# Text Processing：Latent semantic INDEXING <br> －Applied Multivariate Analysis－ 

## A REPEATED THEME

Often, dimension reduction can be 'layered' between our original representations (in this case bag of words) and techniques that operate on that representation (in this case, finding relevant documents)

## Original Representation <br> [dimension reduction] <br> Statistical method

How does this relate to text processing?

## PCA AND FACTOR ANALYSIS INTERPRETATION

- PCA: Find the directions of greatest variance. This doesn't on its face seem like it maintains correlations, but observe:

$$
\operatorname{var}\left(a X_{1}+b X_{2}\right)=a^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(X_{1}\right)+b^{2} \operatorname{Var}\left(X_{2}\right)+2 a b \operatorname{Cov}\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)
$$

If we standardize the matrix, then this reduces to

$$
\operatorname{var}\left(a X_{1}+b X_{2}\right)=a^{2}+b^{2}+2 a b \operatorname{Cov}\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)
$$

This gets maximized over $a^{2}+b^{2}=1$.

- If $\operatorname{Cov}\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right) \approx 0$, then this gets maximized by any $a^{2}+b^{2}=1$ (it doesn't matter)
- If $\operatorname{Cov}\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right) \approx 1$, then this gets maximized by setting $a=b=1 / \sqrt{2}$
- FACtor analysis: Defined by maintaining correlations.

So, in either case, we are really maintaining correlations

## Graphical example of the phenomenon

```
library(mvtnorm)
sigma = matrix(c(1,sig,sig,1),nrow=2)
nsweep = 1000
outcome = matrix(0,nrow=nsweep,ncol=2)
for(sweep in 1:nsweep){
x = rmvnorm(200,c(0,0),sigma)
out.pca = prcomp(x,center=T,scale=F)
outcome[sweep,] = out.pca$rotation[,1]
}
plot(outcome,xlab='PC1',ylab='PC2')
```



Figure: Left: sig $=0$. Right: sig $=.999$

## How does this apply to text processing?

Think about the document-term matrix $\mathbb{X}$.
The columns correspond to the words. If two words $w_{1}, w_{2}$ commonly appear together then the $w_{1}^{t h}$ and $w_{2}^{t h}$ columns of $\mathbb{X}$ are correlated

When we have a large number of documents that are about a topic, it is common to have some, or most, of the documents using related, but not identical words

Therefore, if we were to search $\mathbb{X}$ with a query, we would miss some of the important documents

## An example

Suppose we have a corpus of documents
We wish to search for documents containing agriculture
We can query $Y=$ ("agriculture")
However, "agriculture" is not regularly explicitly mentioned in articles about agriculture

This is where correlations come in. Whenever agriculture is mentioned, it will occur very frequently along with many synonyms ("farming", for instance)

This is where latent semantic indexing comes in

## An EXAMPLE, GIVEN TO US BY AN INVISIBLE HAND

To see why it is called latent semantic indexing, observe the following

When a book is written, a list of terms (or topics) is written down and an index is formed saying where these terms appear. For example, here is the start to the entry for "Agriculture" in the index to The Wealth of Nations

Agriculture, the labour of, does not admit of such subdivisions as manufactures, 6 ; this impossibility of separation, prevents agriculture from improving equally with manufactures, 6 ; natural state of, in a new colony, 92; requires more knowledge and experience than most mechanical professions, and yet is carried on without any restrictions, 127; the terms of rent, how adjusted between landlord and tenant, 144 ; is extended by good roads and navigable canals, 147; under what circumstances pasture land is more valuable than arable, 149; gardening not a very gainful employment, 152-3; vines the most profitable article of culture, 154; estimates of profit from projects, very fallacious, $i b$.; cattle and tillage mutually improve each other, $220 ; \ldots$

## An EXAMPLE, GIVEN TO US BY AN INVISIBLE HAND

It is asking a lot for a computer to do this.
However, if we only want to get the pages where "agriculture" is the topic (like, $6,92,152-3,220 .$.$) , then we can make a$ document-term matrix out of the pages of the book.

This approach will fail if we search this document-term matrix directly.

However, asking for pages that contain highly correlated words (like "rent") should work very well

## Latent semantic indexing (LSI)

If we have our document-term matrix $\mathbb{X}$, then we write
$\mathbb{X}=U D V^{\top}$, where

- The matrix $U$ is the concept-document matrix (and maps into the document space)
- The matrix $V$ is the term-concept matrix (and maps into the term space)
$V$ is the matrix of loadings of the original words
If we have our query $Y$, we can map it into the document space by thinking of it as a new row in $\mathbb{X}$

$$
\mathbb{X}=U D V^{\top} \quad \text { is the same as } \mathbb{X} V D^{-1}=U
$$

Which means we transform $Y$ as

$$
Y V D^{-1}
$$

## To center or not to center?

If we think about LSI as performing PCA, then we should technically do the SVD like

$$
\mathbb{X}-\overline{\mathbb{X}}=U D V^{\top}
$$

However, observe the following example

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a & b & 0 \\
d & 0 & f \\
0 & h & i
\end{array}\right]
$$

What happens if we column center $A$ ?
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## To center or not to center?

