

International Journal on Semantic Web & Information Systems

July-September 2006, Vol. 2, No. 3

Table of Contents

SPECIAL ISSUE: MULTIMEDIA SEMANTICS

Guest Editors: William I. Grosky and Farshad Fotouhi

i Editorial Preface

William I. Grosky, University of Michigan - Dearborn, USA; Farshad Fotouhi, Wayne State University, USA

RESEARCH PAPERS

1 OntoMedia—Semantic Multimedia Metadata Integration and Organization

Bodo Hüsemann, Informationsfabrik GmbH, Münster, Germany; Gottfried Vossen, University of Münster, Germany, and University of Waikato, New Zealand

In this article, an approach to personal information management is described that is based on Semantic Web technology. In particular, the design decisions behind, and core features of OntoMedia, a software system based on a multimedia ontology that is intended for personal usage, are presented.

17 Knowledge-Assisted Image Analysis Based on Context and Spatial Optimization

G. Th. Papadopoulos, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and Informatics and Telematics Institute/Centre for Research and Technology, Greece; Ph. Mylonas, National Technical University of Athens, Greece; V. Mezaris, Informatics and Telematics Institute/Centre for Research and Technology, Greece; Y. Avrithis, National Technical University of Athens, Greece; I. Kompatsiaris, Informatics and Telematics Institute/Centre for Research and Technology, Greece

In this article, an approach to semantic image analysis is presented. Under the proposed approach, ontologies are used to capture general, spatial, and contextual knowledge of a domain, and a genetic algorithm is applied to realize the final annotation.

37 S-IRAS: An Interactive Semantic Image Retrieval and Annotation System

Changbo Yang, Ming Dong, and Farshad Fotouhi, Wayne State University, USA

In this article, a semantic image query system with integrated feedback mechanism is presented. A novel feedback solution for semantic retrieval called semantic feedback is proposed, which allows the system to interact with users directly at the semantic level.

55 Information Retrieval by Semantic Similarity

Angelos Hliaoutakis, Giannis Varelas, Epimenidis Voutsakis, Euripides G. M. Petrakis, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Greece; Evangelos Milios, Dalhousie University, Canada

In this article, approaches to computing the semantic similarity between natural language terms (using WordNet as the underlying reference ontology) and between medical terms (using the MeSH ontology of medical and biomedical terms) are investigated.

Information Retrieval by Semantic Similarity

Angelos Hliaoutakis, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Greece

Giannis Varelas, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Greece

Epimenidis Voutsakis, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Greece

Euripides G. M. Petrakis, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Greece

Evangelos Milios, Dalhousie University, Canada

ABSTRACT

Semantic Similarity relates to computing the similarity between conceptually similar but not necessarily lexically similar terms. Typically, semantic similarity is computed by mapping terms to an ontology and by examining their relationships in that ontology. We investigate approaches to computing the semantic similarity between natural language terms (using WordNet as the underlying reference ontology) and between medical terms (using the MeSH ontology of medical and biomedical terms). The most popular semantic similarity methods are implemented and evaluated using WordNet and MeSH. Building upon semantic similarity, we propose the Semantic Similarity based Retrieval Model (SSRM), a novel information retrieval method capable for discovering similarities between documents containing conceptually similar terms. The most effective semantic similarity method is implemented into SSRM. SSRM has been applied in retrieval on OHSUMED (a standard TREC collection available on the Web). The experimental results demonstrated promising performance improvements over classic information retrieval methods utilizing plain lexical matching (e.g., Vector Space Model) and also over state-of-the-art semantic similarity retrieval methods utilizing ontologies.

Keywords: document retrieval systems; information retrieval; medical information systems; ontologies; semantic similarity

INTRODUCTION

Semantic Similarity relates to computing the similarity between concepts, which are not necessarily lexically similar. Semantic similarity aims at providing robust tools for standardizing the content and delivery of information across communicating information sources.

This has long been recognized as a central problem in Semantic Web where related sources need to be linked and communicate information to each other. Semantic Web will also enable users to retrieve information in a more natural and intuitive way (as in a “query-answering” interaction).

In the existing Web, information is acquired from several disparate sources in several formats (mostly text) using different language terminologies. Interpreting the meaning of this information is left to the users. This task can be highly subjective and time consuming. To relate concepts or entities between different sources (the same as for answering user queries involving such concepts or entities), the concepts extracted from each source must be compared in terms of their meaning (i.e., semantically). Semantic similarity offers the means by which this goal can be realized.

This article deals with a certain aspect of Semantic Web and semantics, that of semantic text association, and text semantics respectively. We demonstrate that it is possible to approximate algorithmically the human notion of similarity using semantic similarity and to develop methods capable of detecting similarities between conceptually similar documents even when they don't contain lexically similar terms. The lack of common terms in two documents does not necessarily mean that the documents are not related. Computing text similarity by classical information retrieval models (e.g., Vector Space, Probabilistic, Boolean (Yates & Neto, 1999)) is based on lexical term matching. However, two terms can be semantically similar (e.g., can be synonyms or have similar meaning) although they are lexically different. Therefore, classical retrieval methods will fail to associate documents with semantically similar but lexically different terms.

In the context of the multimedia semantic Web, this article permits informal textual descriptions of multimedia content to be effectively used in retrieval, and obviates the need for generating structured metadata. Informal descriptions require significantly less human labor than structured descriptions.

In the first part of this article, we present a critical evaluation of several semantic similarity approaches for computing the semantic similarity between terms using two well-known taxonomic hierarchies namely WordNet¹ and MeSH². WordNet is a controlled vocabulary and thesaurus offering a taxonomic hierarchy of

natural language terms developed at Princeton University. MeSH (Medical Subject Heading) is a controlled vocabulary and a thesaurus developed by the U.S. National Library of Medicine (NLM)³ offering a hierarchical categorization of medical terms. Similar results for MeSH haven't been reported before in the literature. All methods are implemented and integrated into a semantic similarity system, which is accessible on the Web.

In the second part of this article, we propose the "Semantic Similarity Retrieval Model" (*SSRM*). *SSRM* suggests discovering semantically similar terms in documents (e.g., between documents and queries) using general or application specific term taxonomies (e.g., WordNet or MeSH) and by associating such terms using semantic similarity methods. Initially, *SSRM* computes *tfidf* weights to term representations of documents. These representations are then augmented by semantically similar terms (which are discovered from WordNet or MeSH by applying a range query in the neighborhood of each term in the taxonomy) and by re-computing weights to all new and pre-existing terms. Finally, document similarity is computed by associating semantically similar terms in the documents and in the queries respectively and by accumulating their similarities.

