• Today’s Reading:
  – HMS ch. 12, articles on web page

• Today’s Lecture:
  – Data Organization
  – Link Analysis

• Upcoming Due Dates:
  – Project Writeup due today
  – Project Reviews due 5/7
Peer Review

- 1-2 pages
- summary
  summarize the paper succinctly and dispassionately. This is not the place to criticize. Perhaps discuss how it fits into the big picture.
- general comments
  Give the big critical picture, before sinking into the details. This is the place to take a breath, keep your perspective, and explain what the papers weaknesses are and whether they are serious, or intrinsic to our current state of knowledge, or whatever.
- constructive criticism
  not only of technical issues, but also organization and clarity.
- minor errors
  typos and grammatical errors, and minor textual problems. It's not the reviewer's job to copy edit the paper, so don't go out of your way to look for typos. If there are serious grammatical problems, please say so but please be charitable, especially if English is not the author's native language.
- from http://www.cs.unm.edu/~bap/how-to-review.html
Project Presentation

• 10 minutes
  – describe your data mining objective
  – problem definition and algorithms
  – experimental evaluation
    • methodology
    • results
  – lessons learned/advice
Data Organization

• data mining distinguished from other data analysis by the sheer **quantity** of data

• **n** number of rows (may be millions)
  – algorithms that are exponential in n are unusable
  – algorithms that are $O(n)$ or $O(n \log n)$ are generally feasible such as:
    • counting frequencies
    • finding the mode
    • sorting
  – multiple passes over the data may not be feasible (even if algorithm is linear time)

• **p** number of columns (may be thousands)
  – for large p, even $O(p^2)$ algorithm may be infeasible
Computer Architecture 101

- Memory hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>memory</th>
<th>size</th>
<th>access time</th>
<th>access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>registers</td>
<td>100 words</td>
<td></td>
<td>direct access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-board cache</td>
<td>16-1000 KB</td>
<td>20 ns</td>
<td>associative access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main memory</td>
<td>16 MB – several GB</td>
<td>70 ns</td>
<td>direct access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disk memory</td>
<td>1 – 1000s GB</td>
<td>10 ms</td>
<td>sequential access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnetic tape</td>
<td>gigabytes, terabytes</td>
<td>seconds, minutes</td>
<td>sequential access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

goal: increase **locality** of reference
Indexing Structures

- An **index** on an attribute A is **data structure** that makes it possible to access data points with a particular value of A more efficiently than a linear scan.
Data Structures 101

• Set of S data vectors = \{x(1),...,x(n)\}

• Queries:
  – point queries: want to find all points having a particular value of an ordinal attribute x.A
  – range queries: all points with b \leq x.A \leq c

• Simplest solution?
  
  binary tree

• Time complexity?
  
  if tree balanced, O(log n) * # of records
B*-trees

- idea similar to BST, used to access data on disk

M chosen so that each node fits into single disk page

For $M = 100$, 3 disk accesses required to find any point in 300 million point dataset

B*-tree of degree $M$ is tree where:
- all leaves are at same depth
- each leaf contains between $\frac{M}{2}$ and $M$ keys
- each interior node (except possibly the root) has $\frac{M}{2} \leq K \leq M$ children, with values $a_1,...,a_{k-1}$
- values stored at the leaves of subtree $C_i$ are larger than $a_{i-1}$ and at most $a_i$
Hash Indices

• based on idea: If number of possible values for attribute A is small, keep list with pointer to all points with attribute value A = a.
• If number of possible values for A is large, use hash function h: Dom(A) → {1, ..., M}
• r[j] is list of pointer to records x_i such that h(a_i) = j
• To find all points with A = a
  – for each element x_i in r[h(a)]
    • check whether x_i.A = a
• Typical hash function: a mod M
Multidimensional Indexing

• especially relevant in multimedia DB applications such as image databases

• example:
  – user: *retrieves all images similar to a given example image*
  – The system extracts features from the query image and searches the database for images having similar features. The features from all of the images in the DB are indexed using appropriate set of features

• types of queries: point queries, range queries, nearest neighbor queries
Types of Multidimensional Indexes

- space filling curves/z ordering/linear quadtrees
  The data is “linearized” and then one of the traditional index structures is used
- grid files: The data space is divided into a “grid” and indexed in each dimension.
- R-trees: Similar to B-trees where space is hierarchically partitioned and indexed at each level by region.
R-trees

- A R+-tree is a spatial data structure optimized for searching areas in N dimensional space.
- R+-tree is a spatial access method which splits space with hierarchically nested boxes. Objects are indexed in each box which intersects them. The tree is height-balanced.
- The R+-tree data structure was created by Timos Sellis, Nick Roussopoulos, and Christos Faloutsos and is described in their paper "The R+-Tree: A Dynamic Index for Multi-Dimensional Objects"
What is Data Warehouse?