If we think about LSI as performing PCA, then we should technically do the SVD like

$$
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$$

However, observe the following example

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
a & b & 0 \\
d & 0 & f \\
0 & h & i
\end{array}\right]
$$

What happens if we column center $A$ ?
We lose sparsity!
The consensus is to column center if your data is small enough, otherwise, don't worry about it

## Example dataset

## Let's look at $D=20$ Reuters news articles about crude oil production and importation.

The corpus has 860 words
"Diamond Shamrock Corp said that $\backslash$ neffective today it had cut its contract prices for crude oil by $\backslash \mathrm{n} 1.50 \mathrm{dlrs}$ a barrel. \n The reduction brings its posted price for West Texas $\backslash n$ Intermediate to 16.00 dlrs a barrel, the copany said. \n \"The price reduction today was made in the light of falling $\ln$ noil product prices and a weak crude oil market, \" a company\nspokeswoman said.\n Diamond is the latest in a line of U.S. oil companies that its contract, or posted, prices over the last two days\nciting weak oil markets.\n Reuter"

## Example dataset: R

## Let's look at

```
mydtm = as.matrix(dtm.stem)
out.pca = prcomp(mydtm)
out.lsi = out.pca$rotation
signif(sort(out.lsi[,1],decreasing=TRUE)[1:24],2)
signif(sort(out.lsi[,1],decreasing=FALSE)[1:24],2)
```


## PC loadings, for Reuters documents

| > signif(sort(out.lsi[,1], decreasing=TRUE)[1:24],2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| january | cubic | fiscales p | petroliferos | yacimientos | billion |
| 0.5000 | 0.3200 | 0.3200 | 0.3200 | 0.3200 | 0.2500 |
| argentine | gas | metrers | metres | natural | produced |
| 0.1600 | 0.1600 | 0.1600 | 0.1600 | 0.1600 | 0.1600 |
| totalled | barrels | added | production | pct | mln |
| 0.1600 | 0.0940 | 0.0860 | 0.0850 | 0.0780 | 0.0770 |
| output | budget | riyals | abdul-aziz | expenditure | revenue |
| 0.0630 | 0.0061 | 0.0061 | 0.0051 | 0.0051 | 0.0041 |
| > signif(sort(out.lsi[,1], decreasing=FALSE) [1:24],2) |  |  |  |  |  |
| posted | canada canadian | west | power | bbl lowered | texaco |
| -0.050 | -0.044 -0.044 | -0.041 | -0.040 | -0.040 -0.036 | -0.033 |
| texas | brings effective | dlrs | grade | sweet contract | ship |
| -0.033 | -0.032 -0.032 | -0.031 | -0.031 | -0.031 -0.031 | -0.030 |
| price | changed pay | postings | decrease | company benchmark | feb |
| -0.030 | -0.028 -0.028 | -0.028 | -0.027 | -0.027 -0.026 | -0.026 |

These are the 24 largest and smallest loadings on the first PC

What story can be told here?
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These are the 24 largest and smallest loadings on the first PC

What story can be told here?

- Large loadings correspond to things related to the international market
- Negative loadings correspond to the American/Canadian market


## PC LOADINGs, FOR TMNT documents
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## PC LOADINGs, FOR TMNT documents



These are the 24 largest and smallest projections onto the first PC
What story can be told here?

- There is a substantial amount of overlap on the first PC

Let's look at a plot

## Plot of PC scores for TMNT



## PC LOADINGS, FOR TMNT DOCUMENTS, SECOND COMPONENT



These are the 24 largest and smallest projections onto the first PC
What story can be told here?

## PC LOADINGS, FOR TMNT DOCUMENTS, SECOND COMPONENT



These are the 24 largest and smallest projections onto the first PC
What story can be told here?

- Positive values are related to the renaissance artists
- Negative values are related to the TMNTs


## Distance to query using LSI

## ORIGINAL REPRESENTATION <br> [dimension reduction] STATISTICAL METHOD

- Form the (normalized) document-term matrix $\mathbb{X}$
- Compute its LSI $\mathbb{X}=U D V^{\top}$
- Get $Y$ into LSI via $\tilde{Y}=Y V D^{-1}$
- Choose a K
- Find distances for documents $d=1, \ldots, D$

$$
\operatorname{distance}(d, \tilde{Y})=\left\|U_{d, 1: k}-\tilde{Y}\right\|_{2}
$$

## Distance to query using LSI

(tmnt leo) 0.9711807<br>(tmnt rap) 0.7696525<br>(tmnt mic) 0.7669749<br>(tmnt don) 0.9718710<br>(real leo) 0.9711512<br>(real rap) 0.9709391<br>(real mic) 0.9709492<br>(real don) 0.9734319<br>query 0.0000000

## Wrap-up

Latent semantic indexing seeks to use correlations to help with document queries

This can be accomplished by forming the SVD of the document-term matrix $\mathbb{X}$. Alternatively, factor analysis is commonly used

The documents and the query get projected into a lower dimensional space where distances are computed

Some complications

- How do the normalization techniques we talked about affect this reduction?
- What happens if we want to make a new query, do we need to reform the entire SVD?
- How does factor analysis compare to PCA?

