

# Scale-Invariant Learning-to-Rank

Christian Sommeregger  
Expedia Group  
London, United Kingdom

Alessio Petrozziello  
Expedia Group  
London, United Kingdom

Ye-Sheen Lim  
Expedia Group  
London, United Kingdom

## ABSTRACT

At Expedia, learning-to-rank (LTR) models play a key role on our website in sorting and presenting information more relevant to users, such as search filters, property rooms, amenities, and images. A major challenge in deploying these models is ensuring consistent feature scaling between training and production data, as discrepancies can lead to unreliable rankings when deployed. Normalization techniques like feature standardization and batch normalization could address these issues but are impractical in production due to latency impacts and the difficulty of distributed real-time inference. To address consistent feature scaling issue, we introduce a scale-invariant LTR framework which combines a deep and a wide neural network to mathematically guarantee scale-invariance in the model at both training and prediction time. We evaluate our framework in simulated real-world scenarios with injected feature scale issues by perturbing the test set at prediction time, and show that even with inconsistent train-test scaling, using framework achieves better performance than without.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• Information systems → Recommender systems.

## KEYWORDS

machine learning, recommender systems

## ACM Reference Format:

Christian Sommeregger, Alessio Petrozziello, and Ye-Sheen Lim. 2018. Scale-Invariant Learning-to-Rank. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 4 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 BACKGROUND

Many e-commerce companies such as Expedia employ A/B testing [6–8] to decide whether a new product or feature is good enough to be rolled out to all customers. In large organizations it is very likely that changes rolled out for testing in different teams would affect the data relied upon by a deployed learning-to-rank (LTR) model without the machine learning engineer even knowing about it [10, 13]. For example, an A/B test might be performed for how the price of a room is displayed to the user: one group of users can be presented with nightly prices, while another group with the price of the full stay. An LTR model tracking room price as a

feature will now see room prices at different scales, and may output differently ranked items for each group of users given the same query. Other examples could be a change in currency, a change of the guest rating range, or hotel-landmarks distances expressed in kilometers instead of miles. A recommender system should be scale-invariant to these features [11].

One common solution to this issue is normalizing [2, 17] the training and test data, along with the data seen during real-time inference at production. However, real-time prediction time normalization in large-scale deployed applications are often infeasible due to increased latency [1, 3, 4], distributed inference limits access to complete item information leading to unreliable normalization, and list-wise standardization is ineffective with truncated lists in real-world environments.

## 2 SCALE-INVARIANT LEARNING-TO-RANK

Faced with this issue, we introduced a scale-invariant framework for our LTR models. In a LTR model, we generally have a scoring function  $f(x_{ij})$  that scores an item  $j$  in a query  $i$  to rank the item within the query. For scale-invariance, we propose the following scoring function:

$$f(x_{ij}) = f_d(x_i^Q, x_{ij}^{I,F}) + f_w(x_i^Q, x_{ij}^{I,S}) \quad (1)$$

where,  $x_{ij}$  are the features associated with item  $j$  in list  $i$ ,  $x_i^Q$  are query-wide features, while  $x_{ij}^{I,F}$  and  $x_{ij}^{I,S}$  are item features with and without scaling issues respectively. The scoring function above is essentially a neural network consisting of a deep path  $f_d$  and a wide path  $f_w$ .  $f_d$  is a feedforward neural network, and if  $f_w$  is defined properly, it can be mathematically proven that any perturbation to  $x_{ij}^{I,S}$  can be canceled out when computing the difference in score for any two items  $f(x_{ij}) - f(x_{ik})$ . Hence, the ranking of items is preserved for a list of items in a query. The provided supplementary materials can be referred to for the proofs. An example of  $f_w$  we have implemented is with a cross-product as follows:

$$f_w(x_i^Q, x_{ij}^{I,S}) = \langle \mathbf{w}, (\mathbf{f}_s(x_i^Q) \otimes_{\text{kron}} \log(x_{ij}^{I,S})) \rangle \quad (2)$$

where,  $\mathbf{w}$  are weights that can be set to "pass-through".

Since we only need the scoring function for scale-invariance, the overall framework is model-agnostic and can be integrated into the widely used industrial standard ListNet [5] or ListMLE [16].