SSRM together with the term-based Vector Space Model (Salton, 1989) (the classic document retrieval method utilizing plain lexical similarity) as well as the most popular semantic information retrieval methods in the literature (Richardson & Smeaton, 1995; Salton, 1989; Voorhees, 1994) are all implemented and evaluated on OHSUMED (Hersh, Buckley, Leone, & Hickam, 1994), a standard TREC collection with 293,856 medical articles, and on a crawl of the Web with more than 1.5 million Web pages with images. *SSRM* demonstrated promising performance achieving better precision and recall than its competitors.

RELATED WORK

Query expansion with potentially related (e.g., similar) terms has long been considered a means for resolving term ambiguities and for

revealing the hidden meaning in user queries. A recent contribution by Collins-Thomson and Callan (2005) proposed a framework for combining multiple knowledge sources for revealing term associations and for determining promising terms for query expansion. Given a query, a term network is constructed representing the relationships between query and potentially related terms obtained by multiple knowledge sources such as synonym dictionaries, general word association scores, co-occurrence relationships in corpus or in retrieved documents. In the case of query expansion, the source terms are the query terms and the target terms are potential expansion terms connected with the query terms by labels representing probabilities of relevance. The likelihood of relevance between such terms is computed using random walks and by estimating the probability of the various aspects of the query that can be inferred from potential expansion terms. *SSRM* is complementary to this approach: It shows how to handle more relationship types (e.g., hyponyms, hypernyms in an ontology) and how to compute good relevance weights given the *tfidf* weights of the initial query terms. *SSRM* focuses on semantic relationships; a specific aspect of term relationships not considered in Collins-Thomson et al. (2005) and demonstrates that it is possible to enhance the performance of retrievals using this information alone.

SSRM is also complementary to Voorhees (1994) as well as to Richardson and Smeaton (1995). Voorhees proposed expanding query terms with synonyms, hyponyms, and hypernyms in WordNet but did not propose an analytic method for setting the weights of these terms. Voorhees reported some improvement for short queries, but little or no improvement for long queries. Richardson and Smeaton proposed taking the summation of the semantic similarities between all possible combinations of document and query terms. They ignored the relative significance of terms (as captured by *tfidf* weights) and they considered neither term expansion nor re-weighting. Our proposed method takes term weights into account, introduces an analytic and intuitive term expansion and re-weighting

method, and suggests a document similarity formula that takes the previous information into account. Similarly to *SSRM*, the text retrieval method (Mihalcea, Corley, & Strapparava, 2006) works by associating only the most semantically similar terms in two documents and by summing up their semantic similarities (weighted by the inverse document frequency *idf*). Query terms are neither expanded nor re-weighted as in *SSRM*. Notice that *SSRM* associates all terms in the two documents and accumulates their semantic similarities.

The methods previously referred to allow for ordering the retrieved documents by decreasing similarity to the query taking into account that two documents may match only partially (i.e., a retrieved document need not contain all query terms). Similarly, to classic retrieval models like VSM, *SSRM* allows for non-binary weights in queries and in documents (initial weights are computed using the standard *tfidf* formula). The experimental results in this article demonstrate that *SSRM* performs better (achieving better precision and recall) than its competitors like Salton (1989) and ontology-based methods (Richardson & Smeaton, 1995; Voorhees, 1994).

Query expansion and the term re-weighting in *SSRM* resemble also earlier approaches, which attempt to improve the query with terms obtained from a similarity thesaurus (e.g., based on term to term relationships (Mandalala, Takenobu, & Hozumi, 1998; Qiu & Frei, 1993)). This thesaurus is usually computed by automatic or semi-automatic corpus analysis (global analysis) and would not only add new terms to *SSRM* but also reveal new relationships not existing in a taxonomy of terms. Along the same lines, Possas, Ziviani, Meira, and Neto (2005) exploit the intuition that co-occurring terms occur close to each other and propose a method for extracting patterns of co-occurring terms and their weights by data mining. These approaches depend on the corpus.

SSRM is independent of the corpus and works by discovering term associations based on their conceptual similarity in a lexical ontology specific to the application domain at hand (i.e.,

WordNet or MeSH in this article). The proposed query expansion scheme is complementary to methods, which expand the query with co-occurring terms (e.g., “railway,” “station”) in retrieved documents (Attar & Fraenkel, 1977) (local analysis). Expansion with co-occurring terms (the same as a thesaurus like expansion) can be introduced as additional expansion step in the method. Along the same lines, *SSRM* needs to be extended to work with phrases (Liu, Liu, Yu, & Meng, 2004).

SEMANTIC SIMILARITY

Issues related to semantic similarity algorithms along with issues related to computing semantic similarity on WordNet and MeSH are discussed next.


WordNet

WordNet⁴ is an online lexical reference system developed at Princeton University. WordNet attempts to model the lexical knowledge of a native speaker of English. WordNet can also be seen as ontology for natural language terms. It contains around 100,000 terms, organized into taxonomic hierarchies. Nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs are grouped into synonym sets (synsets). The synsets are also organized into senses (i.e., corresponding to different meanings of the same term or concept). The synsets (or concepts) are related to other synsets higher or lower in the hierarchy defined by different types of relationships. The most common relationships are the *Hyponym/Hypernym* (i.e., Is-A relationships), and the *Meronym/Holonym* (i.e., Part-Of relationships). There are nine noun and several verb Is-A hierarchies (adjectives and adverbs are not organized into Is-A hierarchies). Figure 1 illustrates a fragment of the WordNet Is-A hierarchy.

MeSH

MeSH⁵ (Medical Subject Headings) is a taxonomic hierarchy (ontology) of medical and biological terms (or concepts) suggested by the U.S. National Library of Medicine (NLM). MeSH terms are organized in Is-A taxonomies with more general terms (e.g., “chemicals

Figure 1. A fragment of the WordNet Is-A hierarchy




and drugs”) higher in a taxonomy than more specific terms (e.g., “aspirin”). There are 15 taxonomies with more than 22,000 terms. A term may appear in more than one taxonomy. Each MeSH term is described by several properties the most important of them being the *MeSH Heading* (MH) (i.e., term name or identifier), *Scope Note* (i.e., a text description of the term) and *Entry Terms* (i.e., mostly synonym terms to the MH). Entry terms also include stemmed MH terms and are sometimes referred to as quasi-synonyms (they are not always exactly synonyms). Each MeSH terms is also characterized by its MeSH tree number (or code name) indicating the exact position of the term in the MeSH tree taxonomy (e.g., “D01,029” is the code name of term “Chemical and drugs”). Figure 2 illustrates a fragment of the MeSH Is-A hierarchy.