• Defined in many different ways, but not rigorously.
  – A decision support database that is maintained separately from the organization’s operational database
  – Support information processing by providing a solid platform of consolidated, historical data for analysis.

• “A data warehouse is a subject-oriented, integrated, time-variant, and nonvolatile collection of data in support of management’s decision-making process.”—W. H. Inmon

• Data warehousing:
  – The process of constructing and using data warehouses
Data Warehouse—Subject-Oriented

- Organized around major subjects, such as *customer, product, sales*.
- Focusing on the modeling and analysis of data for decision makers, not on daily operations or transaction processing.
- Provide a simple and concise view around particular subject issues by *excluding data that are not useful in the decision support process*. 
Data Warehouse vs. Operational DBMS

- **OLTP (on-line transaction processing)**
  - Major task of traditional relational DBMS
  - Day-to-day operations: purchasing, inventory, banking, manufacturing, payroll, registration, accounting, etc.

- **OLAP (on-line analytical processing)**
  - Major task of data warehouse system
  - Data analysis and decision making

- **Distinct features (OLTP vs. OLAP):**
  - User and system orientation: customer vs. market
  - Data contents: current, detailed vs. historical, consolidated
  - Database design: ER + application vs. star + subject
  - View: current, local vs. evolutionary, integrated
  - Access patterns: update vs. read-only but complex queries
From Tables and Spreadsheets to Data Cubes

• A data warehouse is based on a multidimensional data model which views data in the form of a data cube.

• A data cube, such as sales, allows data to be modeled and viewed in multiple dimensions:
  – Dimension tables, such as item (item_name, brand, type), or time(day, week, month, quarter, year).
  – Fact table contains measures (such as dollars_sold) and keys to each of the related dimension tables.

• In data warehousing literature, an n-D base cube is called a base cuboid. The top most 0-D cuboid, which holds the highest-level of summarization, is called the apex cuboid. The lattice of cuboids forms a data cube.
Cube: A Lattice of Cuboids

0-D (apex) cuboid
1-D cuboids
2-D cuboids
3-D cuboids
4-D (base) cuboid
Conceptual Modeling of Data Warehouses

- **Modeling data warehouses: dimensions & measures**
  - **Star schema**: A fact table in the middle connected to a set of dimension tables
  - **Snowflake schema**: A refinement of star schema where some dimensional hierarchy is normalized into a set of smaller dimension tables, forming a shape similar to snowflake
  - **Fact constellations**: Multiple fact tables share dimension tables, viewed as a collection of stars, therefore called galaxy schema or fact constellation
Example of Star Schema

**Time**
- time_key
- day
- day_of_the_week
- month
- quarter
- year

**Location**
- location_key
- street
- city
- province_or_street
- country

**Item**
- item_key
- item_name
- brand
- type
- supplier_type

**Branch**
- branch_key
- branch_name
- branch_type

**Measures**
- units_sold
- dollars_sold
- avg_sales
Example of Snowflake Schema

Time
- time_key
- day
- day_of_the_week
- month
- quarter
- year

Branch
- branch_key
- branch_name
- branch_type

Item
- item_key
- item_name
- brand
- type
- supplier_key

Supplier
- supplier_key
- supplier_type

Location
- location_key
- street
- city_key
- province_or_state
- country

Sales Fact Table
- time_key
- item_key
- branch_key
- location_key
- units_sold
- dollars_sold
- avg_sales

Measures
Example of Fact Constellation

**Sales Fact Table**
- **time_key**
- **item_key**
- **branch_key**
- **location_key**
- **units_sold**
- **dollars_sold**
- **avg_sales**

