

Corrected Evaluation Results of the NTCIR WWW-2, WWW-3, and WWW-4 English Subtasks

Tetsuya Sakai, Sijie Tao
Waseda University, Japan
tetsuyasakai@acm.org
tsjmailbox@ruri.waseda.jp

Maria Maistro
University of Copenhagen, Denmark
mm@di.ku.dk

Zhumin Chu
Tsinghua University, P.R.C.
chuzm19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Yujing Li, Nuo Chen
Waseda University, Japan
liyujing@ruri.waseda.jp
pleviumtan@toki.waseda.jp

Nicola Ferro
University of Padua, Italy
ferro@dei.unipd.it

Junjie Wang
Waseda University, Japan
wjj1020181822@toki.waseda.jp

Ian Soboroff
NIST, USA
ian.soboroff@nist.gov

Yiqun Liu
Tsinghua University, P.R.C.
yiqunliu@tsinghua.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Unfortunately, the official English (sub)task results reported in the NTCIR-14 WWW-2, NTCIR-15 WWW-3, and NTCIR-16 WWW-4 overview papers are incorrect due to noise in the official qrels files; this paper reports results based on the corrected qrels files. The noise is due to a fatal bug in the backend of our relevance assessment interface. More specifically, at WWW-2, WWW-3, and WWW-4, two versions of pool files were created for each English topic: a PRI (“prioritised”) file, which uses the NTCIRPOOL script to prioritise likely relevant documents, and a RND (“randomised”) file, which randomises the pooled documents. This was done for the purpose of studying the effect of document ordering for relevance assessors. However, the programmer who wrote the interface backend assumed that a combination of a topic ID and a document rank in the pool file uniquely determines a document ID; this is obviously incorrect as we have two versions of pool files. The outcome is that all the PRI-based relevance labels for the WWW-2 test collection are incorrect (while all the RND-based relevance labels are correct), and all the RND-based relevance labels for the WWW-3 and WWW-4 test collections are incorrect (while all the PRI-based relevance labels are correct). This bug was finally discovered at the NTCIR-16 WWW-4 task when the first seven authors of this paper served as Gold assessors (i.e., topic creators who define what is relevant) and closely examined the disagreements with Bronze assessors (i.e., non-topic-creators; non-experts). We would like to apologise to the WWW participants and the NTCIR chairs for the inconvenience and confusion caused due to this bug.

1 INTRODUCTION

This paper corrects the official English (sub)task results of the NTCIR-14 WWW-2, NTCIR-15 WWW-3, and NTCIR-16 WWW-4 tasks [7, 11, 12]. The corrected qrels files and the evaluation results are available from <http://sakailab.com/www234corrected>. We would like to apologise to the WWW participants and the NTCIR chairs for the inconvenience and confusion caused due to this bug. More specifically, the English run results of the following participants

are incorrect due to the bug: WWW-2 participants (MPII [19], RUCIR [18], SLWWW [16], and THUIR [20]), WWW-3 participants (ESTUCeng [1], KASYS [13], NAUIR [6], RUCIR [21], SLWWW [8], THUIR [4], Technion [9], and mpii [5]), and WWW-4 participants (KASYS [15], SLWWW [14], and THUIR [17]). Apologies again.

2 NTCIR-14 WWW-2 ENGLISH SUBTASK RESULTS

This section corrects the English subtask results reported in the WWW-2 overview paper [7].

The WWW-2 English topic set contains 80 topics, and each topic was handled by two assessors. For 27 topics¹, both assessors used a PRI file (“PRI-PRI topics”); for 26 topics², both assessors used a RND file (“RND-RND topics”); for the remaining 27 topics³, one assessor used a PRI file while the other assessor used a RND file (“PRI-RND topics”). At the WWW-2 task, the official qrels file was formed by summing the two 3-point scale relevance labels for each topic; thus a 5-point scale qrels file containing relevance levels of L0-L4 was obtained. However, for this particular round of the WWW task, the PRI-based relevance labels were incorrect due to the aforementioned bug. Hence, the combined relevance labels for the 27 PRI-PRI topics and the 27 PRI-RND topics are noisy.

After correcting the PRI-based relevance labels, we formed a correct 5-point scale qrels file using the above method. Table 1 shows the statistics of the corrected WWW-2 qrels file.

Tables 2-3 show the WWW-2 English run rankings based on the corrected qrels file. Tables 4 and 5 show the corresponding statistical significance test results. We can observe that:

- In terms of nDCG and Q, THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3 is statistically the best run in that it statistically significantly outperforms eight/seven other runs (Table 4).

¹0001, 0004, 0007, 0010, 0013, 0016, 0019, 0022, 0025, 0028, 0031, 0034, 0037, 0040, 0043, 0046, 0049, 0052, 0055, 0058, 0061, 0064, 0067, 0070, 0073, 0076, 0079

²0003, 0006, 0009, 0012, 0015, 0018, 0021, 0024, 0027, 0030, 0033, 0036, 0039, 0042, 0045, 0048, 0051, 0054, 0057, 0060, 0063, 0066, 0069, 0072, 0075, 0078

³0002, 0005, 0008, 0011, 0014, 0017, 0020, 0023, 0026, 0029, 0032, 0035, 0038, 0041, 0044, 0047, 0050, 0053, 0056, 0059, 0062, 0065, 0068, 0071, 0074, 0077, 0080

Table 1: NTCIR-14 WWW-2 English relevance assessment statistics. This table replaces the “English” column in Table 8 of Mao et al. [7].

#topics	80
#assessors/topic	2
Pool depth	50
L4-relevant	907
L3-relevant	2,437
L2-relevant	4,462
L1-relevant	6,358
L0	13,463
#docs pooled	27,627

- In terms of nERR, THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base- $\{3, 2\}$ and RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2 are statistically the best runs in that they all statistically significantly outperform five other runs (Tables 5(a)).
- In terms of iRBU (which was not considered at the WWW-2 task but discussed here for the sake of consistency with WWW-3 and WWW-4), the top ten runs in Table 3(b) are statistically tied: THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3 through RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1 all statistically significantly outperform four other runs (Tables 5(b)).

In the WWW-2 overview paper where the noisy qrels file was used [7], THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3 was statistically the best run in terms of nDCG, while THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2 was statistically the best run in terms of Q; no statistically significant differences were observed in terms of nERR. The original conclusion based on the above results was that “*runs from THUIR are the most effective.*” Our corrected results do not contradict the above conclusion, but more clearly points to THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3 as the best English run of the WWW-2 task.

Table 6 shows the system ranking similarity for each pair of evaluation measure in terms of Kendall’s τ , using the corrected WWW-2 qrels file for evaluating the 20 WWW-2 runs. It can be observed that the four system rankings are quite similar, with iRBU (introduced at WWW-3, not at WWW-2) behaving slightly differently compared to the other three.

Table 2: Corrected results for the WWW-2 runs ($n = 80$ topics). This table replaces the Mean nDCG and Mean Q scores in Table 12 of Mao et al. [7].

