

# A Position-Aware Deep Model for Relevance Matching in Information Retrieval

Kai Hui

Max Planck Institute for Informatics  
Saarbrücken Graduate School of Computer Science  
Saarbrücken, Germany  
khui@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Klaus Berberich

Max Planck Institute for Informatics  
htw saar  
Saarbrücken, Germany  
kberberi@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Andrew Yates

Max Planck Institute for Informatics  
Saarbrücken, Germany  
ayates@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Gerard de Melo

Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, New Jersey  
gdm@demelo.org

## ABSTRACT

In order to adopt deep learning for information retrieval, models are needed that can capture all relevant information required to assess the relevance of a document to a given user query. While previous works have successfully captured unigram term matches, how to fully employ position-dependent information such as proximity and term dependencies has been insufficiently explored. In this work, we propose a novel neural IR model named *PACRR* (*Position-Aware Convolutional-Recurrent Relevance Matching*), aiming at better modeling position-dependent interactions between a query and a document via convolutional layers as well as recurrent layers. Extensive experiments on six years' TREC Web Track data confirm that the proposed model yields better results under different benchmarks.

## CCS CONCEPTS

•Information systems →Retrieval models and ranking; *Web searching and information discovery*;

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Despite the widespread use of deep neural models across a range of linguistic tasks, whether such models can improve information retrieval (IR) and what components an IR retrieval model should include remain open questions. In standard ad-hoc IR, the goal is to produce a ranking of relevant documents given an open-domain (“ad hoc”) query and a document collection. Many early neural IR models can be categorized as *semantic matching* models, as they embed both queries and documents into a low-dimensional space, and then compute matching signals based on such dense representations, often via cosine similarity. Examples in this regard include *DSSM* [8] and *C-DSSM* [18]. The notion of relevance is inherently asymmetric, however, making it different from well-studied semantic matching tasks such as semantic relatedness and paraphrase

detection. Instead, *relevance matching* models such as MatchPyramid [14] and DRMM [6] resemble traditional IR retrieval measures in that they directly consider the relevance of the document contents with respect to the query. The two classes of models are fairly distinct, and in this work we focus on relevance matching models. The more recent Duet model [13] is a hybrid approach that combines signals from a local model for relevance matching and a distributed model for semantic matching.

Given that relevance matching approaches mirror ideas from traditional retrieval models, the decades of research on ad-hoc IR can guide us with regard to the specific kinds of relevance signals a model ought to capture. Unigram matches are the most obvious signals to be modeled, as a counterpart to the term frequencies that appear in almost all traditional retrieval models. Beyond this, positional information, including where query terms occur and how they depend on each other, can also be exploited, as demonstrated in retrieval models that are aware of term proximity [19] and term dependencies [9, 12]. Query coverage is another factor that can be used to ensure that, for queries with multiple terms, documents contain different query terms rather than emphasizing only one query term. For example, given the query “dogs adoption requirements”, unigram matching signals correspond to the occurrences of the individual terms “dogs”, “adoption” or “requirements”. When considering positional information, text passages with “dogs adoption” or “requirement of dog adoption” are highlighted, distinguishing them from text that only includes individual terms. Query coverage, meanwhile, further emphasizes that matching signals for “dogs”, “adoption” and “requirements” should all be included in a document.

Unigram signals are directly taken as input by DRMM [6] and subsequently summarized as histograms. The experiments in [6] suggest that DRMM compares favorably to previously proposed Neural IR retrieval models, and that unigram matching signals are well-exploited. As for positional information, both the MatchPyramid [14] and local Duet [13] models account for it by incorporating convolutional layers based on similarity matrices between queries and documents. Although this leads to more complex models, MatchPyramid performs significantly worse than DRMM [6], while Duet’s local model performs similarly to DRMM [13]. This indicates the difficulty of going beyond unigrams to utilize positional

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

*arXiv preprint*, 2017

© 2017 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

information in deep neural IR models. Intuitively, unlike in standard sequence-based models, the interactions between a query and a document are sequential along the query axis as well as along the document axis, making the problem multi-dimensional in nature. In addition, this makes it non-trivial to combine matching signals from different parts of the documents and over different query terms. In fact, we argue that both MatchPyramid and local Duet models fail to fully account for one or more of the aforementioned factors. For example, MatchPyramid’s pooling sizes disregard the query dimensions, thus neglecting query coverage. Meanwhile, local Duet’s CNN filters match entire documents against individual query terms, but neglect proximity and possible dependencies among different query terms. To address these shortcomings, we conjecture that a suitable combination of convolutional kernels and recurrent layers can lead to a model that better accounts for these factors. In particular, we present a novel re-ranking model called *PACRR* (*Position-Aware Convolutional-Recurrent Relevance Matching*). Our approach first produces similarity matrices that record the semantic similarity between each query term and each individual term occurring in a document. These matrices are then fed through a series of convolutional, max-k-pooling, and recurrent layers so as to capture interactions corresponding to, for instance, bigram and trigram matches, and finally to aggregate the signals in order to produce global relevance assessments. In our model, the convolutional layers are designed to capture both unigram matching and position information over text windows with different lengths; k-max pooling layers are along the query dimension, preserving matching signals over different query terms; a recurrent layer combines signals from different query terms to produce a query-document relevance score.

**Organization.** The rest of this paper unfolds as follows. Section 2 describes our approach for computing similarity matrices and the architecture of our deep learning model. The setup and results of our extensive experimental evaluation can be found in Section 3. We discuss related works in Section 4, before concluding in Section 5.

## 2 METHOD

We now describe our novel *PACRR* approach, which consists of two main parts: a relevance matching component that converts each query-document pair into a similarity matrix  $sim_{|q|\times|d|}$  and a deep architecture that takes a given query-document similarity matrix as input and produces a query-document relevance score  $rel(q, d)$ . The pipeline is summarized in Figure. 1. First, the relevance matching component transforms each query  $q$  and document  $d$  into a query-document similarity matrix  $sim_{|q|\times|d|}$  by comparing each query term to each document term and recording the similarity scores. Given such a similarity matrix, our deep model then applies convolutional (CNN) layers to compare query n-grams with document n-grams, followed by max pooling operations to identify the strongest signals for each query term and n-gram size. Finally, a recurrent (RNN) layer aggregates the available relevance signals across different query terms into an overall query-document relevance score  $rel(q, d)$ .