**Measures**
- **item_key**
- **item_name**
- **brand_type**
- **supplier_type**

**Shipping Fact Table**
- **time_key**
- **item_key**
- **shipper_key**
- **from_location**
- **to_location**
- **dollars_cost**
- **units_shipped**

**Location**
- **location_key**
- **street**
- **city**
- **province_or_street**
- **country**

**Shipper**
- **shipper_key**
- **shipper_name**
- **location_key**
- **shipper_type**
Multidimensional Data

- Sales volume as a function of product, month, and region

Dimensions: Product, Location, Time
Hierarchical summarization paths

Industry → Region → Year
Category → Country → Quarter
Product → City → Month
Office → Day
Week
A Sample Data Cube

Product: TV, VCR, PC
Date: 1Qtr, 2Qtr, 3Qtr, 4Qtr
Country: U.S.A, Canada, Mexico

Total annual sales of TV in U.S.A.
Cuboids Corresponding to the Cube

- **0-D (apex) cuboid**
- **1-D cuboids**
- **2-D cuboids**
- **3-D (base) cuboid**
Browsing a Data Cube

- Visualization
- OLAP capabilities
- Interactive manipulation
Typical OLAP Operations

- **Roll up (drill-up):** summarize data
  - *by climbing up hierarchy or by dimension reduction*

- **Drill down (roll down):** reverse of roll-up
  - *from higher level summary to lower level summary or detailed data, or introducing new dimensions*

- **Slice and dice:**
  - *project and select*
Data Management and Data Mining

• How to deal with massive datasets?
  – force the data into main memory
  – scalable version of data mining algorithms
  – special purpose algorithms for disk access
  – pseudo data sets and sufficient statistics
Link Analysis
Link Analysis

• Finding patterns in graphs
  – Bibliometrics – finding patterns in citation graphs
  – Sociometry – finding patterns in social networks
  – Collaborative Filtering – finding patterns in rank(person, item) graph
  – Webometrics – finding patterns in web page links
Web Link Analysis

• Used for
  – ordering documents matching a user query: ranking
  – deciding what pages to add to a collection: crawling
  – page categorization
  – finding related pages
  – finding duplicated web sites
Web as Graph

- **Link graph:**
  - node for each page
  - directed edge $(u,v)$ if page $u$ contains a hyperlink to page $v$

- **Co-citation graph**
  - node for each page
  - *undirected* edge $(u,v)$ iff exists a third page $w$ linking to both $u$ and $v$

- **assumption:**
  - link from page $A$ to page $B$ is a recommendation of page $B$ by $A$
  - If $A$ and $B$ are connected by a link, there is a higher probability that they are on the same topic
Connectivity-Based Ranking

- Query-independent: gives an intrinsic quality score to a page

- Approach #1: larger number of hyperlinks pointing to a page, the better the page
  - drawback?
  - each link is equally important

- Approach #2: weight each hyperlink proportionally to the quality of the page containing the hyperlink
Page Rank

- PageRank $R(p)$ of page $p$:

$$R(p) = \varepsilon / n + (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot \sum_{(q,p) \in G} \frac{R(q)}{\text{out degree}(q)}$$

- where
  - $\varepsilon$ is a dampening factor usually set between 0.1 and 0.2
  - $n$ is the number of nodes in $G$
  - outdegree($q$) is the number of edges leaving page $p$
Alternate Formulation: Random Surfer

- The random surfer can follow any outlink from a page with equal probability. Periodically the random surfer gets bored and jumps to a random page on the Web.

- Page rank is the stationary distribution of infinite walk $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots$
  - Each node is equally likely to be the starting node
  - At node $p_i$
    - with probability $\epsilon$, node $p_{i+1}$ is chosen uniformly at random from all the nodes in $G$
    - with probability $1-\epsilon$, node $p_{i+1}$ is chosen uniformly at random from the nodes $q$ in $G$ s.t. $(p_{i+1}, q)$
PageRank cont.

- PageRank is the dominant eigenvector of the probability transition matrix of the random walk.

- When PageRank is computed iteratively using the previous equation, the computation will eventually converge (under some weak assumptions on the values in the probability matrix).

- Typically 100 iterations suffice to converge.