## 3 EVALUATION

We evaluate the proposed scoring function on three LTR datasets. One is an internal dataset labelled as *ExpediaHotels*, and the other two public datasets labelled as *RecTour* and *MSLR* respectively. *ExpediaHotels* contains 56 million vacation property searches and bookings on Expedia Group's platform where the task is to rank the properties for a given search. The *RecTour* dataset [15] is the same

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Model	Unperturbed	Perturbed
ListNet	0.526	0.518
ListNet (SIR)	0.522	0.522
ListMLE	0.668	0.639
ListMLE (SIR)	0.667	0.667

**Table 1: The NDCG performance of ListNet and ListMLE, with and without SIR integration, on unperturbed and different perturbed test sets for the ExpediaHotels dataset.**

as our internal dataset but anonymised for public research. The *MSLR* dataset [12] is Microsoft’s public Web30k dataset comprising around 30 thousand queries where the task is to rank web documents for a given search.

For each dataset, we evaluate the performance of ListNet and ListMLE, with and without our proposed scale-invariant (SIR), for unperturbed and perturbed cases. In the perturbed cases, we multiply a chosen feature in the test set with a scaling factor, causing scaling issues at prediction time. The feature and scaling factors are selected based on possible occurrence in practice.

For *ExpediaHotels*, the property price feature uses the full price of the length of stay instead of nightly price, and change the price to the currency to the local currency of the property, instead of standardising to USD. This issues occur on a frequent basis as different A/B tests are performed.

For *RecTour*, eventhough the dataset is similar to *ExpediaHotels*, the price feature is anonymised and we have to perturb another feature. The customer rating feature can often change based on different tests to present different rating ranges to users. In this dataset the customer rating feature is multiplied by a factor of 10 at prediction time.

In the case of the *MSLR* dataset, identifying features to perturb for scaling issues at prediction time proves to be a challenging task, as no features exhibit readily apparent scaling concerns. We propose to perturb the number of slash in the URL of a document in a query. Although it may sound like an arbitrary and irrelevant feature to select, it has been shown by [9] that it is a highly relevant label in the dataset. URLs could also be subject to changes as metadata is injected into the link while a user browses a website, which could justify the possibility of the feature being scale variant at prediction time. Therefore, the feature tracking the number of slashes in a URL is multiplied by 100 here at prediction time.

For the *ExpediaHotels* and the *RecTour* datasets, we randomly split the dataset into 70% train and 30% out-of-sample test sets for evaluation. For the *MSLR* dataset, 5 folds of train and test sets are provided. We evaluate across all 5 folds and average the performance. All trained models are equally tuned with classic hyperparameter optimization. All models are trained on Databricks using Tensorflow 2.9 running on AWS g5.24xlarge clusters. Also, we use NDCG [14] as a measure of performance.

In Tables 1, 2 and 3, first of all we can observe that for the unperturbed case, the performance between ListNet and ListMLE integrated with the proposed scale-invariance scoring function performs about the same. This passes our first test of do-no-harm to the existing models in which the proposed scoring function is integrated into. Then, we can observe that when the test set is

Model	Unperturbed	Perturbed
ListNet	0.315	0.222
ListNet (SIR)	0.339	0.324
ListMLE	0.337	0.238
ListMLE (SIR)	0.339	0.330

**Table 2: The NDCG performance of ListNet and ListMLE, with and without SIR integration, on unperturbed and different perturbed test sets for the RecTour dataset.**

Model	Unperturbed	Perturbed
ListNet	0.681	0.603
ListNet (SIR)	0.672	0.666
ListMLE	0.690	0.655
ListMLE (SIR)	0.701	0.692

**Table 3: The NDCG performance of ListNet and ListMLE, with and without SIR integration, on unperturbed and different perturbed test sets for the MSLR dataset.**

perturbed, the models with SIR integrated in maintains its performance quite well when there are scaling issues in the test set that is not seen at training time.

## 4 CONCLUSION

We have proposed a scale-invariant LTR framework that can be integrated easily into any existing LTR approaches that accept an arbitrary scoring function. Through a realistic scenario in which we perturbed the test set at prediction time, we show that using our framework achieves better performance when there are scaling issues.

The current limitation of the proposed scale-invariant ranking function is that it only works for strictly positive numerical features. A challenge remain in our future work includes extending this to work with perturbations that could be negative, as well as perturbations on categorical data. Another limitation is that the proposed ranking function does not detect scaling issue on its own. Therefore prior knowledge of which features would have scaling issues would be needed through domain knowledge and experience. If not known prior, all features would need to be assumed to have scaling issues and pass through the wide layer, potentially resulting in larger outer products that can be hard to optimize.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ioannis Arapakis, Xiao Bai, and B. Barla Cambazoglu. 2014. Impact of response latency on user behavior in web search. In *Proceedings of the 37th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval* (Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia) (*SIGIR '14*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 103–112.
- [2] Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2016. Layer Normalization. arXiv:1607.06450 [stat.ML]
- [3] Xiao Bai, Ioannis Arapakis, B. Barla Cambazoglu, and Ana Freire. 2017. Understanding and Leveraging the Impact of Response Latency on User Behaviour in Web Search. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.* 36, 2, Article 21 (aug 2017), 42 pages.
- [4] Jake D. Brutlag, Hilary Hutchinson, and Maria Stone. 2008. User Preference and Search Engine Latency.