### 2.1 Relevance Matching

We propose encoding the query-document relevance matching via query-document similarity matrices  $sim_{|q|\times|d|}$  that encode the similarity between query and document terms. In particular, given a document  $d$  and a query  $q$ , the similarity between every term pair from  $d$  and  $q$  is encoded as a similarity matrix  $sim_{|q|\times|d|}$ , where  $sim_{ij}$  corresponds to the similarity between the  $i$ -th term from the query  $q$  and the  $j$ -th term from the document  $d$ . When using cosine similarity, we have  $sim \in [-1, 1]^{|q|\times|d|}$ . Our similarity matrix approach retains a richer signal than the similarity histogram approach used in prior work [6], which is limited to performing relevance matching against unigrams. Our matrices preserve both n-gram relevance signals and query coverage information. In particular, n-gram matching corresponds to consecutive document terms that are highly similar to at least one of the query terms, while query coverage is reflected in the number of rows in  $sim$  that include at least one cell with high similarity. As in [6], the similarity between a query term  $q$  and document term  $d$  is calculated by taking the cosine similarity between the terms’ *word2vec* vectors.

The subsequent processing in *PACRR*’s convolutional layers requires that each query-document similarity matrix have the same dimensionality. Given that the lengths of queries and documents vary, we first transform the raw similarity matrices  $sim_{|q|\times|d|}$  into  $sim_{l_q\times l_d}$  matrices with uniform  $l_q$  and  $l_d$  as the number of rows and columns. We unify the query dimension  $l_q$  by zero padding it to the maximum query length. With regard to the document dimension  $l_d$ , we describe two strategies: *firstk* and *kwindow*.

***PACRR-firstk*.** The simplest approach is to zero pad the document dimension of each similarity matrix to the maximum document length. Akin to [13], the *firstk* distillation method simply keeps the first  $k$  columns in the matrix, which correspond to the first  $k$  terms in the document. If  $k > |d|$  the remaining columns are zero padded. The *firstk* method is equivalent to zero padding if  $k$  is set to the maximum document length.

***PACRR-kwindow*.** As mentioned in [6], relevance matching is local. Document terms that have a low query similarity relative to a document’s other terms cannot contribute to the document relevance score, so ignoring them has no effect on the final relevance score. Put differently, relevance matching can be extracted in terms of phrases, sentences or pieces of text that include relevant information. Therefore, one can segment the documents according to relevance relative to the given query, only retaining the text that is highly relevant to the given query. Given this observation, we prune query-document similarity cells with a low similarity score. In the case of unigrams, we simply choose the top  $l_d$  terms with the highest similarity to query terms. In the case of n-grams, we produce a similarity matrix  $sim_{l_q\times l_d}^n$  for each query-document pair and each n-gram size, because the n-gram size must be considered when the top n-term windows are chosen. For each n-term window in the document, *kwindow* calculates the maximum similarity between each term and the query terms, and then calculates the average similarity over each n-term window. It then selects the top  $k = \lfloor l_d/n \rfloor$  windows by average similarity and discards all other terms in the document. The document dimension is zero padded if  $\lfloor l_d/n \rfloor$  is not a multiple of  $k$ . When the convolutional layer later



**Figure 1: The pipeline of PACRR.** The relevance matching component first transforms each query  $q$  and document  $d$  into a query-document similarity matrix  $sim_{|q| \times |d|}$ . Next, a distillation method transforms the raw similarity matrix into a similarity matrix with unified dimensions  $sim_{l_q \times l_d}$ . The *firstk* distillation method is displayed, and the same unified similarity matrix is used for all  $n$ -gram sizes.  $l_g - 1$  convolutional layers (CNN) are applied to the distilled similarity matrices,  $l_g = 3$  is displayed thus CNN with kernel size 2 and 3 are applied. Next, max pooling is applied, ending up with  $l_g$  matrices  $C^1 \dots C^{l_g}$ . Following this,  $n_s$ -max pooling captures the strongest  $n_s$  signals over each query term and  $n$ -gram size, and the case when  $n_s = 2$  is displayed. Finally, the similarity signals from different  $n$ -gram sizes are concatenated together, the query terms' normalized IDFs are added, and a recurrent layer combines these signals for each query term into a query-document relevance score  $rel(q, d)$ .

operates on a similarity matrix produced by *kwindow*, the model's stride is set to  $n$  (i.e., the sliding window moves ahead  $n$  terms at a time rather than one term at a time) so that it only considers consecutive  $n$ -grams that were present in the original document. This variant's output is a similarity matrix  $sim_{l_q \times l_d}^n$  for each  $n$ -gram size. These matrices support  $n$ -gram relevance matching by retaining the context around each high-similarity term.

**Distillation example.** Suppose that we target  $l_d = 4$  and  $l_q = 3$ , given a two term query and a document with six terms. The similarity is computed among query-document term pairs, resulting in a corresponding  $sim_{2 \times 6}$  similarity matrix such as

$$sim_{|q| \times |d|} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.2 & 0 \\ 0.1 & -0.1 & -0.5 & 0.8 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Regardless of the chosen strategy, we zero pad the query dimension because  $l_q > |q|$ . The *firstk* variant then distills the similarity matrix by simply taking the first  $l_d$  columns regardless of the  $n$ -gram size:

$$sim_{l_q \times l_d} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0 & 0.7 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & -0.1 & -0.5 & 0.8 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

We first illustrate the output of *kwindow* in the unigram case (i.e.,  $n = 1$ ). Recall that each column corresponds to a document term. Thus the max similarity for each document term is  $[0.9, 0, 0.7, 0.8, 0.2, 0]$ . We have  $l_d = 4$ , so the columns corresponding to the top four terms are kept and the rest discarded. This results in the document columns 1, 3, 4, and 5 being retained:

$$sim_{l_q \times l_d}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.9 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.2 \\ 0.1 & -0.5 & 0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

In the  $n$ -gram case, we must preserve  $n$ -term windows. Suppose we set  $n = 2$ . Taking the max query term similarity for each document

term and using it to calculate the average similarity over each two term window, we obtain  $[0.45, 0.35, 0.75, 0.5, 0.1]$ .  $\lfloor l_d/n \rfloor = 2$ , so the top two windows are selected for inclusion in the similarity matrix. These correspond to the windows beginning at positions 3 and 4:

$$sim_{l_q \times l_d}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.2 \\ -0.5 & 0.8 & 0.8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Note that the term in position 4 of the original similarity matrix appears twice; this preserves the  $n$ -grams encountered in the original similarity matrix. The window over positions 3 and 4 corresponds to the first occurrence of term 4, and the window over positions 4 and 5 accounts for the second occurrence of term 4. While the term in position 1 of the original similarity matrix has the highest similarity of any query term (0.9), it is not useful for  $n$ -gram matching because the window that includes this term has a comparably low similarity. It will still be considered by the model, however, because it is present in the unigram matrix.