Run	Mean nDCG@10	Run	Mean Q@10
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	0.4804	THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	0.4681
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	0.4608	THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	0.4524
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	0.4459	THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	0.4358
RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	0.4402	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	0.4319
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	0.4342	RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	0.4310
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	0.4329	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	0.4276
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.4210	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.4157
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	0.4093	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	0.4006
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	0.4077	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	0.3969
baseline_eng_v1	0.4032	baseline_eng_v1	0.3884
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	0.4032	THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	0.3884
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.4022	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.3856
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	0.3915	THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	0.3755
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	0.3915	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	0.3734
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	0.3870	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	0.3734
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5	0.3336	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5	0.3181
SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.3300	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.3153
ORG-MANUAL	0.2682	ORG-MANUAL	0.2527
SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.2661	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.2400
SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3	0.2661	SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3	0.2400

Table 3: Corrected results for the WWW-2 runs ($n = 80$ topics). This table replaces the Mean nERR scores in Table 12 of Mao et al. [7]; it also shows the Mean iRBU scores for the sake of consistency with our WWW-3 and WWW-4 results.

Run	Mean nERR@10	Run	Mean iRBU@10
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	0.6430	THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	0.8698
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	0.6422	THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	0.8547
RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	0.6356	RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	0.8530
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	0.6021	THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	0.8441
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	0.6007	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	0.8355
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	0.5842	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	0.8354
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.5730	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	0.8348
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.5705	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	0.8306
baseline_eng_v1	0.5582	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	0.8272
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	0.5582	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	0.8272
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	0.5460	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.8123
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	0.5316	baseline_eng_v1	0.8099
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	0.5288	THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	0.8099
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	0.5288	MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.7988
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	0.5261	THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	0.7912
SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.4795	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5	0.7697
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5	0.4315	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1	0.7152
ORG-MANUAL	0.4161	SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3	0.7085
SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.3756	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4	0.7032
SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3	0.3748	ORG-MANUAL	0.6519

Table 4: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 10,000$ trials) for the corrected WWW-2 results in Table 2. The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. The two-way ANOVA residual variance V_{E2} for computing effect sizes is 0.0206 for nDCG and 0.0257 for Q. This table replaces Table 13 of Mao et al. [7].

(a) nDCG	
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3,RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1,THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4,RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1,ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1,ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
baseline_eng_v1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
(b) Q	
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3,RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1,RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1,ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1,ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
baseline_eng_v1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>

Table 5: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 10,000$ trials) for the corrected WWW-2 results in Table 3. The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. The two-way ANOVA residual variance V_{E2} for computing effect sizes is 0.0476 for nERR and 0.0317 for iRBU. In the uncorrected official results, none of the differences in Mean nERR were statistically significant [7, Table 13]. This new table also shows the iRBU results for the sake of consistency with our WWW-3 and WWW-4 results.

(a) nERR	
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1,RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5,ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4, SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5,ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
baseline_eng_v1	ORG-MANUAL,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
(b) iRBU	
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-1,SLWWW-E-CD-NU-Base-3,SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,ORG-MANUAL
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-PU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-2	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-5	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-1	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-1	SLWWW-E-CO-NU-Base-4,ORG-MANUAL
baseline_eng_v1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-5	<i>ditto</i>
MPII-E-CO-NU-Base-4	ORG-MANUAL
THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base-4	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-DE-PU-Base-5 >	<i>ditto</i>

Table 6: System ranking similarities for pairs of measures in terms of Kendall's τ with 95% CIs ($n = 20$ WWW-2 English runs evaluated with the corrected WWW-2 qrels file). This table replaces Table 14 of Mao et al. [7]. In addition, iRBU is now included in the comparison.

	Q	nERR	iRBU
nDCG	0.942 [0.892, 0.969]	0.858 [0.745, 0.923]	0.826 [0.692, 0.905]
Q	-	0.816 [0.676, 0.899]	0.805 [0.658, 0.893]
nERR	-	-	0.716 [0.519, 0.841]

Table 7: NTCIR-15 English relevance assessment statistics. This table replaces Table 5 of Sakai et al. [12].

	WWW-2 topics	WWW-3 topics	Total
#topics	80	80	160
#assessors/topic	8		
Pool depth	15		
L4-relevant	114	117	231
L3-relevant	3,893	3,236	7,129
L2-relevant	3,872	4,361	8,233
L1-relevant	3,942	3,822	7,764
L0	3,877	5,141	9,018
#docs pooled	15,698	16,677	32,375

3 NTCIR-15 ENGLISH SUBTASK RESULTS

This section corrects the English subtask results reported in the WWW-3 overview paper [12].

The WWW-3 English topic set contains 80 topics (topic IDs: 0101-0180), just like the WWW-2 English topic set (topic IDs: 0001-0080). At NTCIR-15, new relevance assessments were collected for all 160 topics, with eight assessors per topic. For each topic, four assessors used a PRI file, while another four assessors used a RND file. The official qrels file was formed by combining the eight 3-point scale relevance labels by taking the integer part of $\log_2(S+1)$ as the combined relevance level for each document, where S is the sum of the eight raw labels. However, for these assessments collected at NTCIR-15, the RND-based relevance labels were incorrect due to the bug. Hence, every topic was affected by the aforementioned bug.

After correcting the RND-based relevance labels, we formed a corrected combined qrels file on a 5-point scale. Table 7 provides the statistics. Note that the WWW-2 topic set has two versions of (combined) relevance assessments: the (corrected) WWW-2 qrels file (See Table 1) and the (corrected) NTCIR-15 version.

The WWW-3 participants had access to the (noisy) WWW-2 qrels file before submission, so their runs were evaluated only on the WWW-3 topic set. Tables 8-9 show the WWW-3 English run rankings based on (the WWW-3 topic set part of) the corrected NTCIR-15 qrels file. Tables 10-13 show the corresponding statistical significance test results. We can observe that:

- In terms of nDCG, mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 and KASYS-E-CO-NEW- $\{1,4\}$ are statistically the best runs: they statistically significantly outperform 26 other runs (Table 10). Similarly, in terms of Q, mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 and KASYS-E-CO-NEW- $\{1,5,4\}$ are statistically the best runs: they statistically significantly outperform 25 other runs (Table 11).
- In terms of nERR, mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 is statistically the best run: it is the only run that outperforms 27 other runs (Table 12).
- In terms of iRBU, KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4 is statistically the best run: it is the only run that outperforms 21 other runs (Table 13).

In the WWW-3 overview paper where the noisy qrels file was used [12], mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 and KASYS-E-CO-NEW- $\{1,4\}$ were also statistically the best runs in terms of nDCG and Q, although

KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1 was ranked first in terms of average performance. The nERR-based results are also similar before and after the bug fix: mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 is the best run, which suggests that this run is particularly good at navigational searches, as was remarked in the overview paper. The iRBU results are also similar before and after the bug fix: KASYS-E-CO-NEW- $\{4,1\}$ were statistically the best runs in the overview paper.

For addressing the problem of reproducibility at the WWW-4 task, we chose KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1 as a state-of-the-art (SOTA) run from the WWW-3 task. Note that the corrected nDCG and Q results still support this choice, although mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 would have been a good choice as well.

Table 14 shows the system ranking similarity for each pair of evaluation measure in terms of Kendall’s τ , using (the WWW-3 topic set part of) the corrected NTCIR-15 qrels file for evaluating the 37 WWW-3 runs. Again, it can be observed that the four system rankings are quite similar, with iRBU behaving slightly differently compared to the other three; the τ ’s involving iRBU are noticeably lower than those reported in the NTCIR-15 overview paper.

