nearest training documents
- k-Nearest Neighbors with Graphs (Schenker et al., 2005)
 - Represent the documents as graphs
 - Use a graph-theoretical distance measure

Distance between two Graphs

Required properties

- (1) boundary condition: $d(G_1, G_2) \ge 0$
- (2) identical graphs have zero distance: $d(G_1, G_2)=0 \rightarrow G_1 \cong G_2$
- (3) symmetry: $d(G_1, G_2) = d(G_2, G_1)$
- (4) triangle inequality: $d(G_1, G_3) \le d(G_1, G_2) + d(G_2, G_3)$

Maximum Common Subgraph (mcs)

The graph G is a maximum common subgraph (mcs) if G is a common subgraph of G₁ and G₂ and there exist no other common subgraph G' of G₁ and G₂ such that |G'| > |G|



G₁



G

|G| = |V| + |E| = 2 + 1 = 3



 \mathbf{G}_{2}

May 29, 2009

Minimum Common Supergraph (MCS)

• The graph G is a minimum common supergraph (MCS) if G is a common supergraph of G_1 and G_2 and there exist no other common supergraph G' of G_1 and G_2 such that |G'| < |G|



|G| = |V| + |E| = 4 + 2 = 6



 MMCSN Measure (Schenker et al., 2005): $d_{MMCSN}(G_1, G_2) = 1 - \frac{|mcs(G_1, G_2)|}{|MCS(G_1, G_2)|}$ • $mcs(G_1, G_2)$ - maximum common subgraph $MCS(G_1, G_2)$ - minimum common supergraph В mcs (G_1, G_2) \mathbf{G}_{2} $d_{MMCSN}(G_1, G_2) = 1 - \frac{2+1}{4+5} = 0.667$ С B

Prof. Mark Last (BGU)

 $MCS (G_1, G_2)$

Other Distance Measures

• Bunke and Shearer (1998):

$$d_{MCS}(G_1, G_2) = 1 - \frac{|mcs(G_1, G_2)|}{\max(|G_1|, |G_2|)}$$

• Wallis *et al*. (2001):

$$d_{WGU}(G_1, G_2) = 1 - \frac{|mcs(G_1, G_2)|}{|G_1| + |G_2| - |mcs(G_1, G_2)|}$$

• Bunke (1997):

$$d_{UGU}(G_1, G_2) = |G_1| + |G_2| - 2|mcs(G_1, G_2)|$$

• Fernández and Valiente (2001):

 $d_{MMCS}(G_1, G_2) = |MCS(G_1, G_2)| - |mcs(G_1, G_2)|$

k-Nearest Neighbors with Graphs Sample Accuracy Results (Schenker et al., 2004)

Benchmark Data Set: K-series (Boley *et al.*, 1999) 2,340 web documents from 20 categories Source: English news pages hosted at Yahoo!



k-Nearest Neighbors with Graphs

Average Time to Classify One Document

Method	Average time to classify one document		
Vector (cosine)	7.8 seconds		
Vector (Jaccard)	7.79 seconds		
Graphs, 40 nodes/graph	8.71 seconds		
Graphs, 70 nodes/graph	16.31 seconds		
Graphs, 100 nodes/graph	24.62 seconds		

"Lazy" Document Categorization with Graph-Based Models

Advantages

- Keeps HTML structure information
- Retains original order of words
- Outperforms the vector-space model with several distance measures
- Limitation
 - Can work only with "lazy" classifiers (such as k-NN), which have a very low classification speed
 - Conclusion
 - Graph models cannot be used directly for fast, model-based classification of web documents (e.g., using a decision tree)
- Solution
 - The hybrid approach: represent a document as a <u>vector of</u> <u>sub-graphs</u> (in a few minutes...)

The Graph-Based *k*-Means Clustering Algorithm

- *Inputs*: the set of n data items (represented by graphs) and a parameter k, defining the number of clusters to create
- *Outputs*: the centroids of the clusters (represented by median graphs) and for each data item the cluster (an integer in [1,k]) it belongs to
- Step 1. Assign each data item randomly to a cluster (from 1 to *k*).
- Step 2. Using the initial assignment, determine the median of the set of graphs of each cluster.
- Step 3. Given the new medians, assign each data item to be in the cluster of its closest median, using a graph-theoretic distance measure.
- Step 4. Re-compute the medians as in Step 2. Repeat Steps 3 and 4 until the medians do not change.