- Advantage: not query specific, can be done once.
Query-dependent Connectivity-Based Ranking

- Carrier and Kazman
- For each query, build a subgraph of the link graph $G$ limited to pages on query topic
- Build the neighborhood graph
  1. A start set $S$ of documents matching query given by search engine ($\sim 200$)
  2. Set augmented by its neighborhood, the set of documents that either point to or are pointed to by documents in $S$ (limit to $\sim 50$)
  3. Then rank based on indegree

problem?
Idea

- We desire pages that are **relevant** (in the neighborhood graph) and **authoritative**
- As in page rank, not only the in-degree of a page $p$, but the quality of the pages that point to $p$. If more important pages point to $p$, that means $p$ is more authoritative
- Key idea: Good **hub** pages have links to good **authority** pages
- given user query, compute a hub score and an authority score for each document
  - high authority score $\rightarrow$ relevant content
  - high hub score $\rightarrow$ links to documents with relevant content
HITS algorithm

- Kleinberg, 1998
- Hypertext Internet Topic Search
Kleinberg’s Algorithm

1. Initialize: $h_p=1$, $a_p=1$ for all pages in neighborhood graph
2. While the vectors H and A have not converged
   3. $A[i] = \sum_{(j,i) \in N} H[j]$
   4. $H[i] = \sum_{(i,j) \in N} A[j]$
5. Normalize the H and A vectors
Does the algorithm converge?

• A is adjacency matrix of neighborhood graph
• At the ith iteration:
  \[ a_i = A^t h_{i-1} \]
  \[ h_i = A^t a_i \]
  normalize \( a_i \) and \( h_i \)

• Under mild conditions converges, convergence rate \( \sigma_1^2 / \sigma_2^2 \)
• \( h^{(k)} \) converges to the leading left singular vector of \( A \)
• \( a^{(k)} \) converges to the leading right singular vector of \( A \)
Problems

- Considers only a small part of web graph, adding a few edges can potentially change scores considerably, thus easier to manipulate scores.
- If neighborhood graph contains more pages on a topic different from the query, then the top authority and hub pages are on this different topic. Called topic drift.
Improvements to Basic Algorithm

- Put weights on edges to reflect importance of links, e.g., put higher weight if anchor text associated with the link is relevant to query
- Normalize weights outgoing from a single source or coming into a single sink. This alleviates spamming of query results
- Eliminate edges between same domain
Using Link Structure for Web page classification

- Mitchell and Slatterly.
Probabilistic Relational Models

Author

Research Area

Institution

Wrote

Paper

Topic

Word1

... WordN

P( Institution | Research Area)

P( Topic | Paper.Author.Research Area)

P( WordN | Topic)
Link Uncertainty

Document Collection

Document Collection
Dependency model for existence of relationship
Exists Uncertainty Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citer.Topic</th>
<th>Cited.Topic</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domains

Cited paper

Cites

Citing paper

Cora Dataset, McCallum, et. al

Web Page

Category

From Page

Link

Exists

WebKB, Craven, et. al

Web Page

Category

To Page
Prediction Accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Naive-Bayes 0.75</th>
<th>Naive-Bayes 0.81</th>
<th>Link 0.75</th>
<th>Link 0.81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WebKB</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Web Domain

From-Page

From

Hub

Category

Word1

WordN

To-Page

To

Hub

Category

Word1

WordN

Link

Exists

Has

Anchor

Word

Has
WebKB Results

Accuracy

School

cornell
texas
wisconsin
washington

Naive-Bayes
Anchors
Exists
Ex+Hubs
Ex+Anchors
Ex+Hubs+Anchors
Graph structure in the Web

• Understanding the various properties of the web graph – diameter, degree distributions, connected components – useful for:
  – designing better crawl strategies on the web
  – analyzing behavior of web algorithms that use link information
  – prediction of web structures, such as bipartite cores and better algorithms to compute them
  – predict emergence of new, yet unexploited, phenomena in the web graph
Example Web Graph Properties

- Six degrees of separation between any 2 web pages
  - almost true in the strongly connected component part of web graph if allow traversal of both out-links and in-links
  - not true in general. small-world network models for graphs

- Probability that a web page has in-degree i is proportional to $1/i^x$. Latest estimate for $x=2.1$

- Average path length between two web pages is 19 (Barabasi). Disputed by (Raghavan, et. al).
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