Semantic Similarity Methods

Several methods for determining semantic similarity between terms have been proposed in the literature and most of them have been tested on WordNet⁶. Similar results on MeSH haven’t been reported in the literature.

Semantic similarity methods are classified into four main categories:

Figure 2. A fragment of the MeSH Is-A hierarchy



1. **Edge Counting Methods:** Measure the similarity between two terms (concepts) as a function of the length of the path linking the terms and on the position of the terms in the taxonomy (Leacock & Chodorov, 1998; Li, Bandar, & McLean, 2003; Rada, Mili, Bicknell, & Blettner, 1989; Richardson, Smeaton, & Murphy, 1994; Wu & Palmer, 1994).
2. **Information Content Methods:** Measure the difference in information content of the two terms as a function of their probability of occurrence in a corpus (Lin, 1993; Lord, Stevens, Brass, & Goble, 2003; Jiang & Conrath, 1998; Resnik, 1999). In this article, information content is computed according to Seco, Veale, and Hayes (2004). The taxonomy (WordNet or MeSH in this article) is used as a statistical resource for computing the probabilities of occurrence of terms. More general concepts (higher in the hierarchy) with many hyponyms convey less information content than more specific terms (lower in the hierarchy) with less hyponyms. This approach is independent of the corpus and also guarantees that the information content of each term is less than the in-

formation content of its subsumed terms. This constraint is common to all methods of this category. Computing information content from a corpus does not always guarantee this requirement. The same method is also applied for computing the information content of terms.

3. **Feature Based Methods:** Measure the similarity between two terms as a function of their properties (e.g., their definitions or “glosses” in WordNet or “scope notes” in MeSH) or based on their relationships to other similar terms in the taxonomy. Common features tend to increase the similarity and (conversely) non-common features tend to diminish the similarity of two concepts (Tversky, 1977).
4. **Hybrid methods** combine the previous ideas (Rodriguez & Egenhofer, 2003). Term similarity is computed by matching synonyms, term neighborhoods, and term features. Term features are further distinguished into parts, functions, and attributes and are matched similarly to (Tversky, 1977).

Semantic similarity methods can also be distinguished between:

1. **Single Ontology similarity methods**, which assume that the terms which are compared are from the same ontology (e.g., MeSH).
2. **Cross Ontology similarity methods**, which compare terms from two different ontologies (e.g., WordNet and MeSH).

An important observation and a desirable property of most semantic similarity methods is that they assign higher similarity to terms which are close together (in terms of path length) and lower in the hierarchy (more specific terms), than to terms which are equally close together but higher in the hierarchy (more general terms).

Edge counting and information content methods work by exploiting structure information (i.e., position of terms) and information

Table 1. Summary of semantic similarity methods

Method	Method Type	Increases with Commonality	Decreases with Difference	Symmetric Property	Normalized in [0,1]	Position in Hierarchy
(Rada et al., 1989)	Edge Counting	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
(Wu & Palmer, 1994)	Edge Counting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
(Li et al., 2003)	Edge Counting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
(Leacock & Chodorov, 1998)	Edge Counting	no	yes	yes	no	yes
(Richardson et al., 1994)	Edge Counting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
(Resnik, 1999)	Info Content	yes	no	yes	no	yes
(Lin, 1993)	Info Content	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
(Lord et al., 2003)	Info Content	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
(Jiang & Conrath, 1998)	Info Content	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
(Tversky, 1977)	Feature	yes	yes	no	yes	no
(Rodriguez & Egenhofer, 2003)	Hybrid	yes	yes	no	yes	no


content of terms in a hierarchy and are best suited for comparing terms from the same ontology. Because the structure and information content of different ontologies are not directly comparable, cross ontology similarity methods usually call for hybrid or feature based approaches. The focus of this work is on single ontology methods. For details on the methods used in the work, please refer to Varelas (2005).

Additional properties of the similarity methods previously referred to are summarized in Table 1. It shows method type, whether similarity affected by the common characteristics of the concepts which are compared, whether it decreases with their differences, whether the similarity is a symmetric property, whether its value is normalized in $[0, 1]$ and, finally, whether it is affected by the position of the terms in the taxonomy.

Semantic Similarity System

All methods previously stated are implemented and integrated into a semantic similarity system which is accessible on the Web⁷. Figure 3 illustrates the architecture of this system. The system communicates with WordNet and MeSH. Each term is represented by its tree hierarchy (corresponding to an XML file, which is stored in the XML repository. The tree hierarchy of a term represents the relationships of the term with its hyponyms and hypernyms. These XML files are created by the XML generator using the WordNet XML Web-Service⁸. The purpose of this structure is to facilitate access to terms stored in the XML repository by indexing the terms by their name of identifier (otherwise accessing a term would require exhaustive searching through the entire WordNet or MeSH files). The information con-

Figure 3. Semantic similarity system



tent of all terms is also computed in advance and stored separately in the information content database. The user is provided with several options at the user interface (e.g., sense selection, method selection).

Evaluation of Semantic Similarity Methods

In the following, we present a comparative evaluation of the similarity methods referred to previously.

Semantic Similarity on WordNet

In accordance with previous research (Resnik, 1999), we evaluated the results obtained by applying the semantic similarity methods presented in this work to the same pairs used in the experiment by Miller and Charles (1991): 38 undergraduate students were given 30 pairs of nouns and were asked to rate the similarity of each pair on a scale from 0 (not similar) through 4 (perfect synonymy). The average rating of each pair represents a good estimate of how similar the two words are.

We compared the computed similarity scores for the same terms as in Miller and Charles with the human relevance results reported there. The similarity values obtained by all competitive computational methods (all senses of the first term are compared with all senses of the second term) are correlated with the average scores obtained by the humans in Miller and Charles (1991). The higher the correlation of a method the better the method is (i.e., the more it approaches the results of human judgments).