Median of a set of graphs S (Bunke et al., 2001) is a graph $g \in S$ such that g has the lowest average distance to all elements in S:

$$g = \arg\min_{\forall s \in S} \left(\frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{i=1}^{|S|} d(s, G_i) \right)$$

Graph-Based Document Clustering

Comparative Evaluation – Dunn Index

 d_{\min} - the minimum distance between any two objects in different clusters

 d_{\max} - the maximum distance between any two items



 d_{\min}

ímin

max

Presented in Markov et al., 2008

THE HYBRID APPROACH TO WEB DOCUMENT CATEGORIZATION

The Hybrid Approach to Document Categorization

(Markov et al., 2006)

- Basic Idea
 - Represent a document as a vector of sub-graphs
 - Categorize documents with a model-based classifier (e.g., a decision tree), which is much faster than a "lazy" method
- Naïve Approach
 - Select sub-graphs that are most frequent in each category
- Smart Approach
 - Select sub-graphs that are more frequent in a specific category than in other categories
- Smart Approach with Fixed Threshold
 - Select sub-graphs that are frequent in a specific category and more frequent than in other categories

Predictive Model Induction with Hybrid Representation (Markov *et al.*, 2006)



Representation of all documents as vectors with Boolean values for every sub-graph in the set

Identification of best attributes (Boolean features) for classification

Finally – prediction model induction and extraction of classification rules

Frequent Subgraph Extraction Example

(based on the FSG algorithm by Kuramochi and Karypis, 2004)



Comparative Evaluation

Benchmark Data Sets

- K-series (Source: Boley et al., 1999)

- 2,340 documents and 20 categories
- Documents in that collection were originally news pages hosted at Yahoo

- U-series (Source: Craven et al., 1998)

- 4167 documents taken from the computer science department of four different universities: Cornell, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin
- 7 major categories: course, faculty, students, project, staff, department, and other
- Known as "WebKB Dataset"

Dictionary construction

 N most frequent words in each document were taken for vector / graph construction, that is, exactly the same words in each document were used for both the graph-based and the bag-of-words representations

Categorization Accuracy and Speed



Prof. Mark Last (BGU)

Percentage of Multi-node Subgraphs



Litvak and Last (2008)

GRAPH-BASED KEYWORD EXTRACTION

Our methodology

• The *keyword* - is a word presenting in the document summary.

- Document representation the "simple" directed graph:
 - Unique nodes non-stop words
 - Unlabeled edges order-relationship
 - A \rightarrow B \Leftrightarrow B appears after A in the same sentence
- Keyword extraction as a first stage of extractive summarization
 - The most salient words ("keywords") are extracted in order to generate a summary.

The "simple" graph-based document representation

Example:

Text

<title> Hurricane Gilbert Heads Toward Dominican Coast </title>

<*TEXT>* Hurricane Gilbert swept toward the Dominican Republic Sunday, and the Civil Defense alerted its heavily populated south coast to prepare for high winds, heavy rains and high seas. The storm was approaching from the southeast with sustained winds of 75 mph gusting to 92 mph. *</TEXT>*



Keyword extraction The supervised approach

 Training a *classification algorithm* on a repository of summarized documents.

 Each node in a document graph belongs to one of two classes:

 YES - the word is included in the document extractive summary

- NO - otherwise.

The Supervised approach (cont.)

The *features* used for nodes classification:

- In Degree number of incoming edges
- Out Degree number of outgoing edges
- Degree total number of edges
- *Frequency* term frequency of the word represented by node
- Frequent words distribution ∈ {0, 1}, equals to 1 iff Frequency ≥ threshold (0.05)
 - *Location Score* an average of location scores between all sentences (S(N)) containing the word N represented by node, where sentence location score is an reciprocal of the sentence location in text (1/i)
- Tfidf Score the tf-idf score of the word represented by node. We used formula: $\frac{tf}{tf+1} \log_2 \frac{|D|}{df}$
- Headline Score $\in \{0, 1\}$, equals to 1 iff document headline contains word represented by node

Feature extraction

Example:

- Node "Dominican":
- In Degree = 2
- Out Degree = 2
- Degree = 4
- *Frequency* = 2/27 = 0.074
- Frequent words distribution
 = 1
- •Location Score = (1/1+1/2)/2 = 0.75•Tfidf Score = $(0.07/1.07)*\log_2(566/2) =$ 0.53

• Headline Score = 1



The unsupervised approach

 Unsupervised text unit extraction in the context of the text summarization task.