Table 15 shows the system ranking similarity in terms of Kendall’s τ , when the corrected WWW-2 qrels file and (the WWW-2 topic set part of) the corrected NTCIR-15 qrels file are compared for each evaluation measure. It can be observed that the two qrels versions are not interchangeable: they yield somewhat different system rankings. Similar remarks were made in the overview paper, although the correlations are somewhat higher after the bug fix.

Table 8: Corrected results for the WWW-3 runs ($n = 80$ WWW-3 topics). This table replaces the Mean nDCG and Mean Q scores in Table 11 of Sakai et al. [12].

Run	Mean nDCG@10	Run	Mean Q@10
mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6869	mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	0.7009
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6866	KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6951
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	0.6831	KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	0.6935
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	0.6761	KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	0.6921
mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	0.6528	mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	0.6680
Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6312	Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6559
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	0.6296	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	0.6337
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6123	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6177
Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	0.6000	Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	0.6142
mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	0.5992	mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	0.6125
Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	0.5856	Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	0.6004
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	0.5708	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	0.5921
THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	0.5630	THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	0.5757
THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	0.5597	Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	0.5698
THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	0.5501	Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	0.5608
Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	0.5463	THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	0.5588
SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	0.5413	THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	0.5567
KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.5378	SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	0.5508
Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	0.5371	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.5436
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	0.5332	KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	0.5425
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.5295	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	0.5402
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	0.5294	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.5281
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.5056	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.5134
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.5049	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.5105
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.5011	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.5044
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.4917	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.4951
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.4860	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.4911
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.4824	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.4907
THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.4786	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.4887
baselineEng	0.4784	baselineEng	0.4868
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	0.4748	THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.4851
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.4747	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	0.4766
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.4710	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.4710
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	0.4397	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	0.4384
THUIR-E-CO-REP-5	0.3913	THUIR-E-CO-REP-5	0.4064
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	0.3748	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	0.3688
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.3300	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.3208

Table 9: Corrected results for the WWW-3 runs ($n = 80$ WWW-3 topics). This table replaces the Mean nERR and Mean iRBU scores in Table 12 of Sakai et al. [12].

Run	Mean nERR@10	Run	Mean iRBU@10
mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	0.8067	KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	0.9526
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	0.7895	KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	0.9513
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	0.7853	KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	0.9344
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	0.7777	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	0.9199
mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	0.7517	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	0.9174
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	0.7474	mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	0.9146
Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	0.7467	Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	0.9027
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	0.7328	THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	0.9005
mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	0.7029	mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	0.8944
Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	0.7009	Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	0.8900
Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	0.6818	mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	0.8861
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	0.6747	THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	0.8833
THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	0.6719	THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	0.8686
THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	0.6633	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.8646
THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	0.6614	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	0.8598
Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	0.6539	THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.8520
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	0.6522	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.8509
KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.6489	Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	0.8508
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.6486	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	0.8504
Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	0.6432	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	0.8500
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	0.6389	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.8457
SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	0.6288	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	0.8441
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.6211	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.8431
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.6196	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.8379
THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.6179	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.8374
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.6065	Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	0.8360
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.6036	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.8352
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.6031	KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	0.8336
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	0.5915	SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	0.8315
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.5849	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	0.8294
baselineEng	0.5846	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.8271
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	0.5804	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	0.8269
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	0.5774	Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	0.8065
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	0.5712	baselineEng	0.7991
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	0.5080	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	0.7677
THUIR-E-CO-REP-5	0.5001	THUIR-E-CO-REP-5	0.7618
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.4431	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4	0.7452

Table 10: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 10,000$ trials) for the corrected WWW-3 results in Table 8 (nDCG). The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. The two-way ANOVA residual variance V_{E2} for computing effect sizes is 0.0238 for nDCG. This table replaces Table 24(a) of Sakai et al. [12].

mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2,THUIR-E-CO-REV-3,THUIR-E-CO-REV-1,THUIR-E-CO-REV-2,Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	THUIR-E-CO-REV-3,THUIR-E-CO-REV-1,THUIR-E-CO-REV-2,Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
baselineEng	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>

Table 11: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 10,000$ trials) for the corrected WWW-3 results in Table 8 (Q). The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. The two-way ANOVA residual variance V_{E2} for computing effect sizes is 0.0284 for Q. This table replaces Table 24(b) of Sakai et al. [12].

mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	THUIR-E-CO-REV-3,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-REV-1, THUIR-E-CO-REV-2,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,baselineEng,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,baselineEng,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,baselineEng,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,baselineEng,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,baselineEng, THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2, THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
baselineEng	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>

Table 12: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 10,000$ trials) for the corrected WWWW-3 results in Table 9 (nERR). The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. The two-way ANOVA residual variance V_{E2} for computing effect sizes is 0.0360 for nERR. This table replaces Table 25(a) of Sakai et al. [12].

mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	Technion-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2,THUIR-E-CO-REV-2,THUIR-E-CO-REV-1, THUIR-E-CO-REV-3,Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1, ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	THUIR-E-CO-REV-1,THUIR-E-CO-REV-3,Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1, baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4, THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3, SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,baselineEng, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4, THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1, ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1, baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4, THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5	THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
baselineEng	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1	<i>ditto</i>
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>

Table 13: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 10,000$ trials) for the corrected WWW-3 results in Table 9 (iRBU). The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. The two-way ANOVA residual variance V_{E2} for computing effect sizes is 0.0265 for iRBU. This table replaces Table 25(b) of Sakai et al. [12].

KASYS-E-CO-NEW-4	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5,Technion-E-CO-NEW-4,ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3, Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5, RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,baselineEng, SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-2,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-1,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-4,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-3,KASYS-E-CO-REP-3, Technion-E-CO-NEW-3,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-1,KASYS-E-CO-REP-2,SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3, NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4, THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
KASYS-E-CO-NEW-5	SLWWW-E-CD-NEW-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-3,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-2,NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-1,Technion-E-CO-NEW-5, baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-3	Technion-E-CO-NEW-5,baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
mpii-E-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-1	baselineEng,SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
THUIR-E-CO-REV-1	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4,THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
mpii-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
mpii-E-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-E-CO-REV-2	THUIR-E-CO-REP-5,RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
NAUIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-2	RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-4
THUIR-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
RUCIR-E-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
Technion-E-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
ESTUCeng-E-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-E-CO-REP-3	<i>ditto</i>

Table 14: System ranking similarities for pairs of measures in terms of Kendall's τ with 95% CIs ($n = 37$ WWW-3 English runs evaluated with the corrected NTCIR-15 qrels file). This table replaces Table 14 of Sakai et al. [12].

	Q	nERR	iRBU
nDCG	0.949 [0.921, 0.967]	0.910 [0.862, 0.942]	0.604 [0.441, 0.728]
Q	-	0.883 [0.822, 0.924]	0.571 [0.400, 0.704]
nERR	-	-	0.646 [0.495, 0.759]

Table 15: System ranking similarities for each evaluation measure in terms of Kendall's τ with 95% CIs ($n = 20$ WWW-2 runs evaluated with the corrected WWW-2 qrels file and with the corrected NTCIR-15 qrels file). This table replaces Table 15 of Sakai et al. [12].

Measure	τ	95%CI
nDCG	0.742	[0.559, 0.856]
Q	0.689	[0.479, 0.824]
nERR	0.747	[0.566, 0.859]
iRBU	0.653	[0.427, 0.802]

4 NTCIR-16 WWW-4 RESULTS

This section corrects the results reported in the WWW-4 overview paper [11].