## 2.2 Deep Retrieval Model

Given a query-document similarity matrix  $sim_{l_q \times l_d}$  as input, our deep architecture then relies on convolutional layers to match query  $n$ -grams and document  $n$ -grams to produce a similarity signal for each query term, document term, and  $n$ -gram size  $n$ . Subsequently, max pooling layers extract the document's strongest similarity cue for each query term and each  $n$ . Finally, a recurrent layer aggregates these individual query term signals to predict a global query-document relevance score  $rel(q, d)$ .

**Convolutional  $n$ -gram relevance matching.** The purpose of this step is to match query  $n$ -grams with document  $n$ -grams given a query-document similarity matrix as input. This is accomplished by applying multiple two-dimensional convolutional layers with

different kernel sizes to the input similarity matrix. Each convolutional layer is responsible for a specific n-gram size; by applying its kernel on  $n \times n$  windows, it produces a similarity signal for each window. When the *firstk* method is used, each convolutional layer receives the same similarity matrix  $sim_{l_q \times l_d}$  as input because *firstk* produces the same similarity matrix regardless of the n-gram size. When the *kwindow* method is used, each convolutional layer receives a similarity matrix  $sim_{l_q \times l_d}^n$  corresponding to the convolutional layer’s n-gram size. We use  $l_g - 1$  different convolutional layers with kernel sizes  $2 \times 2, 3 \times 3, \dots, l_g \times l_g$ , corresponding to bi-gram, tri-gram,  $\dots$ ,  $l_g$ -gram matching, respectively, where the maximum n-gram size to consider is governed by a hyper-parameter  $l_g$ . The original similarity matrix corresponds to unigram matching, while a convolutional layer with kernel size  $n \times n$  is responsible for capturing n-gram matching for an  $n \times n$  square within  $sim_{l_q \times l_d}^n$ . Each convolutional layer applies  $n_f$  different filters to its input, where  $n_f$  is another hyper-parameter. We use a stride of size (1, 1) for the *firstk* distillation method, meaning that the convolutional kernel advances one step at a time in both the query and document dimensions. For the *kwindow* distillation method, we use a stride of (1,  $n$ ) to move the convolutional kernel one step at a time in the query dimension, but  $n$  steps at a time in the document dimension. This ensures that the convolutional kernel only operates over consecutive terms that existed in the original document. Thus, we end up with  $l_g - 1$  matrices  $C_{l_q \times l_d \times n_f}^n$ , where  $n$  indicates the corresponding n-gram size. The original similarity matrix will be used to handle unigrams.

**Max pooling.** The purpose of this step is to capture the  $n_s$  strongest similarity signals for each query term. Measuring the similarity signal separately for each query term allows the model to consider query term coverage, while capturing the  $n_s$  strongest similarity signals for each query term allows the model to consider signals from different kinds of relevance matching pattern, e.g., n-gram matching and non-contiguous matching. In practice, we use a small  $n_s$  to prevent the model from being biased by document length; while each similarity matrix contains the same number of document term scores, longer documents have more opportunities to contain terms that are similar to query terms. To capture the strongest  $n_s$  similarity signals for each query term, we first perform max pooling over the filter dimension  $n_f$  to keep only the strongest signal from the  $n_f$  different filters. We then perform k-max pooling [11] over the query dimension  $l_q$  (corresponding to rows in the original similarity matrix) to keep the strongest  $n_s$  similarity signals for each query term. Both pooling steps are performed on each of the  $l_g - 1$  matrices  $C^i$  from the convolutional layer (corresponding to each n-gram size) and on the original similarity matrix (corresponding to unigrams) to produce the 3-dimensional tensor  $\mathcal{P}_{l_q \times l_g \times n_s}$ . This tensor contains the  $n_s$  strongest similarity signals for each query term and for each n-gram size across all  $n_f$  filters.

**Recurrent layer for global relevance.** Finally, our model transforms the query term similarity signals in  $\mathcal{P}_{l_q \times l_g \times n_s}$  into a single document relevance score  $rel(q, d)$ . It achieves this by applying a recurrent layer to  $\mathcal{P}$ , taking a sequence of vectors (i.e., one vector per query term) as input and learning weights to transform them into the final relevance score. In more detail, we first calculate the

IDF of each query term  $q_i$  on the document collection and pass the IDFs through a softmax layer to normalize them relative to each other. Next, we split up the query term dimension to produce a matrix  $\mathcal{P}_{l_g \times n_s}$  for each query term  $q_i$ . Finally, we form the recurrent layer’s input by flattening each matrix  $\mathcal{P}_{l_g \times n_s}$  into a vector by concatenating the matrix’s rows together and appending query term  $q_i$ ’s normalized IDF onto the end of the vector. This sequence of vectors for each query term  $q_i$  is passed into a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) recurrent layer [7] with an output dimensionality of one. That is, the LSTM’s input is a sequence of query term vectors where each vector is composed of the query term’s normalized IDF and the similarity signals for the unigram case and for each n-gram size. The LSTM’s output is then used as our document relevance score  $rel(q, d)$ .