 No collection of summarized documents is needed

• We apply the HITS algorithm to document graphs.

HITS Kleinberg, J.M. 1999.

For each node, HITS produces two sets of scores -• an "authority" and a "hub":

$$HITS_A(V_i) = \sum_{V_j \in In(V_i)} HITS_H(V_j) \quad (1)$$
$$HITS_{II}(V_i) = \sum_{V_j \in Out(V_i)} HITS_A(V_j) \quad (2)$$

For the total rank (H) calculation we used the following four functions: $H(V_i) = HITS_A(V_i)$

 $II(V_i) = IIITS_H(V_i)$

 $H(V_i) = avg \{HITS_A(V_i), HITS_H(V_i)\}$

 $H(V_i) - \max \left\{ HITS_A(V_i), HITS_H(V_i) \right\}$

Experimental results

• DUC, 2002 collection:

- 566 English texts along with 2-3 summaries per document on average.
- The size (|V|) of syntactic graphs extracted from these texts is 196 on average, varying from 62 to 876.

Comparison of supervised and unsupervised approaches

Method	71.	Accuracy	TP/Recall	FP	Precision	F-Measure
Supervised	J48	0.847*	0.203	0.022	0.648	0.309
	NaiveBayes	0.839*	0.099	0.011	0.648	0.172
	SMO	0.839*	0.053	0.002	0.867	0.100
Unsupervised	N = 10	0.813	0.186	0.031	0.602	0.282
	N = 20	0.799	0.296	0.080	0.480	0.362
	N = 3 0	0.772	0.377	0.138	0.409	0.388
	N = 40	0.739	0.440	0.200	0.360	0.392
	N = 50	0.703	0.494	0.264	0.324	0.387
	N = 60	0.667	0.548	0.328	0.299	0.383
	N = 70	0.626	0.587	0.383	0.276	0.372
	N = 80	0.580	0.612	0.429	0.252	0.354
	N = 90	0.533	0.629	0.460	0.230	0.334
	N = 100	0.485	0.628	0.476	0.208	0.310
	N = 110	0.439	0.626	0.490	0.188	0.287
	N = 120	0.391	0.601	0.480	0.166	0.258

- We consider unsupervised model based on extracting top N ranked words for different values of $10 \le N \le 120$.
- Set from top 2 features: Frequent words distribution and In Degree is used for NBC



Selected Publications

- A. Schenker, M. Last, H. Bunke, A. Kandel, "Classification of Web Documents Using Graph Matching", *International Journal of Pattern Recognition and Artificial Intelligence*, Special Issue on Graph Matching in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Vol. 18, No. 3, 2004, pp. 475-496.
- A. Schenker, H. Bunke, M. Last, A. Kandel, "Graph-Theoretic Techniques for Web Content Mining", *World Scientific*, 2005.
- A. Markov, M. Last, "A Simple, Structure-Sensitive Approach for Web Document Classification", *Atlantic Web Intelligence Conference (AWIC2005)*, Lodz, Poland, June 2005.
- A. Markov, M. Last, and A. Kandel, "Fast Categorization of Web Documents Represented by Graphs", in Advances in Web Mining and Web Usage Analysis, O. Nasraoui, *et al.* (Eds), *Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science (LNCS/LNAI)*, Vol. 4811, 2007, pp. 56-71.
- A. Markov, M. Last, and A. Kandel, "The Hybrid Representation Model for Web Document Classification", *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, Vol. 23, No. 6, pp. 654-679, 2008.
- M. Litvak and M. Last, "Graph-Based Keyword Extraction for Single-Document Summarization", *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Multi-source, Multilingual Information Extraction and Summarization (MMIES2)*, Manchester, UK, August 23, 2008, pp. 17–24.

Future Research

- Enhancing graph representations of text and web documents
 - Utilizing POS tagging
 - Concept fusion based on available ontologies
 - Implementing graph representations for more languages
 - Identification of the most relevant sections in long documents, online forums, etc.
- Cross-lingual summarization of text documents
- Topic detection and tracking in the web content
- Opinion and sentiment mining