Unlike the previous WWW test collections which relied on ClueWeb12-B13⁴, the NTCIR-16 WWW-4 test collection introduced a new corpus called Chuweb21. The WWW-4 test collection has 50 topics (0201-0250). Each topic was judged independently by three assessors: a Gold assessor (i.e., topic creator), a Bronze-Waseda (BronzeW) assessor, and a Bronze-Tsinghua (BronzeT) assessor. Seven of the WWW-4 task organisers served as Gold assessors. BronzeW assessors are international course students of Waseda University, Japan; previous WWW English subtasks relied entirely on BronzeW assessors. BronzeT assessors are professional labellers working for a Chinese company.

The Bronze-All qrels file used in the WWW-4 overview paper was created by simply summing the 3-point scale BronzeW and BronzeT relevance labels; hence the qrels file is on a 5-point scale (L0-L4). The Bronze-All-based results in the overview paper are correct, because all Bronze assessors used a PRI file for each topic, and all PRI-based assessments for the WWW-4 test collection happened to be correct. On the other hand, the Gold-based results in the overview paper are incorrect, as the Gold qrels file suffers from the aforementioned bug. More specifically, the Gold assessors used a PRI file for 25 topics,⁵ and a RND file for the remaining 25 topics,⁶ and the RND-based relevance assessments are incorrect. Hereafter, we report on results based on the corrected Gold qrels file.

Table 16 shows the statistics of the corrected Gold WWW-4 qrels file, together with the Bronze statistics for comparison. The table is actually the same as the one in the overview paper: the label distribution for the Gold qrels file remains unchanged; only the document-label mapping was changed after the bug fix.

Table 17 shows the mean inter-assessor agreement for each pair of qrels files, after fixing the Gold qrels file. Before the bug fix, the mean Gold-Waseda and Gold-Tsinghua agreements were 0.242 and 0.280, respectively; it can be observed that the mean agreements after the bug fix are reasonable, and also similar to the mean Waseda-Tsinghua agreement (which is unaffected by the bug since it is independent of the Gold assessments). Table 18 compares the mean κ 's shown in Table 17 in terms of statistical significance. It can be observed that the differences in mean inter-assessor agreements are not statistically significant.

Tables 19 and 20 examine the per-topic κ 's at the individual assessor level, after fixing the Gold qrels file. For example, the "Gold01" row of Table 19 compares the labels of Gold01 (the first author of this paper) with those of Waseda and Tsinghua assessors, and shows the mean κ over the eight topics that she was in charge of. Before the bug fix, the mean κ 's were in the range of 0.145-0.507, whereas the new mean κ 's are in the range of 0.329-0.623. In short, the corrected mean inter-assessor agreements look "normal."

Table 21 shows the WWW-4 run rankings based on the corrected Gold qrels file. Table 22 shows the corresponding statistical significance test results. The following observations can be made.

- In terms of nDCG, THUIR-CO-NEW-2 is statistically the best run, in that it is the only run that statistically significantly outperforms eight other runs. Q also agrees, although both THUIR-CO-NEW-{2,1} statistically significantly outperform nine other runs. However, even THUIR-CO-NEW-2 is statistically indistinguishable from **KASYS-CO-REV-6**, the SOTA from WWW-3 (equivalent to the WWW-3 run KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1). Also, note that **KASYS-CO-REV-6** is ranked first in the Mean iRBU ranking. Hence, we cannot conclude from these results that the improvement over the WWW-3 SOTA is substantial.
- In terms of nERR, which is a measure suitable for navigational search, ORG-TOPICDEV is the top run: this is the only run that outperforms seven other runs. This is not surprising, as it contains only the seed relevant documents identified by the Gold assessors at topic development time.
- SLWWW-CO-REP-1, which is our only REP run, performs very similarly to **KASYS-CO-REV-6** in terms of all four evaluation measures. This suggests that the reproducibility effort may be successful to some degree.

In the WWW-4 overview paper where the noisy Gold qrels file was used [11], the statistical significance test results were highly inconclusive: in terms of nDCG, Q, and iRBU, 17 out of the 18 runs were statistically tied: they all statistically significantly outperformed ORG-TOPICDEV. No statistically significant differences were found with nERR. In contrast, our corrected results show that THUIR-CO-NEW-2 does better than some of the other runs, which is consistent with the Bronze-All results reported in the WWW-4 overview paper. Also, the nERR-based rankings are strikingly different before and after the bug fix: ORG-TOPICDEV, the top performer in the corrected results, was ranked near the bottom in the overview paper. This is probably because the relevant documents identified by the Gold assessors at topic development time were not labelled as relevant in the Gold qrels file due to the bug.

Table 23 Part (a) compares the system rankings according to the four evaluation measures with the corrected qrels file; Part (b) does the same with the Bronze-All qrels file (unchanged from the overview paper); Part (c) compares the Gold and Bronze-All run rankings when the same evaluation measure is used. Part (c) is substantially different after the bug fix: in the WWW-4 overview paper, the Gold-vs-Bronze-all τ 's were in the range of 0.327-0.680; in contrast, our new τ 's are in the range of 0.614-0.804. This means that the original Gold-based rankings were quite wrong.

⁴<https://www.lemurproject.org/clueweb12/>

⁵0201, 0204, 0205, 0208, 0209, 0212, 0213, 0214, 0217, 0218, 0219, 0222, 0223, 0225, 0228, 0229, 0231, 0235, 0236, 0239, 0242, 0245, 0246, 0248, 0249

⁶0202, 0203, 0206, 0207, 0210, 0211, 0215, 0216, 0220, 0221, 0224, 0226, 0227, 0230, 0232, 0233, 0234, 0237, 0238, 0240, 0241, 0243, 0244, 0247, 0250

Table 16: NTCIR-14 WWW-2 English relevance assessment statistics. This is identical to Table 4 from Sakai et al. [11]: although the original Gold qrels file contained noise, the distribution of L0-L4 labels was correct. It was the document-label mapping that was incorrect.

relevance level	Gold (1 assessor/topic)	Bronze-Waseda (1 assessor/topic)	Bronze-Tsinghua (1 assessor/topic)	Bronze-All (2 assessors/topic)
L0	7,154	5,584	6,571	4,900
L1	1,806	3,158	1,986	1,881
L2	1,373	1,591	1,776	1,485
L3	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,241
L4	N/A	N/A	N/A	826
total	10,333	10,333	10,333	10,333

Table 17: Mean per-topic inter-assessor agreement in terms of quadratic weighted Cohen’s κ ($n = 50$ topics). This table replaces Table 5 of Sakai et al. [11]; the Waseda-Tsinghua agreement is unchanged as this comparison does not involve Gold assessments that contained noise.

qrels version	mean κ
Gold-Waseda	0.440
Gold-Tsinghua	0.495
Waseda-Tsinghua	0.458

Table 18: Comparison of the mean κ ’s with a randomised Tukey HSD test ($B = 5,000$ trials). The effect sizes are based on the two-way ANOVA residual variance $V_{E2} = 0.0173$ [10]. This table replaces Table 6 of Sakai et al. [11].