**Training objective and prediction.** Our model is trained on triples consisting of a query  $q$ , relevant document  $d^+$ , and non-relevant document  $d^-$  using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) to minimize a loss function. We use a standard pairwise max margin loss as in Eq. 1.


$$\mathcal{L}(q, d^+, d^-; \Theta) = \max(0, 1 - rel(q, d^+) + rel(q, d^-)) \quad (1)$$

At each training step, we perform SGD on a mini-batch of 32 triples. For the purpose of choosing the triples, we consider all documents that are judged with a label more relevant than  $Rel^1$  as *highly relevant*, and put the remaining relevant documents into a *relevant* group. To pick each triple, we sample a relevance group with probability proportional to the number of documents in the group within the training set, and then we randomly sample a document with the chosen label to serve as the positive document  $d^+$ . If the chosen group is the highly relevant group, we randomly sample a document from the relevant group to serve as the negative document  $d^-$ . If the chosen group is the relevant group, we randomly sample a non-relevant document as  $d^-$ . This sampling procedure ensures that we differentiate between highly relevant documents (i.e., those with a relevance label of *HRel*, *Key* or *Nav*) and relevant documents (i.e., those are labeled as *Rel*). The training continues until a given number of epochs is reached. The model is saved at every epoch. We use the model with the best  $Err@20$  on the validation set to make predictions.

### 3 EVALUATION

In this section, we empirically evaluate our novel *PACRR* models using manual relevance judgments by re-ranking search results from the standard TREC Web Track. We compare them against both traditional query-likelihood (*QL*) and the current state-of-the-art deep retrieval models: *DRMM* [6], *Duet* [13], and *MatchPyramid* [14]. As our focus is on the deep relevance matching model as mentioned in Section 1, we only compare against *Duet*’s local model, denoted as *Duet-local*. To put our model in context, we follow previous work in re-ranking search results from query-likelihood relevance models akin to [6]. Additionally, we scrutinize the models in more detail by re-ranking a wide range of runs from Trec Web Track participants from 2009–14. In practice, individual runs only cover a small subset of judged documents. Thus, we further provide a

<sup>1</sup>Judgments from TREC include junk pages (*Junk*), non-relevance (*NRel*), relevance (*Rel*), high relevance (*HRel*), key pages (*Key*) and navigational pages (*Nav*).



**Figure 2: The loss on training data and the Expected reciprocal rank (Err@20) and nDCG@20 per epoch on validation data when training on Web Track 2010–14. The x-axis denotes the epoch. The y-axis indicates the Err@20/nDCG@20 on the left and the training loss on the right. The best performance appears on 109th epoch with Err@20=0.242. The lowest loss (0.767) on the training data occurs after 118 epochs.**

further examination of predictions based on all available judgments by deriving pairwise comparisons between documents from Trec judgments.

### 3.1 Experimental Setup

We rely on the 2009–2014 TREC Web Track ad-hoc task benchmarks<sup>2</sup>, which are widely used in the IR community. The benchmarks are based on the CLUEWEB09 and CLUEWEB12 datasets as document collections. In total, there are 300 queries and more than 100k judgments (qrels). Three years (2012–14) of query-likelihood baselines (Terrier version) provided by TREC<sup>3</sup> serve as baseline runs in Section 3.2. In particular, two runs based on *QL* in each year are used: one based on all documents, referred to as *QL-ALL*, and one that relies on spam-filtering before ranking, referred to as *QL-NOSPAM* [5]. In Section 3.3, the search results from runs submitted by participants from each year are also employed: there are 71 (2009), 55 (2010), 62 (2011), 48 (2012), 50 (2013), and 27 (2014) runs. Err@20 [4] and nDCG@20 [10] serve as evaluation measures, and both are computed with the script from TREC<sup>4</sup>.

**Training.** All models are trained and tested based on years in a robin manner, fully utilizing the judged data, and making each year as unit to make comparison, as a result of the fact that the runs from TREC employed for re-ranking are on a per-year basis. For better comparisons and a more fine-grained analysis, we evaluate each year of TREC data separately. In particular, the available judgments are considered in accordance with the individual years of the Web Track, with 50 queries per year. Proceeding in a round-robin order, we report test results on one year by exploiting the respective remaining five years (250 queries) for training. From these 250 queries, we reserve 50 random queries as a held-out set for validation and hyper-parameter tuning, while the remaining 200

queries serve as the actual training set. As mentioned in Section 2, model parameters and training epochs are chosen by maximizing the Err@20 on the validation set. The selected model is then used to make predictions on the separate test data. One example for this training procedure is displayed in Figure 2. There are four hyper-parameters that govern the behavior of the proposed *PACRR-kwindow* and *PACRR-firstk*: the unified length of the document dimension  $l_d$ , the k-max pooling size  $n_s$ , the maximum n-gram size  $l_g$ , and the number of filters used in convolutional layers  $n_f$ . Due to limited computational resources, we determine the range of hyper-parameters to try based on pilot experiments and domain intuitions. In particular, we evaluate  $l_d \in [256, 384, 512, 640, 768]$ ,  $n_s \in [1, 2, 3, 4]$  and  $l_g \in [2, 3, 4]$ . Given the limited possible matching patterns given a small kernel size, e.g.,  $l_g = 3$ , the  $n_f$  is fixed to 32. For *PACRR-firstk*, we intuitively desire to retain as much information as possible from the input, and thus the  $l_d$  is always set to 768. The *DRMM* (*DRMM<sub>LCH×IDF</sub>*), the *Duet-local*, as well as the *MatchPyramid* [14] are trained similarly. For the purposes of choosing the triples, we group the relevance labels *HRel*, *Key*, and *Nav* into a *highly relevant* group and the relevance label *Rel* into a *relevant* group.

### 3.2 Re-Ranking Query-Likelihood Results

We first examine the proposed model by re-ranking the search results from the *QL* baselines from TREC, which are only available on 2012–14. The results are summarized in Table 1. As reported in [6], *DRMM* significantly outperforms *QL-ALL* on WT12 and WT14. However, it only performs significantly better on WT12 when re-ranking *QL-NOSPAM*. Overall, we observe a 32% improvement on average with *DRMM* relative to either *QL* baseline. Meanwhile, *Duet-local* and *MatchPyramid* performs close to *DRMM* on all years. As for the proposed models, we observe significant improvements with *PACRR-kwindow* on all three years when re-ranking *QL-ALL*, and significant improvements on 2012 and 2013 when re-ranking *QL-NOSPAM*, whereas *PACRR-firstk* improves both runs on all three years. More remarkably, by solely re-ranking the search results from *QL-ALL*, *PACRR-firstk* can already rank within the top-3 participating systems on all three years; and the re-ranked search results from *PACRR-kwindow* is also ranked within the top-5 based on nDCG@20. Moreover, from Table 1, when mixing the results from *QL-ALL* and *QL-NOSPAM* together, both *PACRR-kwindow* and *PACRR-firstk* provide around 60% improvements on average among years.