Table 2 shows the correlation obtained by each method. Jiang et al. (1998) suggested removing one of the pairs from the evaluation. This increased the correlation of their method to 0.87. The method by Li et al. (2003) is among the best and it is also the fastest. These results lead to the following observations:

1. Information Content methods perform very well and close to the upper bound suggested by (Resnik, 1999).
2. Methods that consider the positions of the terms in the hierarchy (e.g., Li et al., 2003)

Table 2. Evaluation of semantic similarity methods on WordNet

Method	Method Type	Correlation
(Rada et al., 1989)	Edge Counting	0.59
(Wu & Palmer, 1994)	Edge Counting	0.74
(Li et al., 2003)	Edge Counting	0.82
(Leacock & Chodorov, 1998)	Edge Counting	0.82
(Richardson et al., 1994)	Edge Counting	0.63
(Resnik, 1999)	Info Content	0.79
(Lin, 1993)	Info Content	0.82
(Lord et al., 2003)	Info Content	0.79
(Jiang & Conrath, 1998)	Info Content	0.83
(Tversky, 1977)	Feature	0.73
(Rodriguez & Egenhofer, 2003)	Hybrid	0.71

perform better than plain path length methods (e.g., Rada et al., 1989).

3. Methods exploiting the properties (i.e., structure and information content) of the underlying hierarchy perform better than Hybrid and Feature based methods, which do not fully exploit this information. However, Hybrid and feature based methods (e.g., Rodriguez et al., 2003), are mainly targeted towards cross ontology similarity applications where edge counting and information content methods do not apply.

Semantic Similarity on MeSH

An evaluation of Semantic Similarity methods on MeSH haven't been reported in the literature before. For the evaluation, we designed an experiment similar to that by Miller and Charles (1991) for WordNet: We asked a medical expert to compile a set of MeSH term pairs. A set of 49 pairs was proposed, together with an estimate of similarity between 0 (not similar) and 4 (perfect similarity) for each pair. To reduce the subjectivity of similarity estimates, we created a form-based interface with all pairs on the Web⁹ and we invited other medical experts to enter their evaluation (the interface is still accepting results by experts worldwide). So far, we received estimates from 12 experts.

The analysis of the results revealed that: (a) Some medical terms are more involved or ambiguous leading to ambiguous evaluation by many users. For each pair, the standard deviation of their similarity (over all users) was computed. Pairs with standard deviation higher than a user defined threshold $t=0.8$ were excluded from the evaluation. (b) Medical experts were not at the same level of expertise and (in some cases) gave unreliable results. For each user we computed the standard deviation of their evaluation (over all pairs). We excluded users who gave significantly different results from the majority of other users. Overall, 13 out of the 49 pairs and 4 out of the 12 users were excluded from the evaluation.

Following the same procedure as in the WordNet experiments, the similarity values obtained by each method (all senses of the first term are compared with all senses of the second term) are correlated with the average scores obtained by the humans.

The correlation results are summarized in Table 3. These results lead to similar observations with the previous experiment:

1. Edge counting and information content methods perform about equally well. However, methods that consider the positions of the terms (lower or higher) in the hierarchy (e.g., Li et al., 2003) perform

Table 3. Evaluation of semantic similarity methods on MeSH

Method	Method Type	Correlation
(Rada et al., 1989)	Edge Counting	0.50
(Wu & Palmer, 1994)	Edge Counting	0.67
(Li, et al., 2003)	Edge Counting	0.70
(Leacock & Chodorov, 1998)	Edge Counting	0.74
(Richardson, et al., 1994)	Edge Counting	0.64
(Resnik, 1999)	Info Content	0.71
(Lin, 1993)	Info Content	0.72
(Lord et al., 2003)	Info Content	0.70
(Jiang & Conrath, 1998)	Info Content	0.71
(Tversky, 1977)	Feature	0.67
(Rodriguez & Egenhofer, 2003)	Hybrid	0.71

- better than plain path length methods (e.g., Rada et al., 1989).
- Hybrid and feature based methods exploiting properties of terms (e.g., scope notes, entry terms) perform at least as well as information content and edge counting methods (exploiting information relating to the structure and information content of the underlying taxonomy), implying that term annotations in MeSH represent significant information by themselves and that it is possible to design even more effective methods by combining information from all the sources listed previously (term annotations, structure information and information content).

SEMANTIC SIMILARITY RETRIEVAL MODEL (SSRM)

Traditionally, the similarity between two documents (e.g., a query q and a document d) is computed according to the Vector Space Model (VSM) (Salton, 1989) as the cosine of the inner product between their document vectors:

$$Sim(q, d) = \frac{\sum_i q_i d_i}{\sqrt{\sum_i q_i^2 \sum_i d_i^2}} \quad (1)$$

where q_i and d_i are the weights in the two vector representations. Given a query, all documents

are ranked according to their similarity with the query. This model is also known as the “bag of words model” for document retrieval.

The lack of common terms in two documents does not necessarily mean that the documents are unrelated. Semantically similar concepts may be expressed in different words in the documents and the queries, and direct comparison by word-based VSM is not effective. For example, VSM will not recognize synonyms or semantically similar terms (e.g., “car,” “automobile”).

SSRM suggests discovering semantically similar terms using term taxonomies like WordNet or MeSH. Query expansion is also applied as a means for capturing similarities between terms of different degrees of generality in documents and queries (e.g., “human,” “man”). Queries are augmented with conceptually similar terms, which are retrieved by applying a range query in the neighborhood of each term in an ontology. Each query term is expanded by synonyms, hyponyms, and hypernyms. The degree of expansion is controlled by the user (i.e., so that each query term may introduce new terms more than one level higher or lower in an ontology). SSRM can work with any general or application specific ontology. The selection of ontology depends on the application domain (e.g., WordNet for image retrieval on the Web (Varelas, Voutsakis, Raftopoulou, Petrakis, &

Milios, 2005), MeSH for retrieval in medical document collections (Hliaoutakis, Varelas, Petrakis, & Milios, 2006)).

Query expansion by *SSRM* resembles the idea by Voorhees (1994). However, Voorhees did not show how to compute good weights for the new terms introduced into the query after expansion nor it showed how to control the degree of expansion. Notice that, high degree of expansion results in topic drift. *SSRM* solves this problem and implements an intuitive and analytic method for setting the weights of the new query terms.

Voorhees relied on the Vector Space Model (VSM) and therefore on lexical term matching for computing document similarity. Therefore, it is not possible for this method to retrieve documents with conceptually similar but lexically different terms. *SSRM* solves this problem by taking all possible term associations between two documents into account and by accumulating their similarities.

Similarly to VSM, queries and documents are first syntactically analyzed and reduced into term vectors. Very infrequent or very frequent terms are eliminated. Each term in this vector is represented by its weight. The weight of a term is computed as a function of its frequency of occurrence in the document collection and can be defined in many different ways. The term frequency-inverse document frequency model (Salton, 1989) is used for computing the weight: The weight d_i of a term i in a document is computed as $d_i = tf_i \cdot idf_i$, where tf_i is the frequency of term i in the document and idf_i is the inverse document frequency of i in the whole document collection.