Gold-Waseda vs. Gold-Tsinghua	$p = 0.097, ES_{E2} = 0.417$
Gold-Waseda vs. Waseda-Tsinghua	$p = 0.781, ES_{E2} = 0.135$
Gold-Tsinghua vs. Waseda-Tsinghua	$p = 0.354, ES_{E2} = 0.282$

Table 19: Mean per-topic inter-assessor agreement for each gold assessor in terms of quadratic weighted Cohen’s κ ($n = 8$ topics for Gold01; $n = 7$ topics for the others). For example, the labels of Gold01 are compared with those given by the Waseda and Tsinghua bronze assessors. This table replaces Table 7 of Sakai et al. [11].

assessor	mean κ (with Waseda)	mean κ (with Tsinghua)
Gold01	0.393	0.473
Gold02	0.438	0.583
Gold03	0.329	0.366
Gold04	0.504	0.473
Gold05	0.453	0.486
Gold06	0.414	0.463
Gold07	0.554	0.623

Table 20: Mean per-topic inter-assessor agreement for each bronze assessor in terms of quadratic weighted Cohen’s κ ($n = 10$ topics). For example, the labels of Waseda01 are compared with those given by the Gold and Tsinghua assessors. This table replaces Table 8 of Sakai et al. [11]. The values in the rightmost column are unchanged as they do not involve Gold assessments.

assessor	mean κ (with Gold)	mean κ (with Tsinghua)
Waseda01	0.395	0.450
Waseda02	0.460	0.459
Waseda03	0.490	0.444
Waseda04	0.426	0.428
Waseda05	0.428	0.507
assessor	mean κ (with Gold)	mean κ (with Waseda)
Tsinghua06	0.549	0.476
Tsinghua07	0.480	0.485
Tsinghua08	0.462	0.395
Tsinghua09	0.481	0.500
Tsinghua10	0.501	0.432

Table 21: Results for the WWW-4 runs based on the corrected Gold qrels file ($n = 50$ WWW-4 test topics). This table replaces Table 9 of Sakai et al. [11].

Run name	(a) Mean nDCG	Run name	(b) Mean Q
THUIR-CO-NEW-2	0.5157	THUIR-CO-NEW-2	0.4491
THUIR-CO-NEW-1	0.4994	THUIR-CO-NEW-1	0.4434
KASYS-CO-REV-6	0.4855	SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	0.3994
SLWWW-CO-REP-1	0.4833	KASYS-CO-REV-6	0.3911
SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	0.4708	SLWWW-CO-REP-1	0.3891
SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	0.4578	SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	0.3884
THUIR-CO-NEW-3	0.4416	SLWWW-CO-NEW-3	0.3682
SLWWW-CO-NEW-3	0.4353	THUIR-CO-NEW-3	0.3659
SLWWW-CO-NEW-5	0.4211	SLWWW-CO-NEW-5	0.3515
THUIR-CO-NEW-5	0.4069	THUIR-CO-NEW-5	0.3250
KASYS-CO-NEW-4	0.3859	KASYS-CO-NEW-4	0.3184
KASYS-CO-NEW-2	0.3858	KASYS-CD-NEW-1	0.3169
KASYS-CD-NEW-1	0.3852	KASYS-CO-NEW-2	0.3164
baseline	0.3824	KASYS-CD-NEW-3	0.3154
THUIR-CO-NEW-4	0.3820	baseline	0.3126
KASYS-CD-NEW-3	0.3812	THUIR-CO-NEW-4	0.3013
KASYS-CD-NEW-5	0.3107	KASYS-CD-NEW-5	0.2350
ORG-TOPICDEV	0.2802	ORG-TOPICDEV	0.1587
Run name	(c) Mean nERR	Run name	(d) Mean iRBU
ORG-TOPICDEV	0.7213	KASYS-CO-REV-6	0.8846
THUIR-CO-NEW-2	0.6983	SLWWW-CO-REP-1	0.8842
THUIR-CO-NEW-1	0.6753	THUIR-CO-NEW-2	0.8538
KASYS-CO-REV-6	0.6554	SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	0.8378
SLWWW-CO-REP-1	0.6481	SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	0.8333
SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	0.6214	THUIR-CO-NEW-1	0.8307
SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	0.6115	THUIR-CO-NEW-3	0.8149
SLWWW-CO-NEW-3	0.5986	SLWWW-CO-NEW-3	0.8114
THUIR-CO-NEW-3	0.5946	THUIR-CO-NEW-5	0.8109
SLWWW-CO-NEW-5	0.5720	SLWWW-CO-NEW-5	0.7848
THUIR-CO-NEW-4	0.5578	THUIR-CO-NEW-4	0.7627
KASYS-CO-NEW-4	0.5386	KASYS-CD-NEW-1	0.7504
THUIR-CO-NEW-5	0.5373	KASYS-CO-NEW-2	0.7500
baseline	0.5155	KASYS-CD-NEW-3	0.7500
KASYS-CO-NEW-2	0.5145	KASYS-CO-NEW-4	0.7498
KASYS-CD-NEW-1	0.5058	baseline	0.7497
KASYS-CD-NEW-3	0.5033	KASYS-CD-NEW-5	0.7321
KASYS-CD-NEW-5	0.4760	ORG-TOPICDEV	0.6794

Table 22: Randomised Tukey HSD test results ($B = 5,000$ trials) for the Gold-based results in Table 21. The runs in the left column statistically significantly outperform those in the right column at the 5% significance level. This table replaces Table 10 of Sakai et al. [11].

(a) nDCG	
THUIR-CO-NEW-2	KASYS-CO-NEW-4,KASYS-CO-NEW-2,KASYS-CD-NEW-1,baseline,THUIR-CO-NEW-4, KASYS-CD-NEW-3,KASYS-CD-NEW-5,ORG-TOPICDEV
THUIR-CO-NEW-1	KASYS-CD-NEW-1,baseline,THUIR-CO-NEW-4,KASYS-CD-NEW-3,KASYS-CD-NEW-5,ORG-TOPICDEV
KASYS-CO-REV-6	KASYS-CD-NEW-5,ORG-TOPICDEV
SLWWW-CO-REP-1	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-5	ORG-TOPICDEV
THUIR-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
(b) Q	
THUIR-CO-NEW-2	THUIR-CO-NEW-5,KASYS-CO-NEW-4,KASYS-CD-NEW-1,KASYS-CO-NEW-2, KASYS-CD-NEW-3,baseline,THUIR-CO-NEW-4,KASYS-CD-NEW-5,ORG-TOPICDEV
THUIR-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	KASYS-CD-NEW-5,ORG-TOPICDEV
KASYS-CO-REV-6	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-REP-1	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-CO-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-5	ORG-TOPICDEV
THUIR-CO-NEW-5	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-CD-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
KASYS-CD-NEW-3	<i>ditto</i>
baseline	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
(c) nERR	
ORG-TOPICDEV	KASYS-CO-NEW-4,THUIR-CO-NEW-5,baseline,KASYS-CO-NEW-2,KASYS-CD-NEW-1, KASYS-CD-NEW-3,KASYS-CD-NEW-5
THUIR-CO-NEW-2	baseline,KASYS-CO-NEW-2,KASYS-CD-NEW-1,KASYS-CD-NEW-3,KASYS-CD-NEW-5
THUIR-CO-NEW-1	KASYS-CD-NEW-3,KASYS-CD-NEW-5
KASYS-CO-REV-6	KASYS-CD-NEW-5
SLWWW-CO-REP-1	<i>ditto</i>
(d) iRBU	
KASYS-CO-REV-6	KASYS-CD-NEW-5,ORG-TOPICDEV
SLWWW-CO-REP-1	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-CO-NEW-2	ORG-TOPICDEV
SLWWW-CO-NEW-4	<i>ditto</i>
SLWWW-CO-NEW-2	<i>ditto</i>
THUIR-CO-NEW-1	<i>ditto</i>

Table 23: Corrected run ranking correlations in terms of Kendall's τ with 95% CIs ($n = 18$ runs). This table replaces Table 14 of Sakai et al. [11]; Part (b) is unchanged as it does not rely on the Gold qrels file.