### 3.3 Re-Ranking Search Results

Different models based on different methodologies lead to different initial document rankings, and *QL* is only one of them. In this section, we would like to examine the performance of the proposed models in re-ranking different sets of search results. Thus, we extend our analysis to re-rank search results from all submitted runs in six years of the TREC Web Track ad-hoc task. In particular, we only consider the judged documents from TREC, which loosely corresponds to top-20 documents in each run. The tested models make predictions for individual documents, which are used to re-rank the documents within each submitted run. Given that there are about 50 runs for each year, it is no longer feasible to list the


<sup>2</sup><http://trec.nist.gov/tracks.html>

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/trec-web/trec-web-2014>

<sup>4</sup><http://trec.nist.gov/data/web/12/gdeval.pl>

**Table 1: Err@20 and nDCG@20 on TREC Web Track 2012–14 when re-ranking search results from QL. The comparisons are conducted in between two variants of PACRR and DRMM (D/d), Duet-local (L/l), as well as MatchPyramid (M/m). And all methods are compared against original QL (Q/q) baseline. The upper/lower-case characters in the brackets indicate a significant difference under two-tailed paired Student’s t-tests at 95% or 90% confidence levels relative to the corresponding approach. For example, in wt12 the PACRR-firstsk method significantly outperforms all four baselines at 95% confidence levels when using nDCG@20. In addition, the relative ranks among all runs within the respective years according to Err@20 and nDCG@20 are also reported directly after the absolute scores.**

Measure		Year	PACRR-firstsk	Rank	PACRR-kwindow	Rank	Duet-local	Rank	DRMM	Rank	MatchPyramid	Rank	QL	Rank
QL-ALL	Err@20	wt12	0.318 ( <i>mQ</i> )	2	0.313 ( <i>MQ</i> )	4	0.281 ( <i>Q</i> )	10	0.289 ( <i>Q</i> )	10	0.227	16	0.177	26
		wt13	0.166 ( <i>DQ</i> )	3	0.139 ( <i>Q</i> )	14	0.147 ( <i>Q</i> )	12	0.124	25	0.141 ( <i>q</i> )	13	0.101	38
		wt14	0.221 ( <i>LMQ</i> )	2	0.208 ( <i>Q</i> )	3	0.179 ( <i>Q</i> )	12	0.193 ( <i>Q</i> )	10	0.176 ( <i>Q</i> )	12	0.131	25
	nDCG@20	wt12	0.243 ( <i>DLMQ</i> )	2	0.250 ( <i>DLMQ</i> )	2	0.186 ( <i>Q</i> )	11	0.197 ( <i>Q</i> )	8	0.164 ( <i>Q</i> )	16	0.106	39
		wt13	0.295 ( <i>DLQ</i> )	3	0.279 ( <i>DQ</i> )	4	0.248 ( <i>q</i> )	11	0.228	20	0.258 ( <i>Q</i> )	7	0.190	36
		wt14	0.339 ( <i>LMQ</i> )	1	0.331 ( <i>LMQ</i> )	1	0.267 ( <i>q</i> )	11	0.300 ( <i>Q</i> )	6	0.278 ( <i>Q</i> )	10	0.231	23
QL-NOSPAM	Err@20	wt12	0.334 ( <i>DMQ</i> )	2	0.300 ( <i>DmQ</i> )	7	0.286 ( <i>q</i> )	10	0.239	16	0.235	16	0.190	25
		wt13	0.143 ( <i>DQ</i> )	13	0.124 ( <i>Q</i> )	25	0.133 ( <i>DQ</i> )	14	0.105 ( <i>LM</i> )	35	0.133 ( <i>DQ</i> )	15	0.095	46
		wt14	0.213 ( <i>mQ</i> )	2	0.193	10	0.179	12	0.188	11	0.178	12	0.159	21
	nDCG@20	wt12	0.240 ( <i>DLMQ</i> )	2	0.229 ( <i>DLMQ</i> )	3	0.178 ( <i>q</i> )	12	0.184 ( <i>Q</i> )	11	0.163	16	0.132	24
		wt13	0.261 ( <i>DQ</i> )	7	0.241 ( <i>Q</i> )	14	0.232 ( <i>Q</i> )	19	0.212 ( <i>m</i> )	25	0.245 ( <i>dQ</i> )	14	0.180	40
		wt14	0.295 ( <i>dL</i> )	7	0.287 ( <i>d</i> )	9	0.254	17	0.253	17	0.268	11	0.261	14



**Figure 3: Re-ranking search results from Trec Web Track 2009–14 runs with PACRR-kwindow, PACRR-firstsk, DRMM, Duet-local and MatchPyramid respectively. The x-axis represents the ranking score of the original TREC runs and the y-axis represents the score of the corresponding re-ranked runs. The dashed line is  $y=x$ . Err@20 is used in the upper row and nDCG@20 is used in the lower row.**

measure scores for each re-ranked run. Thus, we summarize the results by comparing the performance of each run before and after re-ranking as in Figure 3. We also provide concrete statistics over each year to compare the methods under consideration in Table 2. In Figure 3, each column corresponds to one year and the top row is based on Err@20, while the six plots at the bottom are based on nDCG@20. The axes represent the metric scores before (x-axis) and after (y-axis) re-ranking. The dashed line separating them is  $y = x$ , indicating when no change is observed from the re-ranking. Therefore, the points in the upper left correspond to the ones showing improved performance when re-ranking, and vice versa for the lower right region. In Table 2, we provide statistics for the relative changes of measures before and after re-ranking and report them

in terms of percentages (“average  $\Delta$  measure score”). The number of systems whose results on individual years has increased after re-ranking with a tested model is reported in the bottom part of Table 2. Note that these results assess two different aspects: the average  $\Delta$  measure score in Table 2 captures the degree to which a model can improve an initial run, while the number of runs indicate to what extent an improvement can be achieved across different systems. In other words, the former measures the strength of the models, and the latter demonstrates the adaptability of the models. We first consider the bottom left three plots in Figure 3, corresponding to results on 2009–11 under nDCG@20, similar to the ones reported in [6]. It can be observed that all baselines perform fare well. For example, the nDCG@20 of QL from [6] is 0.224 (cf. Table 2