Then *SSRM* works in three steps:

Query Re-Weighting: The weight q_i of each query term i is adjusted based on its relationships with other semantically similar terms j within the same vector:

$$q_i' = q_i + \sum_{\substack{j \neq i \\ sim(i,j) \geq t}} q_j sim(i,j) \quad (2)$$

where t is a user defined threshold ($t=0.8$ in this article). Multiple related terms in the same query reinforce each other (e.g., "railway," "train," and "metro"). The weights of non-similar terms remain unchanged (e.g., "train," "house"). For short queries specifying only a few terms the weights are initialized to 1 and are adjusted according to the formula in Equation 2.

Query Expansion: First, the query is augmented by synonym terms, using the most common sense of each query term. Then, the query is augmented by terms higher or lower in the tree hierarchy (i.e., hypernyms and hyponyms) which are semantically similar to terms already in the query. Figure 4 illustrates this process: Each query term is represented by its tree hierarchy. The neighborhood of the term is examined and all terms with similarity greater than threshold T are also included in the query vector. This expansion may include terms more than one level higher or lower than the original term. Then, each query term i is assigned a weight as follows:

Figure 4. Term expansion




Figure 5. SSRM algorithm

Input: Query q , Document d , Semantic Similarity function $sim()$, Thresholds t, T , Ontology.
Output: Document similarity value $Sim(d,q)$.

- Compute query term vector:** $q=(q_1,q_2,...)$ using *tfidf* weighting scheme.
- Compute document term vector:** $d=(d_1,d_2,...)$ using *tfidf* weighting scheme.
- Query re-weighting:** For all term i in q compute new weight based on other semantically similar terms j in q as $q'_i = q_i + \sum_{\substack{j \neq i \\ sim(i,j) \geq t}} q_j sim(i,j)$.
- Query expansion:** For all terms j in q retrieve terms i from ontology satisfying $sim(i,j) \geq T$.
- Term re-weighting:** For all terms i in q compute new weight as

$$q'_i = \begin{cases} q_i + \sum_{\substack{i \neq j \\ sim(i,j) \geq T}} \frac{1}{n} q_j sim(i,j), & i \text{ had weight } q_i \\ \sum_{\substack{i \neq j \\ sim(i,j) \geq T}} \frac{1}{n} q_j sim(i,j), & i \text{ is a new term} \end{cases}$$
- Query Normalization:** Normalize query by length.
- Compute document similarity:** $Sim(q,d) = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j q_i q_j sim(i,j)}{\sum_i \sum_j q_i q_j}$.

$$q'_i = \begin{cases} q_i + \sum_{\substack{i \neq j \\ sim(i,j) \geq T}} \frac{1}{n} q_j sim(i,j), & i \text{ had weight } q_i \\ \sum_{\substack{i \neq j \\ sim(i,j) \geq T}} \frac{1}{n} q_j sim(i,j), & i \text{ is a new term} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where n is the number of hyponyms of each expanded term j . For hypernyms $n=1$. The summation is taken over all terms j introducing terms to the query. It is possible for a term to introduce terms that already existed in the query. It is also possible that the same term is introduced by more than one other terms. Equation 2, suggests taking the weights of the original query terms into account and that the contribution of each term in assigning weights to query terms is normalized by the number n of its hyponyms. After expansion and re-weighting, the query vector is normalized by document length, like each document vector.

Document Similarity: The similarity between an expanded and re-weighted query q and a document d is computed as:

$$Sim(q,d) = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j q_i q_j sim(i,j)}{\sum_i \sum_j q_i q_j} \quad (4)$$

where i and j are terms in the query and the document respectively. Query terms are expanded and re-weighted according to the previous steps while document terms d_j are computed as *tfidf* terms (they are neither expanded nor re-weighted). The similarity measure in Equation 4 is normalized in the range $[0,1]$. Figure 5 presents a summary of *SSRM*.

Discussion

SSRM relaxes the requirement of classical retrieval models that conceptually similar terms be mutually independent (known also as “synonymy problem”). It takes into account dependencies between terms during its expansion and re-weighting steps. Their dependence is expressed quantitatively by virtue of their semantic similarity and this information is taken explicitly into account in the computation of document similarity. Notice however the quadratic time complexity of *SSRM* due to Equation 3 as opposed to the linear time complexity of

Equation 1 of VSM. To speed up similarity computations, the semantic similarities between pairs of MeSH or WordNet terms are stored in a hash table. To reduce space only pairs with similarity greater than 0.3 are stored.

SSRM approximates VSM in the case of non-semantically similar terms: If $sim(i,j)=0$ for all $i \neq j$ then Equation 3 is reduced to Equation 1. In this case, the similarity between two documents is computed as a function of weight similarities between identical terms (as in VSM).

Expanding and re-weighting is fast for queries, which are typically short, consisting of only a few terms, but not for documents with many terms. The method suggests expansion of the query only. However, the similarity function will take into account the relationships between all semantically similar terms between the document and the query (something that VSM cannot do).

The expansion step attempts to automate the manual or semi-automatic query re-formulation process based on feedback information from the user (Rochio, 1971). Expanding the query with a threshold T will introduce new terms depending also on the position of the terms in the taxonomy: More specific terms (lower in the taxonomy) are more likely to expand than more general terms (higher in the taxonomy). Notice that expansion with low threshold values T (e.g., $T=0.5$) is likely to introduce many new terms and diffuse the topic of the query (topic drift). The specification of threshold T may also depend on query scope or user uncertainty. A low value of T might be desirable for broad scope queries or for initially resolving uncertainty as to what the user is really looking for. The query is then repeated with higher threshold. High values of threshold are desirable for very specific queries: Users with high degree of certainty might prefer to expand with a high threshold or not to expand at all.

The specification of T in Equation 2 requires further investigation. Appropriate threshold values can be learned by training or relevance feedback (Rui, Huang, Ortega, & Mechrota, 1998). Word sense disambiguation

(Patwardhan, Banerjee, & Petersen, 2003) can also be applied to detect the correct sense to expand rather than expanding the most common sense of each term. *SSRM* also makes use of a second threshold t for expressing the desired similarity between terms within the query (Equation 1). Our experiments with several values of t revealed that the method is rather insensitive to the selection of this threshold. Throughout this article we set $t = 0.8$.

Evaluation of *SSRM*

SSRM has been tested on two different applications and two data sets respectively. The first application is retrieval of medical documents using MeSH and the second application is image retrieval on the Web using WordNet.

The experimental results illustrate that it is possible to enhance the quality of classic information retrieval methods by incorporating semantic similarity within the retrieval method.