(a) Gold	Q	nERR	iRBU
nDCG	0.922 [0.850, 0.960]	0.647 [0.400, 0.806]	0.784 [0.610, 0.886]
Q	-	0.595 [0.327, 0.775]	0.758 [0.610, 0.886]
nERR	-	-	0.536 [0.247, 0.737]
(b) Bronze-All	Q	nERR	iRBU
nDCG	0.961 [0.924, 0.980]	0.725 [0.517, 0.852]	0.699 [0.477, 0.837]
Q	-	0.686 [0.457, 0.830]	0.712 [0.497, 0.845]
nERR	-	-	0.503 [0.204, 0.716]

(c) Gold vs. Bronze-All	
nDCG	0.804 [0.643, 0.897]
Q	0.791 [0.622, 0.890]
nERR	0.752 [0.559, 0.868]
iRBU	0.614 [0.353, 0.786]

Table 24: RMSE_{abs} scores for each replicability runs and measures. This table replaces Table 17 of Sakai et al. [12].

Run Type	Run Name	nDCG	Q	RMSE _{abs}	
				nERR	iRBU
REP A-run	KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	0.2003	0.2288	0.3047	0.2352
REP A-run	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	0.3686	0.4192	0.4977	0.4794
REP B-run	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.2567	0.2739	0.3622	0.3591

5 REPRODUCIBILITY RESULTS

We evaluate reproducibility with the measures defined in [2]. All measures are computed with the `repro_eval` library [3]. In WWW-3 we have both reproducibility and replicability results, in WWW-4 we only have reproducibility results.

5.1 WWW-3 Reproducibility Results

This section corrects the reproducibility results reported in the WWW-3 overview paper [12]. Note that WWW-3 overview paper uses an old version of the ACM Artifact Review and Badging Policy⁷. In this paper we use the latest version instead⁸, which swaps the meaning of the two terms reproducibility and replicability. Therefore, reproducibility and replicability are swapped when comparing this section with WWW-3 overview paper.

The targets of the reproducibility experiment are 2 runs submitted at WWW-2: one advanced A-run (THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base2) and one baseline B-run (THUIR-E-CO-PU-Base4). We evaluate 2 REP A-runs (KASYS-E-CO-REP-2 and SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4) and 1 REP B-run (KASYS-E-CO-REP-3). For reproducibility, we re-evaluate both the original and reproduced runs with the corrected qrels from WWW-2. For replicability, we use the corrected WWW-2 qrels for the original runs with WWW-2 topics and the corrected WWW-3 qrels for replicated runs with WWW-3 topics.

5.1.1 Reproducibility. Results reporting the ordering of documents (Table 16 in [12]) compare the original and reproduced runs with Kendall’s τ union and Rank Biased Overlap (RBO) and do not use the qrels. Therefore, these results are not affected by the aforementioned bug.

Table 24 reports the corrected RMSE_{abs} scores (the lower the better). Overall RMSE_{abs} are slightly higher when computed with

the corrected qrels. This strengthens the conclusion from [12], that *none of the REP runs could successfully replicate the effectiveness scores of the original runs*. The trend among runs remains unchanged, with KASYS-E-CO-REP-2 being better than SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4.

Table 25 reports the corrected p -values returned from a two tailed paired t-test (the lower the p -value, the higher the evidence that the original and reproduced runs are significantly different). For REP A-runs, the corrected p -values are smaller, which further supports the conclusion from [12] that REP A-runs are significantly different from the original advanced run. For REP B-runs the corrected p -values are smaller and again this strengthen the observation that the REP B-run is not significantly different from the original baseline run.

Finally, Table 26 shows results of reproducibility of the effect over a baseline. Scores for RMSE_Δ slightly increase, as it happens for RMSE_{abs}. The same happens for ΔRI_{repro} . For ER_{repro} scores get closer to zero, meaning that KASYS REP runs could not reproduce the same effects of the original runs. Again, this results supports the conclusions from Sakai et al. [12].

5.1.2 Replicability. Table 27 reports the corrected p -values returned from a two tailed unpaired t-test (the lower the p -value, the higher the evidence that the original and replicated runs are significantly different). Results are somehow different from those reported in [12], overall all p -values increased and:

- KASYS-E-CO-REP-2 is not significantly different from the original run, but it was in [12];
- SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4 is not significantly different from the original run with Q measure, but it was in [12], and it is significantly different from the original run with nERR and iRBU, but it was not in [12].
- KASYS-E-CO-REP-3 is not significantly different from the original run with iRBU, but it was in [12].

These results suggest that among REP A-runs, KASYS-E-CO-REP-2 replicates better the original run, which is now consistent with the reproducibility results in Table 25. Similarly, the increased p -values for the REP B-run better align with the reproducibility results.

Finally, Table 28 shows results of replicability of the effect over a baseline. The corrected replicability results exhibit a similar trend to the corrected reproducibility results: ER_{repli} scores get closer to zero and ΔRI_{repli} slightly increase. This confirms that the replication experiment was not successful.

5.2 WWW-4 Reproducibility Results

This section corrects the reproducibility results reported in the WWW-4 overview paper [11]. The target of reproducibility is the run KASYS-CO-REV-6 and the submitted reproducibility run is SLWWW-CO-REP-1. For reproducibility, we re-evaluate both the original and reproduced runs with the corrected qrels from WWW-4. We do not compute any replicability measure because the systems were not tested on a different set of topics as in WWW-3.

As for WWW-3, reproducibility measures which consider the ordering of documents are not affected by the bug (Figures 2a and 2b in [11]).

Table 29 reports RMSE and p -values for the reproduced run. The corrected RMSE scores are not very far from those reported in [11]

⁷<https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/artifact-review-badging>

⁸<https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/artifact-review-and-badging-current>

Table 25: p -value returned by a two tailed paired t-test run between the original and reproduced runs. This table replaces Table 18 of Sakai et al. [12].

Run Type	Run Name	nDCG	Q	p -value	
				nERR	iRBU
REP A-run	KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	2.1022×10^{-6}	1.0804×10^{-6}	2.7970×10^{-4}	2.0544×10^{-4}
REP A-run	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	7.7170×10^{-26}	3.7204×10^{-24}	1.5874×10^{-17}	2.3279×10^{-16}
REP B-run	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.7819	0.8381	0.9364	0.3702

Table 26: Results for reproducibility of effects over a baseline. This table replaces Table 19 of Sakai et al. [12].

A-run	B-run	$RMSE_{\Delta}$				ER_{repro}				ΔRI_{repro}			
		nDCG	Q	nERR	iRBU	nDCG	Q	nERR	iRBU	nDCG	Q	nERR	iRBU
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	0.2658	0.2921	0.3924	0.3236	-0.5029	-0.6020	-0.0604	0.0846	0.2846	0.3262	0.2340	0.0732

Table 27: p -value returned by a two tailed unpaired t-test run between the original and replicated runs. This table replaces Table 20 of Sakai et al. [12].