**Table 2: The average statistics when re-ranking all runs from the TREC Web Track 2009–14 based on Err@20 and nDCG@20. The average differences of the measure score for individual runs are reported in the 1st part. The comparisons are conducted in between two variants of PACRR and DRMM (D/d), Duet-local (L/l), as well as MatchPyramid (M/m). The upper/lower-case characters in the brackets indicate a significant difference under two-tailed paired Student’s t-tests at 95% or 90% confidence levels relative to the corresponding approach. For example, in wt12 the PACRR-firstk method significantly outperforms all three baselines at 95% confidence levels when using both measures. The number of runs that show improvements in terms of a measure is summarized at the bottom.**

Tested Methods	Measures	year	wt09	wt10	wt11	wt12	wt13	wt14	
		# total runs	71	55	62	50	52	29	
average $\Delta$ measure score over each year (%): $\frac{\text{re-rank score} - \text{original score}}{\text{original score}}$	Err@20	PACRR-firstk	66% (DL)	362% (dm)	43% (DLM)	76% (DLM)	37% (DLM)	41% (DLM)	
		PACRR-kwindow	70% (DLm)	393% (DIM)	10% (LM)	83% (DLM)	21% (DLM)	36% (DLM)	
		Duet-local	80% (DM)	316%	15% (DM)	64% (M)	26% (DM)	19% (M)	
		DRMM	54% (LM)	315%	11% (LM)	61% (M)	5% (LM)	19% (M)	
	nDCG@20	MatchPyramid	65% (DL)	313%	2% (DL)	48% (DL)	29% (DL)	14% (DL)	
		PACRR-firstk	69% (DLM)	304% (LM)	56% (DLM)	100% (DLM)	31% (DLM)	31% (DLM)	
		PACRR-kwindow	63% (Dm)	345% (DLM)	27% (DLM)	113% (DLM)	23% (DL)	30% (DLM)	
		Duet-local	62% (DM)	237% (D)	17% (DM)	55% (DM)	17% (DM)	10% (DM)	
		DRMM	49% (LM)	274% (LM)	8% (LM)	70% (LM)	9% (LM)	15% (L)	
		MatchPyramid	59% (DL)	232% (D)	1% (DL)	37% (DL)	21% (DL)	14% (L)	
		Err@20	PACRR-firstk	67	52	60	46	45	29
			PACRR-kwindow	69	55	29	48	34	22
Duet-local	67		52	38	43	36	17		
DRMM	58		52	29	43	21	19		
nDCG@20	MatchPyramid	60	51	25	39	42	17		
	PACRR-firstk	67	55	62	50	48	27		
	PACRR-kwindow	66	55	52	50	42	25		
	Duet-local	61	51	43	46	41	17		
	DRMM	61	55	31	44	32	16		
	MatchPyramid	54	51	24	40	42	20		

therein), and the nDCG@20 after re-ranking is 0.258, while in Figure 3, the re-ranked runs with initial nDCG@20 between 0.2 and 0.25 have nDCG@20 around 0.3, which is especially true on 2009 and 2011. Table 2 further demonstrates that either PACRR variant can improve by at least 23% on average across different years in terms of nDCG@20. Beyond that, 80% of submitted runs are improved after re-ranking by the proposed models. For 2010–12, all submitted runs are consistently improved by PACRR-firstk in terms of nDCG@20. Both variants of PACRR can significantly outperform three baseline models on at least four years out of six years in terms of average improvements, when employing either ERR@20 or nDCG@20 respectively, where the statistical tests are conducted between the improvements over individual runs when re-ranked by different models. From both Figure 3 and Table 2, however, it is clear that none of the tested models can make consistent improvements over all submitted runs along six years. In other words, there still exist document pairs that are predicted contradicting to the judgments from TREC. Thus, in next Section, we further investigate the performance in terms of prediction over document pairs.

### 3.4 Ranking Document Pairs

As pointed out in [16], the ranking of documents can be decomposed into rankings of document pairs. In other words, a model’s retrieval quality can be examined by checking across a range of individual document pairs how likely it is that the model assigns a higher score for documents that are more relevant. Thus, it is possible for us to compare different models over the same set of complete judgments, removing the issue of different initial runs.

Moreover, although ranking is our ultimate task, a direct inspection of pairwise prediction results can indicate which kinds of document pairs a model succeeds at or fails on. We first convert the graded judgments from TREC into ranked document pairs by comparing their labels. In particular, document pairs are created among documents that have different labels. A prediction is counted as correct if it assigns a higher score to the document from the pair that is labeled with a higher degree of relevance. The judgments from TREC contain at most six relevance levels: junk pages (*Junk*), non-relevance (*NRel*), relevance (*Rel*), high relevance (*HRel*), key pages (*Key*) and navigational pages (*Nav*), corresponding to six graded levels, i.e., -2, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4. Different years have different levels and different grade assignment policies, so we merge and unify the original levels from the six years into four grades: *Nav*, *HRel*, *Rel* and *NRel*. Given the absence of *HRel* and *Nav* on some queries, we first summarize the results by macro-averaging over each year in Figure 4. Specifically, we divide the number of correctly predicted document pairs by the total number of documents from a year (for 50 queries). This captures the average accuracy as a bar for each label combination. The statistics are calculated over all possible combinations of judgment pairs. We further group accuracy number according to their type of label combination over individual queries. The statistics are summarized in Table 3. The column named volume is the percentage of the current label combination out of all document pairs, and the # query column statistics the number of queries where there exists a label combination. In Table 3, we observe that PACRR model variants always perform better than the baselines on label combinations *HRel* vs. *NRel*, *Rel*




Figure 4: Comparison of *PACRR-kwindow*, *PACRR-firstk*, *DRMM*, and *Duet-local* over document pairs that are ranked in agreement with the judgments from TREC. The x-axis is the pair of labels from TREC judgments. The y-axis is the ratio between the number of correctly ranked document pairs and the total number. All judgments from TREC are considered.