SSRM outperforms classic and state-of-the-art semantic information retrieval methods (Richardson et al., 1995; Salton, 1989; Voorhees, 1994). The retrieval system is built upon Lucene¹⁰, a full-featured text search engine library written in Java. All retrieval methods are implemented on top of Lucene.

The following methods are implemented and evaluated:

1. Semantic Similarity Retrieval Model (*SSRM*): Queries are expanded with semantically similar terms in the neighborhood of each term. The results that follow correspond to two different thresholds $T=0.9$ (i.e. the query is expanded only with very similar terms) and $T=0.5$ (i.e., the query is expanded with terms which are not necessarily conceptually similar). In WordNet, each query term is also expanded with synonyms. Because no synonymy relation is defined in MeSH we did not apply expansion to Mesh terms in the query with Entry Terms. Semantic similarity in *SSRM* is computed by Li et al., (2003).

2. Vector Space Model (VSM) (Salton, 1989): Text queries can also be augmented by synonyms.
3. Term expansion (Voorhees, 1994): The query terms are expanded always with hyponyms one level higher or lower in the taxonomy and synonyms. The method did not propose an analytic method for computing the weights of these terms.
4. Semantic similarity accumulation (Richardson et al., 1995): Accumulates the semantic similarities between all pairs of document and query terms. It ignores the relative significance of terms (as it is captured by *tfidf*). Query terms are not expanded nor re-weighted as in SSRM.

In the experiments that follow, each method is represented by a *precision/recall* curve. For each query, the best 50 answers were retrieved (the *precision/recall* plot of each method contains exactly 50 points). Precision and recall values are computed from each answer set and therefore, each plot contains exactly 50 points. The top-left point of a precision/recall curve corresponds to the *precision/recall* values for the best answer or best match (which has rank 1) while the bottom right point corresponds to the *precision/recall* values for the entire answer set. A method is better than another if it achieves better precision and better recall. As we shall see in the experiments, it is possible for two precision-recall curves to crossover. This means that one of the two methods performs better for small answer sets (containing less answers than the number of points up to the cross-section), while the other performs better for larger answer sets. The method achieving higher precision and recall for the first few answers is considered to be the better method (based on the assumption that typical users focus their attention on the first few answers).

Information Retrieval on OHSUMED

SSRM has been tested on OHSUMED¹¹ (a standard TREC collection with 293,856 medical articles from Medline published between 1988-1991) using MeSH as the underlying ontology.

All OHSUMED documents are indexed by title, abstract and MeSH terms (MeSH Headings). These descriptions are syntactically analyzed and reduced into separate vectors of MeSH terms which are matched against the queries according to Equation 3 (as similarity between expanded and re-weighted vectors). The weights of all MeSH terms are initialized to one while the weights of titles and abstracts are initialized by *tfidf*. The similarity between a query and a document is computed as:


$$Sim(q,d) = \frac{Sim(q,d_{MeSH-terms}) + Sim(q,d_{title})}{Sim(q,d_{abstract})} \quad (5)$$

where $d_{MeSH-terms}$, d_{title} and $d_{abstract}$ are the representations of the document MeSH terms, title and abstract respectively. This formula suggests that a document is similar to a query if its components are similar to the query. Each similarity component can be computed either by VSM or by SSRM.

For the evaluations, we applied the subset of 63 queries of the original query set developed by Hersh et al. (1994). The correct answers to these queries were compiled by the editors of OHSUMED and are also available on the Web along with the queries. A document is considered similar to a query if the query terms are included in the document. OHSUMED provides the means for comparing the performance of different methods. However, it is not particularly well suited for semantic information retrieval with SSRM. A better criterion would be to judge whether a document is on the topic of the query (even if it contains lexically different terms).

The results in Figure 6 demonstrate that SSRM with expansion with very similar terms $T=0.9$ and for small answer sets (i.e., with less than eight answers) outperforms all other methods (Richardson et al., 1995; Salton, 1989; Voorhees, 1994). For larger answer sets, Voorhees (1994) is the best method. For answer sets with 50 documents all methods (except VSM) perform about the same. SSRM with expansion threshold $T=0.5$ performed worse than SSRM with $T=0.9$. An explanation may be that it introduced many new terms and not

Figure 6. Precision-recall diagram for retrievals on OHSUMED using MeSH



all of them are conceptually similar with the original query terms.

Image Retrieval on the Web


Searching for effective methods to retrieve information from the Web has been in the center of many research efforts during the last few years. The relevant technology evolved rapidly thanks to advances in Web systems technology (Arasu, Cho, Garcia-Molina, Paepke, & Raghavan, 2002) and information retrieval research (Yates et al., 1999). Image retrieval on the Web, in particular, is a very important problem in itself (Kherfi, Ziou, & Bernardi, 2004). The relevant technology has also evolved significantly propelled by advances in image database research (Smeulders, Worring, Santini, Gupta, & Jain, 2000).

Image retrieval on the Web requires that content descriptions be extracted from Web pages and used to determine which Web pages contain images that satisfy the query selection criteria. Several approaches to the problem of content-based image retrieval on the Web have been proposed and some have been implemented

on research prototypes, for example, ImageRover (Taycher, Cascia, & Sclaroff, 1997), WebSEEK (Smith & Chang, 1997), Diogenis (Aslandongan & Yu, 2000), and commercial systems, Google Image Search¹², Yahoo¹³, and AltaVista¹⁴. Because, methods for extracting reliable and meaningful image content from Web pages by automated image analysis are not yet available images on the Web are typically described by text or attributes associated with images in html tags (e.g., filename, caption, alternate text etc.). These are automatically extracted from the Web pages and are used in retrievals. Google, Yahoo, and AltaVista are example systems of this category.

We choose the problem of image retrieval based on surrounding text as a case study for this evaluation. *SSRM* has been evaluated through *IntelliSearch*¹⁵, a prototype Web retrieval system for Web pages and images in Web pages. An earlier system we built supported retrievals using only VSM (Voutsakis, Petrakis, & Milios, 2005). In this article, the system has been extended to support retrievals using *SSRM* with WordNet as the underlying reference ontology.

Figure 7. Precision-recall diagram for retrievals on the Web using WordNet



The retrieval system of *IntelliSearch* is built upon Lucene and the database stores more than 1.5 million Web pages with images.