Run Type	Run Name	nDCG	Q	p -value	
				nERR	iRBU
REP A-run	KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	0.0662	0.0431	0.8180	0.6015
REP A-run	SLWWW-E-CO-REP-4	0.0225	0.0526	2.8406×10^{-3}	0.0296
REP B-run	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	1.9769×10^{-4}	1.8240×10^{-4}	5.3593×10^{-3}	0.3011

Table 28: Results for replicability of effects over a baseline. This table replaces Table 21 of Sakai et al. [12].

A-run	B-run	ER_{repli}				ΔRI_{repli}			
		nDCG	Q	nERR	iRBU	nDCG	Q	nERR	iRBU
KASYS-E-CO-REP-2	KASYS-E-CO-REP-3	-0.0617	-0.0140	0.0290	-0.0601	0.1991	0.2069	0.2156	0.0849

Table 29: Reproducibility results with effectiveness measures: RMSE and p -values. This table replaces Figure 2c of Sakai et al. [11].

	RMSE	p -values
nDCG	0.0227	0.5084
Q	0.0257	0.5856
nERR	0.0595	0.3966
iRBU	0.0123	0.7953

and still support the observation that WWW-4 reproducibility results are better than those reported in other reproducibility experiments [2, 12]. The same applies to p -values, even if they tend to be overall lower.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This paper corrected the results reported in the NTCIR-14 WWW-2, NTCIR-15 WWW-3, and NTCIR-16 overview papers [7, 11, 12].

Our new conclusions are as follows.

- According to the corrected WWW-2 English run results, THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3 is statistically the best run in terms of both nDCG and Q. The same run is also ranked first on average with nERR and iRBU. (According to the original results, the same run was statistically the best run in terms of nDCG, but another THUIR run was statistically the best run in terms of Q.) Hence the corrected WWW-2 results make THUIR-E-CO-MAN-Base-3 the clear winner. (The conclusion in the WWW-2 overview paper was less specific: it said that “runs from THUIR are the most effective.”)
- According to the corrected WWW-3 English run results, mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 and KASYS-E-CO-NEW-{1,4} are statistically the best run in terms of nDCG; the results with Q are similar. (These three runs also formed the top cluster according to the original significance test results, although KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1 was originally ranked above mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 according to mean scores.) According to nERR, mpII-E-CO-NEW-1 is statistically the best run, which suggests that this run is good at navigational searches. (The same remark was made in the WWW-3 overview paper.)
- According to the WWW-4 results based on the corrected Gold qrels file, THUIR-CO-NEW-2 is statistically the best run in terms of nDCG, but even this run is statistically indistinguishable from **KASYS-CO-REV-6**, which is equivalent to KASYS-E-CO-NEW-1 from WWW-3. Hence, we cannot conclude that the improvement over the WWW-3 is substantial. The results with Q are similar. (The conclusion in the WWW-4 overview paper remains unchanged.) In terms of nERR, ORG-TOPICDEV, which contains a few relevant documents per topic found by the Gold assessors at topic development time, is statistically the best run. (In the original results, ORG-TOPICDEV did not perform well even in terms of nERR probably because the seed relevant documents were not correctly labelled in the Gold qrels file.) SLWWW-CO-REP-1 performs very similarly to **KASYS-CO-REV-6** and it looks quite successful as a reproducibility run. (The conclusion in the WWW-4 overview paper remains unchanged.)
- Reproducibility experiments are affected to a very limited extent. The main conclusions from WWW-3 (reproducibility and replicability runs were not successful) and WWW-4 (the reproducibility run was successful to a good extent) still hold. The only notable difference was observed for the p -values of replicability runs in WWW-3, however the corrected p -values align better with the p -values computed for reproducibility runs.

As a summary of the impact of the bug, Table 30 shows the Kendall’s τ between the ranking based on the original qrels file and that based on the corrected qrels file for each evaluation and for each task, with 95% CIs. It can be observed that, while the bug did not affect the main conclusions in the overview papers substantially, the impact on the entire system rankings is indeed substantial. Recall that the low correlation for nERR for the WWW-4

Table 30: Summary of the impact of the bug: Kendall’s τ (with 95% CIs) between the ranking based on the original qrels file and that based on the corrected qrels file for each evaluation and for each task.

(a) WWW-2: 80 topics; $n = 20$ runs	
nDCG	0.758 [0.583, 0.866]
Q	0.679 [0.465, 0.818]
nERR	0.653 [0.427, 0.802]
iRBU	0.711 [0.512, 0.838]
(b) WWW-3: 80 topics; $n = 37$ runs	
nDCG	0.877 [0.813, 0.920]
Q	0.844 [0.766, 0.898]
nERR	0.791 [0.690, 0.862]
iRBU	0.616 [0.457, 0.737]
(c) WWW-4: 50 topics; $n = 18$ runs (Gold assessments)	
nDCG	0.686 [0.457, 0.830]
Q	0.863 [0.744, 0.929]
nERR	0.340 [0.008, 0.605]
iRBU	0.601 [0.335, 0.778]

ranking is due to the fact that the seed relevant documents identified by the Gold assessors at topic development time for the RND-based topics (i.e., one-half of the topic set) were not recognised as relevant in the original qrels file.

We plan to report on detailed Gold-Bronze and PRI-RND comparisons based on the WWW-4 data elsewhere.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Apologies yet again to the WWW participants and the NTCIR chairs for the inconvenience and confusion caused by the bug.

This paper was partially supported by the the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 893667.

DISCLAIMER

Certain companies and products are identified in this paper in order to specify the experimental procedure adequately. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendation or endorsement by NIST, nor is it intended to imply that the products or companies identified are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

APPENDIX: THE EFFECT OF NOISY PARTS OF THE QRELS FILES ON THE OFFICIAL RESULTS

This appendix discusses the effect of noisy parts the qrels files (due to the aforementioned bug) on the official system rankings, by comparing the following three types of system ranking in terms of Kendall’s τ on a common topic set.

- good+noise** The original system ranking where the qrels file suffers from the bug;
- good+corrected** The corrected system ranking where the noisy parts of the qrels file were corrected, as we have reported in the main part of this paper;

good+NULL An alternative system ranking where the same noisy parts of the qrels file were *removed* rather than corrected.

For all qrels files, we use the linear gain value setting. If good+noise resembles good+corrected more than good+NULL does, this suggests that the noisy parts are somewhat useful for estimating the good+corrected ranking.

The good+NULL option does not apply to the WWW-4 Gold data, because each topic has exactly one gold assessor by definition: each topic is either PRI-based or RND-based, and removing the noisy RND-based assessments simply means dropping 25 of the 50 topics. Hence the following subsections discuss the WWW-2 and WWW-3 system rankings.

As we have described in Section 2, the 80 WWW-2 topics is composed of 27 PRI-PRI topics, 26 RND-RND topics, and 27 PRI-RND topics, and the official PRI-based assessments were the noise for this particular test collection. Hence, for WWW-2, the effect of noise can be investigated by focussing on the 27 PRI-RND topics (for which the original qrels file contains 50% noise per document), and comparing the following three types system ranking.

good+noise A ranking based on the original qrels file with relevance levels L0-L4, where the noisy PRI-based assessments are combined with the RND-based assessments;

good+corrected A ranking based on the corrected qrels file with relevance levels L0-L4, where the above noisy PRI-based assessments have been corrected;

good+NULL A ranking based on a 3-point scale (L0-L2) qrels file that relies only on the RND-based assessments.