Table 3: Comparison among tested methods in terms of accuracy in ranking document pairs with different labels. The column named “volume” records the occurrences of each label combination out of the total pairs. The # queries column records the number of queries that include a particular label combination. The comparisons are conducted in between two variants of PACRR and DRMM (D/d), *Duet-local* (L/l), as well as *MatchPyramid* (M/m). The upper/lower-case characters in the brackets indicate a significant difference under two-tailed paired Student’s t-tests at 95% or 90% confidence levels relative to the corresponding approach. For example, in the “*Rel-NRel*” group, both variants significantly outperforms all three baselines at 95% confidence levels. In the last row, the average accuracy among different kinds of label combinations is computed, weighted by their corresponding volume.

label combinations	volume (%)	# queries	tested methods				
			<i>PACRR-firstk</i>	<i>PACRR-kwindow</i>	<i>Duet-local</i>	<i>DRMM</i>	<i>MatchPyramid</i>
<i>Nav-HRel</i>	0.3%	49	45.8%	45.5%	45.2%	48.2%	47.3%
<i>Nav-Rel</i>	1.1%	65	56.0% (m)	56.3% (M)	54%	57% (M)	53.2% (D)
<i>Nav-NRel</i>	3.6%	67	76.1% (DLM)	76.6% (DLM)	67.1% (M)	71.5% (M)	64.7% (DL)
<i>HRel-Rel</i>	8.4%	257	57.3%	57.0%	55.5%	55.8%	52.8%
<i>HRel-NRel</i>	23.1%	262	76.7% (DLM)	76.4% (DLM)	68.4%	70.1% (M)	65.6% (D)
<i>Rel-NRel</i>	63.5%	290	73.0% (DLM)	72.5% (DLM)	63.9% (DM)	65.9% (LM)	61.4% (DL)
weighted average			72.4%	72.0%	64.2%	66.1%	61.6%

vs. *NRel* and *Nav* vs. *NRel*, which in total cover 90% of all document pairs. Meanwhile, apart from *Nav-Rel*, there is no significant difference when distinguishing *Nav* from other types. The three

baselines perform closely, where *DRMM* and *Duet-local* perform slightly better than *MatchPyramid*.



### 3.5 Discussion

**Hyper-parameters.** As mentioned in Section 3.1, models are selected based on the  $\text{Err}@20$  over validation data. Hence, it is sufficient to use a reasonable and representative validation dataset, rather than handpicking a specific set of parameter settings. However, to have a better understanding of the influence of different hyper-parameters, we explore *PACRR-kwindow*'s effectiveness when several hyper-parameters are varied. The results when re-ranking *QL-ALL* search results are given in Figure 5. The results are reported based on the models with the highest validation scores after fixing certain hyper-parameters. For example, the  $\text{Err}@20$  in the leftmost figure is obtained when fixing  $l_d$  to the values shown. The crosses in Figure 5 correspond to the models that were selected for use on the test data, based on their validation set scores. It can be seen that the selected models are not necessarily the best model on the test data, as evidenced by the differences between validation and test data results, but we consistently obtain scores within a reasonable margin. Owing to space considerations, we omit the plots for *PACRR-firstk*.

**Choice between *kwindow* and *firstk* approaches.** As mentioned, both *PACRR-kwindow* and *PACRR-firstk* serve to address the variable-length challenge for documents and queries, and to make the training feasible and more efficient. In general, if both training and test documents are known to be short enough to fit in memory, then *PACRR-firstk* can be used directly. Otherwise, *PACRR-kwindow* is a reasonable choice to provide comparable results. Alternatively, one can regard this choice as another hyper-parameter, and make a selection based on held-out validation data.

**Accuracy in sorting document pairs.** Beyond the observations from Section 3.4, we further examine the methods' accuracy over binary judgments by merging the *Nav*, *HRel* and *Rel* labels. The accuracies become 73.5%, 74.1% and 67.4% for *PACRR-kwindow*, *PACRR-firstk*, and *DRMM*, respectively. Note that the manual judgments that indicate a document as relevant or non-relevant relative to a given query includes disagreements [3, 20] and errors [2]. In particular, a 64% agreement (cf. Table 2 (b) therein) is observed over the inferred relative order among document pairs based on graded judgments from six trained judges [3]. When reproducing TREC judgments, AI-Maskari et al. [1] reported a 74% agreement (cf. Table 1 therein) with the original judgments from TREC when a group of users re-judged 56 queries on the TREC-8 document collections. Meanwhile, Alonso and Mizzaro [2] observed a 77% agreement relative to judgments from TREC when collecting judgments via crowdsourcing. Therefore, the 74% agreement achieved by both *PACRR* methods is close to the aforementioned agreements among different human assessors. However, when distinguishing *Nav*, *HRel* and *Rel*, the tested models still fall significantly short of human-level results. These distinctions are important for a successful ranker, especially when measuring with graded metrics such as  $\text{Err}@20$  and  $\text{nDCG}@20$ . Hence, further research is needed for better discrimination among relevant documents with different degrees of relevance. In addition, as for the distinction between *Nav* documents and *Rel* or *HRel* documents, we argue that since *Nav* actually indicates that a document mainly satisfies a navigational intent, this makes such documents qualitatively different from *Rel* and *HRel* documents. Specifically, a *Nav* is more relevant for a

user with navigational intent, whereas for other users it may in some cases be less useful than a document that directly includes highly pertinent information content. Therefore, we hypothesize that further improvements can be obtained by introducing a classifier for navigational documents before employing our proposed deep retrieval model.

## 4 RELATED WORK

Ad-hoc retrieval systems aim at ranking documents with respect to their relevance relative to given queries. Recently, the promise of deep learning as a potential driver for new advances in retrieval quality has attracted significant attention. Early works like Deep Structured Semantic Models [8] (*DSSM*) learned low-dimensional representations of queries and documents in a shared space and performed ranking by comparing the cosine similarity between a given query's representation and the representations of documents in the collection. Similar approaches such as C-DSSM [18] relied on alternative means of learning document representations. Severyn and Moschitti [17] further combined learned semantic representations with external features to rank question answers and tweets. In addition, other approaches to learning representation of documents or queries can also be deployed for retrieval, by taking the similarity between such representations as relevance scores. Models of this sort include ARC-I and ARC-II by Pang et al. [15], which performed text classification by producing representations of documents and queries separately (ARC-I), or, alternatively, produced representations that also considered the interactions between queries and documents jointly (ARC-II). The experiments from [6] (as well as our own pilot experiments) showed that none of the above deep models can consistently improve traditional retrieval models such as *QL* on the long-established TREC benchmarks.