As it is typical in the literature (Petrakis, Kontis, Voutakis, & Milios, 2005; Shen, Ooi, & Tan, 2000; Voutsakis et al., 2005), the problem of image retrieval on the Web is treated as one of text retrieval as follows: Images are described by the text surrounding them in the Web pages (i.e., captions, alternate text, image file names, page title). These descriptions are syntactically analyzed and reduced into term vectors, which are matched against the queries. Similarly, to the previous experiment, the similarity between a query and a document (image) is computed as:

$$Sim(q,d) = Sim(q,d_{image-file-name}) + Sim(q,d_{caption}) + Sim(q,d_{page-title}) + Sim(q,d_{alternate-text}) \quad (6)$$

For the evaluations, 20 queries were selected from the list of the most frequent Google image queries. These are short queries containing between 1 and 4 terms. The evaluation is

based on human relevance judgments by five human referees. Each referee evaluated a subset of four queries for both methods.

Figure 7 indicates that *SSRM* is far more effective than *VSM* achieving up to 30% better precision and up to 20% better recall. A closer look into the results reveals that the efficiency of *SSRM* is mostly due to the contribution of non-identical but semantically similar terms. *VSM* (like most classical retrieval models relying on lexical term matching) ignore this information. In *VSM*, query terms may also be expanded with synonyms. Experiments with and without expansion by synonyms are presented. Notice that *VSM* with query expansion by synonyms improved the results of plain *VSM* only marginally, indicating that the performance gain of *SSRM* is not due to the expansion by synonyms but rather due to the contribution of semantically similar terms.

CONCLUSION

This article makes two contributions. The first contribution is to experiment with several semantic similarity methods for computing

the conceptual similarity between natural language terms using WordNet and MeSH. To our knowledge, similar experiments with MeSH have not been reported elsewhere. The experimental results indicate that it is possible for these methods to approximate algorithmically the human notion of similarity reaching correlation (with human judgment of similarity) up to 83% for WordNet and up to 74% for MeSH. The second contribution is SSRM, information retrieval method that takes advantage of this result. SSRM outperforms VSM, the classic information retrieval method and demonstrates promising performance improvements over other semantic information retrieval methods in retrieval on OHSUMED, a standard TREC collection with medical documents, which is available on the Web. Additional experiments have demonstrated the utility of SSRM in Web image retrieval based on text image descriptions extracted automatically. SSRM has been also tested on Medline¹⁶, the premier bibliographic database of the U.S. National Library of Medicine (NLM) (Hliaoutakis et al., 2006). All experiments confirmed the promise of SSRM over classic retrieval models. SSRM can work in conjunction with any taxonomic ontology like MeSH or WordNet and any associated document corpus. Current research is directed towards extending SSRM to work with compound terms (phrases), and more term relationships (in addition to the Is-A relationships).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Dr Qiufen Qi of Dalhousie University for prepared the MeSH terms and the queries for the experiments with MeSH and evaluated the results of retrievals on Medline. We thank Nikos Hurdakis, and Paraskevi Raftopoulou for valuable contributions into this article. The U.S. National Library of Medicine provided us with the complete data sets of MeSH and Medline. This article was funded by project MedSearch/BIOATTERN (Fp6, Project No 508803) of the European Union (EU), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and IT Interactive Services Inc.

REFERENCES

- Arasu, A., Cho, J., Garcia-Molina, H., Paepke, A., & Raghavan, S. (2002). Searching the Web. *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology, 1*(1), 2-43.
- Aslandongan, Y. A., & Yu, C. T. (2000). Evaluating strategies and systems for content-based indexing of person images on the Web. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Multimedia* (pp. 313-321).
- Attar, R., & Fraenkel, A. S. (1977). Local feedback in full text retrieval systems. *Journal of the ACM, 23*(3), 397-417.
- Collins-Thomson, K., & Callan, J. (2005). Query expansion using random walk models. In *Proceedings of CIKM* (pp. 704-711).
- Hersh, W. R., Buckley, C., Leone, T. J., & Hickam, D. H. (1994). OHSUMED: An interactive retrieval evaluation and new large. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGIR* (pp. 192-201).
- Hliaoutakis, A., Varelas, G., Petrakis, E. G. M., & Milios, E. (2006). MedSearch: A retrieval system for medical information based on semantic similarity. In *Proceedings of ECDL* (pp. 512-515).
- Jiang, J. J., & Conrath, D. W. (1998). Semantic similarity based on corpus statistics and lexical taxonomy. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Research in Computational Linguistics*.
- Kherfi, M. L., Ziou, D., & Bernardi, A. (2004). Image retrieval from the World Wide Web: Issues, techniques, and systems. *ACM Computing Surveys, 36*(1), 35-67.
- Leacock, C., & Chodorov, M. (1998). Combining local context and WordNet similarity for word sense identification. In C. Fellbaum (Ed.), *WordNet: An electronic lexical database and some of its applications* (chap. 11). Boston: MIT Press.
- Li, Y., Bandar, Z. A., & McLean, D. (2003). An approach for measuring semantic similarity between words using multiple information sources. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering,*

- 15(4), 871-882.
- Lin, D. (1993). Principle-based parsing without overgeneration. In *ACL* (pp. 112-120).
- Liu, S., Liu, F., Yu, C., & Meng, M. (2004). An effective approach to document retrieval via utilizing wordnet and recognizing phrases. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGIR* (pp. 266-272).
- Lord, P. W., Stevens, R. D., Brass, A., & Goble, C. A. (2003). Investigating semantic similarity measures across the gene ontology: The relationship between sequence and annotation. *Bioninformatics*, 19(10), 1275-1283.
- Mandala, R., Takenobu, T., & Hozumi, T. (1998). The use of WordNet in information retrieval. In *COLING/ACL* (pp. 469-477).
- Mihalcea, R., Corley, C., & Strapparava, C. (2006, July). Corpus-based and knowledge-based measures of text semantic similarity. In *Proceedings of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2006)*. Boston.
- Miller, G., & Charles, W. (1991). Contextual correlates of semantic similarity. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 6(1), 1-28.
- Patwardhan, S., Banerjee, S., & Petersen, T. (2003, February). Using measures of semantic relatedness for word sense disambiguation. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Intelligent Text Processing and Computational Linguistics*, Mexico City, Mexico (pp. 241-257).
- Petrakis, E., Kontis, K., Voutakis, E., & Milios, E. (2005). Relevance feedback methods for logo and trademark image retrieval on the Web. In *Proceedings of ACM SAC, IAR* (pp. 23-27).
- Possas, B., Ziviani, N., Meira, W., & Neto, B. R. (2005). Set-based vector model: An efficient approach for correlation-based ranking. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 23(4), 397-429.
- Qiu, Y., & Frei, H. P. (1993). Concept-based query expansion. In *Proceedings of SIGIR* (pp. 160-169).
- Rada, R., Mili, E., Bicknell, E., & Blettner, M. (1989). Development and application of a metric on semantic nets. *IEEE Transaction on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, 19(1), 17-30.
- Resnik, O. (1999). Semantic similarity in a taxonomy: An information-based measure and its application to problems of ambiguity and natural language. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 11, 95-130.
- Richardson, R., & Smeaton, A. (1995). *Using WordNet in a knowledge-based approach to information retrieval* (Working Paper: CA-0395). Dublin, Ireland: School of Computer Applications.
- Richardson, R., Smeaton, A., & Murphy, J. (1994). *Using WordNet as a knowledge base for measuring semantic similarity between words* (Working paper CA-1294). Dublin, Ireland: School of Computer Applications, Dublin City University.
- Rochio, J. J. (1971). Relevance feedback in information retrieval. In G. Salton (Ed.), *The SMART retrieval system—Experiments in automatic document processing* (pp. 313-323). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rodriguez, M. A., & Egenhofer, M. J. (2003). Determining semantic similarity among entity classes from different ontologies. *IEEE Trans. on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 15(2), 442-456.
- Rui, Y., Huang, T. S., Ortega, M., & Mechrota, S. (1998). Relevance feedback: A power tool for interactive content-based image retrieval. *IEEE Transaction on Circ. and Syst. for Video Technology*, 8(5), 644-655.
- Salton, G. (1989). *Automatic text processing: the transformation analysis and retrieval of information by computer*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Seco, N., Veale, T., & Hayes, J. (2004). *An intrinsic information content metric for semantic similarity in WordNet*. Ireland:

- Dept. of Computer Science, University College Dublin.
- Shen, H. T., Ooi, B. C., & Tan, K. L. (2000). Giving meanings to WWW images. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Multimedia* (pp. 39-47).
- Smeulders, A. W. M., Worring, M., Santini, S., Gupta, A., & Jain, R. (2000). Content-based image retrieval at the end of the early years. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pp. 1349-1380.
- Smith, J. R., & Chang, S. F. (1997). Visually searching the Web for content. *IEEE Multimedia*, 4(3), 12-20.
- Taycher, L., Cascia, M. L. & Sclaroff, S. (1997). Image digestion and relevance feedback in the ImageRover WWW search engine. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Visual Information Systems* (pp. 85-94).
- Tversky, A. (1977). Features of similarity. *Psychological Review*, 84(4), 327-352.
- Varelas, G. (2005). *Semantic similarity methods in WordNet and their application to information retrieval on the Web* (TR-TUC-ISL-01-2005). Retrieved from <http://www.intelligence.tuc.gr/publications/Varelas.pdf>
- Varelas, G., Voutsakis, E., Raftopoulou, P., Petrakis, E. G. M., & Milios, E. (2005). Semantic similarity methods in WordNet and their application to information retrieval on the Web. In *WIDM* (pp. 10-16).
- Voorhees, E. M. (1994). Query expansion using lexical-semantic relations. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR* (pp. 61-69).
- Voutsakis, E., Petrakis, E., & Milios, E. (2005). Weighted link analysis for logo and trademark image retrieval on the Web. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI)* (pp. 581-585).
- Wu, Z., & Palmer, M. (1994). Verb semantics and lexical selection. In *ACL* (pp. 133-138).
- Yates, R. B., & Neto, B. R. (1999). *Modern information retrieval*. Boston: Addison Wesley Longman.

END NOTES

- 1 <http://wordnet.princeton.edu>
- 2 <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh>
- 3 <http://www.nlm.nih.gov>
- 4 <http://wordnet.princeton.edu>
- 5 <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh>
- 6 <http://marimba.d.umn.edu/cgi-bin/similarity/similarity.cgi>
- 7 <http://www.intelligence.tuc.gr/similarity>
- 8 <http://wnws.sourceforge.net>
- 9 <http://www.intelligence.tuc.gr/mesh>
- 10 <http://lucene.apache.org>
- 11 http://trec.nist.gov/data/t9_filtering.html
- 12 <http://images.google.com>
- 13 <http://images.search.yahoo.com>
- 14 <http://www.altavista.com/image>
- 15 <http://www.intelligence.tuc.gr/intel-lisearch>
- 16 http://www.nlm.nih.gov/databases/databases_medline.html

Angelos Hliaoutakis received his Diploma from the Dept. of Electronics and Computer Engineering, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Chania, Greece in 2005. He is currently an MSc candidate at the same department. His research interests are focused on information retrieval, natural language processing, information extraction and medical information systems. Part of his work has been published in various international conferences and scientific journals.

Giannis Varelas received his Diploma from the Dept. of Electronics and Computer Engineering, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Chania, Greece in 2005. He is currently an MSc candidate at the same department. His research interests are focused on information retrieval, Semantic Web and software engineering. Part of his work has been published in various international conferences and scientific journals.

Epimenidis Voutsakis received his Diploma from the Dept. of Electronics and Computer Engineering, Technical University of Crete (TUC), Chania, Greece in 2004. He is currently an MSc candidate at the same department. His research interests are focused on information retrieval, Web link analysis, information extraction and software engineering. Part of his work has been published in various international conferences and scientific journals.

Euripides Petrakis received a Bachelor in Physics from the National University of Athens in 1986. He holds a PhD from the University of Crete, Department of Computer Science, since 1993. He joined the Technical University of Crete (TUC) on January 1998, where he is serving as associate professor at the Computer Science division of the Department of Electronic and Computer Engineering and as director of the Intelligent Systems Laboratory. He is currently involved in research on modern aspects of information retrieval in multimedia information systems, Web information systems, medical information systems and Semantic Web. He is a member of the IEEE.

Evangelos Milios received a Diploma in electrical engineering from the National Technical University of Athens, Greece, and master's and PhD degrees in electrical engineering and computer science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. After spending five years doing research on shape analysis, sensor-based robotics, and signal processing in the Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto, he joined York University as an associate professor. Since July of 1998 he has been with the Faculty of Computer Science, Dalhousie University, and Halifax, Nova Scotia, where he is professor. He was director of the Graduate Program (1999-2002). He is a senior member of the IEEE. He served as a member of the ACM Dissertation Award committee (1990-1992) and a member of the AAAI/SIGART Doctoral Consortium Committee (1997-2001). He has published on the processing, interpretation and use of visual and range signals for landmark-based navigation and map construction in single and multi-agent robotics. His current research activity is centered on networked information spaces, applications of automatic term extraction from special-text corpora, and Web information retrieval.