As we have described in Section 3, each of the 80 WWW-3 topics rely on 4 PRI-based and 4 RND-based assessments per document in the original qrels file, and the RND-based assessments were the noise (i.e., 50% noise per document for every topic). Hence, for WWW-3, the effect of noise can be investigated on the full topic set, by comparing the following three types of system ranking

good+noise A ranking based on the original qrels file with relevance levels L0-L4;

good+noise A ranking based on the corrected qrels file with relevance levels L0-L4, with all four RND-based assessments corrected; and

good+noise A ranking based on a 4-point scale (L0-L3) qrels file that relies only on the 4 PRI-based assessments, formed by applying the log-based merging scheme described in Section 3.

Table 31 shows the results of comparing good+noise, good+corrected, and good+NULL for the WWW-2 and WWW-3 runs. Note that the WWW-3 results should be considered more reliable as it utilises more topics, more runs, and more relevance labels per document compared to WWW-2. (For WWW-3, the comparisons between good+noise and good+corrected have already been reported in Table 30, as we use the full WWW-3 topic set in this additional analysis as well.) It can be observed that, with the exception of iRBU on the WWW-2 data, the good+NULL ranking resembles the good+corrected ranking more than the good+noise ranking does on average in each case. This suggests that the noisy parts in the original qrels file are generally not useful for estimating the good+corrected (i.e., true) ranking.

Table 31: Effect of noise in the qrels file on the system ranking in terms of Kendall’s τ with 95% CIs.

(a) WWW-2 ($n = 20$ runs; 27 PRI-RND topics)		
	good+corrected	good+NULL
nDCG		
good+noise	0.747 [0.566, 0.859]	0.895 [0.808, 0.944]
good+corrected	-	0.779 [0.616, 0.878]
Q		
good+noise	0.642 [0.412, 0.795]	0.779 [0.616, 0.878]
good+corrected	-	0.768 [0.599, 0.872]
nERR		
good+noise	0.589 [0.338, 0.762]	0.705 [0.503, 0.834]
good+corrected	-	0.663 [0.442, 0.808]
iRBU		
good+noise	0.679 [0.465, 0.818]	0.721 [0.527, 0.844]
good+corrected	-	0.521 [0.248, 0.717]
(b) WWW-3 ($n = 37$ runs; 80 topics)		
	good+corrected	good+NULL
nDCG		
good+noise	0.877 [0.813, 0.920]	0.908 [0.859, 0.940]
good+corrected	-	0.947 [0.918, 0.966]
Q		
good+noise	0.844 [0.766, 0.898]	0.913 [0.867, 0.944]
good+corrected	-	0.907 [0.858, 0.940]
nERR		
good+noise	0.791 [0.690, 0.862]	0.857 [0.784, 0.906]
good+corrected	-	0.928 [0.889, 0.954]
iRBU		
good+noise	0.616 [0.457, 0.737]	0.800 [0.703, 0.868]
good+corrected	-	0.779 [0.674, 0.853]

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmet Aydın, Gökhan Göksel, Ahmet Arslan, and Bekir Taner Dinçer. 2020. ES-TUCeng at the NTCIR-15: Experimenting with new document quality features. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 253–257.
- [2] Timo Breuer, Nicola Ferro, Norbert Fuhr, Maria Maistro, Tetsuya Sakai, Philipp Shaer, and Ian Soboroff. 2020. How to Measure the Reproducibility of System-oriented IR Experiments. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGIR 2020*. 349–358.
- [3] Timo Breuer, Nicola Ferro, Maria Maistro, and Philipp Schaer. 2021. repro_eval: A Python Interface to Reproducibility Measures of System-Oriented IR Experiments. In *Proceedings of ECIR 2021 Part II (LNCS 12657)*. 481–486.
- [4] Zhumin Chu, Jingtao Zhan, Xiangsheng Li, Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2020. THUIR at the NTCIR-15 WWW-3 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 249–252.
- [5] Canjia Li and Andrew Yates. 2020. MPIO at the NTCIR-15 WWW-3 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 258–261.
- [6] Zhu Liang, Jinling Shang, Xuwen Song, and Si Shen. 2020. NAUIR at the NTCIR-15 WWW-3 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 262–266.
- [7] Jiaxin Mao, Tetsuya Sakai, Cheng Luo, Peng Xiao, Yiqun Liu, and Zhicheng Dou. 2019. Overview of the NTCIR-14 We Want Web Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-14*. 455–467.
- [8] Masaki Muraoka, Zhaohao Zeng, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2020. SLWWW at the NTCIR-15 WWW-3 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 243–246.
- [9] Fianna Raiber and Oren Kurland. 2020. The Technion at the WWW-3 Task: Cluster-Based Document Retrieval. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 247–248.
- [10] Tetsuya Sakai. 2018. *Laboratory Experiments in Information Retrieval: Sample Sizes, Effect Sizes, and Statistical Power*. Springer.
- [11] Tetsuya Sakai, Sijie Tao, Zhumin Chu, Maria Maistro, Yujing Li, Nuo Chen, Nicola Ferro, Junjie Wang, Ian Soboroff, and Yiqun Liu. 2022. Overview of the NTCIR-16 We Want Web with CENTRE (WWW-4) Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-16*. 234–235.

- [12] Tetsuya Sakai, Sijie Tao, Zhaohao Zeng, Yukun Zheng, Jiaxin Mao, Zhumin Chu, Yiqun Liu, Maria Maistro, Zhicheng Dou, Nicola Ferro, and Ian Soboroff. 2020. Overview of the NTCIR-15 We Want Web with CENTRE (WWW-3) Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 219–234.
- [13] Kohei Shinden, Atsuki Maruta, and Makoto P. Kato. 2020. KASYS at the NTCIR-15 WWW-3 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 235–238.
- [14] Yuya Ubukata, Masaki Muraoka, Sijie Tao, and Tetsuya Sakai. 2022. SLWWW at the NTCIR-16 WWW-4 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-16*. 243–246.
- [15] Kota Usuha, Kohei Shinden, and Makoto P. Kato. 2022. KASYS at the NTCIR-16 WWW-4 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-16*. 247–253.
- [16] Peng Xiao and Tetsuya Sakai. 2019. SLWWW at the NTCIR-14 We Want Web Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-14*. 490–493.
- [17] Shenghao Yang, Haitao Li, Zhumin Chu, Jingtao Zhan, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2022. THUIR at the NTCIR-16 WWW-4 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-16*. 254–257.
- [18] Xue Yang, Shuqi Lu, Shijun Wang, Han Zhang, and Zhicheng Dou. 2019. RUCIR at the NTCIR-14 We Want Web-2 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-14*. 481–489.
- [19] Andrew Yates. 2019. MPII at the NTCIR-14 CENTRE Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-14*.
- [20] Yukun Zheng, Zhumin Chu, Xiangsheng Li, Jiaxin Mao, Yiqun Liu, Min Zhang, and Shaoping Ma. 2019. THUIR at the NTCIR-14 WWW-2 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-14*. 472–480.
- [21] Xiaochen Zuo, Jing Yao, and Zhicheng Dou. 2020. RUCIR at the NTCIR-15 WWW-3 Task. In *Proceedings of NTCIR-15*. 239–242.