Guo et al. [6] highlighted that the matching needed for information retrieval differs from the kind that is used in NLP tasks, which typically aim at *semantic matching*. Information retrieval ranking models, in contrast, are concerned with *relevance matching*. The former focuses on comparing the meaning of two input texts, while the latter focuses on the inherently asymmetric goal of representing the text and determining its relevance to a user query. The overall semantics of the document needn't be similar to the user intent expressed by the query. Indeed, traditional retrieval models such as query-likelihood (*QL*) [21] are heavily based on this notion of relevance matching, capturing it via unigram occurrences of query terms. *DRMM* learns the same sort of unigram matches as in traditional retrieval models, but with more advanced instruments from deep learning. In particular, *DRMM* takes a sequence of fixed-length query term similarity histograms as input; each histogram  $h_j$  represents the matches between one query term  $q_j$  in a given query  $q$  and the terms in a given document. The query similarity histograms are each fed through a series of fully connected layers to produce a similarity signal for each query term. The document's relevance score  $\text{rel}(q, d)$  is a weighted summation of each query term's similarity signal. More recently, Duet [13] employs a deep ranking model that considers both exact matches between document and query terms (the *local model*) and the similarity between low-dimensional representations of the query and document (the *distributed model*). As mentioned in Section 1, we propose a novel




Figure 5: The Err@20 of re-ranked *QL-ALL* with *PACRR-kwindow* when applying different hyper-parameters:  $l_d$ ,  $n_s$  and  $l_g$ . The x-axis reflects the parameter settings for different hyper-parameters, and the y-axis the Err@20. Points covered with crosses correspond to the ones reported in Table 1.

model to better encode positional information with a neural IR approach.

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this work, we have highlighted and demonstrated the importance of preserving positional information for deep retrieval models by incorporating insights from traditional information retrieval models into our *PACRR* novel deep retrieval model. In particular, our model captures term dependencies and proximity among query term occurrences through the use of convolutional layers that consider document and query  $n$ -grams of different sizes. Our model considers document relevance across different query terms through the use of a recurrent layer that combines relevance signals across query terms. Extensive experiments on TREC Web Track ad-hoc data show that the proposed model both substantially outperforms the state-of-the-art deep model on these data and can dramatically improve search results as a re-ranker.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Azzah Al-Maskari, Mark Sanderson, and Paul Clough. 2008. Relevance judgments between TREC and Non-TREC assessors. In *Proceedings of the 31st annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. ACM, 683–684.
- [2] Omar Alonso and Stefano Mizzaro. 2012. Using crowdsourcing for TREC relevance assessment. *Information Processing & Management* 48, 6 (2012), 1053–1066.
- [3] Ben Carterette, Paul N Bennett, David Maxwell Chickering, and Susan T Dumais. 2008. Here or there: Preference Judgments for Relevance. In *Advances in Information Retrieval*. Springer, 16–27.
- [4] Olivier Chapelle, Donald Metzler, Ya Zhang, and Pierre Grinspan. 2009. Expected reciprocal rank for graded relevance. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM conference on Information and knowledge management (CIKM '09)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 621–630. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1645953.1646033>
- [5] Kevyn Collins-Thompson, Craig Macdonald, Paul Bennett, Fernando Diaz, and Ellen M Voorhees. 2015. *TREC 2014 web track overview*. Technical Report. DTIC Document.
- [6] Jiafeng Guo, Yixing Fan, Qingyao Ai, and W Bruce Croft. 2016. A deep relevance matching model for ad-hoc retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. ACM, 55–64.
- [7] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long Short-Term Memory. *Neural Computation* 9, 8 (Nov. 1997), 1735–1780. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>
- [8] Po-Sen Huang, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, Li Deng, Alex Acero, and Larry Heck. 2013. Learning Deep Structured Semantic Models for Web Search Using Clickthrough Data. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM '13)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2333–2338. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2505515.2505665>
- [9] Samuel Huston and W. Bruce Croft. 2014. A Comparison of Retrieval Models using Term Dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM International Conference on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, CIKM 2014, Shanghai, China, November 3-7, 2014*, Jianzhong Li, Xiaoyang Sean Wang, Minos N. Garofalakis, Ian Soboroff, Torsten Suel, and Min Wang (Eds.). ACM, 111–120. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2661829.2661894>
- [10] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2002. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of IR techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 20, 4 (2002), 422–446.
- [11] Nal Kalchbrenner, Edward Grefenstette, and Phil Blunsom. 2014. A convolutional neural network for modelling sentences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.2188* (2014).
- [12] Donald Metzler and W Bruce Croft. 2005. A Markov random field model for term dependencies. In *Proceedings of the 28th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. ACM, 472–479.
- [13] Bhaskar Mitra, Fernando Diaz, and Nick Craswell. 2017. Learning to Match Using Local and Distributed Representations of Text for Web Search. In *Proceedings of WWW 2017*. ACM.
- [14] Liang Pang, Yanyan Lan, Jiafeng Guo, Jun Xu, and Xueqi Cheng. 2016. A Study of MatchPyramid Models on Ad-hoc Retrieval. *CoRR* abs/1606.04648 (2016). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.04648>
- [15] Liang Pang, Yanyan Lan, Jiafeng Guo, Jun Xu, Shengxian Wan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2016. Text Matching As Image Recognition. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'16)*, 2793–2799.
- [16] Kira Radinsky and Nir Ailon. 2011. Ranking from Pairs and Triplets: Information Quality, Evaluation Methods and Query Complexity. In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining (WSDM '11)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 105–114. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1935826.1935850>
- [17] Aliaksei Severyn and Alessandro Moschitti. 2015. Learning to Rank Short Text Pairs with Convolutional Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR '15)*.
- [18] Yelong Shen, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, Li Deng, and Grégoire Mesnil. 2014. Learning Semantic Representations Using Convolutional Neural Networks for Web Search. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW '14 Companion)*.
- [19] Tao Tao and ChengXiang Zhai. 2007. An exploration of proximity measures in information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 30th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. ACM, 295–302.
- [20] Ellen M Voorhees. 2000. Variations in relevance judgments and the measurement of retrieval effectiveness. *Information processing & management* 36, 5 (2000), 697–716.
- [21] Chengxiang Zhai and John Lafferty. 2001. A study of smoothing methods for language models applied to ad hoc information retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 24th annual international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in information retrieval*. ACM, 334–342.