- [5] Zhe Cao, Tao Qin, Tie-Yan Liu, Ming-Feng Tsai, and Hang Li. 2007. Learning to rank: from pairwise approach to listwise approach. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 129–136.
- [6] Heng-Tze Cheng, Levent Koc, Jeremiah Harmsen, Tal Shaked, Tushar Chandra, Hrishu Aradhye, Glen Anderson, Greg Corrado, Wei Chai, Mustafa Ispir, Rohan Anil, Zakaria Haque, Lichan Hong, Vihan Jain, Xiaobing Liu, and Hemal Shah. 2016. Wide & Deep Learning for Recommender Systems. arXiv:1606.07792 [cs.LG]
- [7] Eleri Dixon, Emily Enos, and Scott Brodmerkle. 2011. A/b testing of a webpage. US Patent 7,975,000.
- [8] Malay Haldar, Mustafa Abdool, Prashant Ramanathan, Tao Xu, Shulin Yang, Huizhong Duan, Qing Zhang, Nick Barrow-Williams, Bradley C Turnbull, Brendan M Collins, et al. 2019. Applying deep learning to Airbnb search. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1927–1935.
- [9] Xinzhi Han and Sen Lei. 2018. Feature Selection and Model Comparison on Microsoft Learning-to-Rank Data Sets. arXiv:1803.05127 [stat.AP]
- [10] Murium Iqbal, Nishan Subedi, and Kamelia Aryafar. 2019. Production Ranking Systems: A Review. arXiv:1907.12372 [cs.IR]
- [11] David M Pennock, Eric Horvitz, C Lee Giles, et al. 2000. Social choice theory and recommender systems: Analysis of the axiomatic foundations of collaborative filtering. In *AAAI/IAAI*. AAAI Press, Washington, USA, 729–734.
- [12] Tao Qin and Tie-Yan Liu. 2013. Introducing LETOR 4.0 Datasets. arXiv:1306.2597 [cs.IR]
- [13] David Sculley, Gary Holt, Daniel Golovin, Eugene Davydov, Todd Phillips, Dietmar Ebner, Vinay Chaudhary, Michael Young, Jean-Francois Crespo, and Dan Dennison. 2015. Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2503–2511.
- [14] Yining Wang, Liwei Wang, Yuanzhi Li, Di He, Wei Chen, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2013. A theoretical analysis of NDCG ranking measures. In *Proceedings of the 26th annual conference on learning theory (COLT 2013)*, Vol. 8. PMLR, Princeton, NJ, USA, 6.
- [15] Adam Woznica and Jan Krasnobebski. 2021. Presentation of the Expedia Group RecTour Research Dataset. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Recommenders in Tourism co-located with the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6.
- [16] Fen Xia, Tie-Yan Liu, Jue Wang, Wensheng Zhang, and Hang Li. 2008. Listwise approach to learning to rank: theory and algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1192–1199.
- [17] Quynong Yuan and Nanfeng Xiao. 2019. Scaling-based weight normalization for deep neural networks. *IEEE Access* 7 (2019), 7286–7295.

## A SCALE-INVARIANCE PROOF

In learning-to-rank models, there is a ranking function that takes a list of items (represented by some vector of item-level features and query-level features) in a query, and scores each item to obtain an optimal sorted list of items. Before diving into the formal explanation of the proposed ranking function we establish the notations used throughout the paper in Table 4.

The proposed SIR ranking function is defined as  $f_n : \mathbb{R}^{M+K_1+K_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is composed of two paths. One is the deep path defined as  $f_d : \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^{K_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which takes  $\mathbf{x}_i^Q$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}$  as input and calculates the score of the items using a feed-forward neural network and a dense layer containing the scores. The other is the wide path defined as  $f_w : \mathbb{R}^M \times \mathbb{R}^{K_1+K_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which takes  $\mathbf{x}_i^Q$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}$  as input, and linearly interacts them through their outer product. The output of both path are summed and passed to a soft-max function to convert the sumFmed outputs into probabilities, which can then be interpreted as scores. Note that the Siamese network form is for visualisation only. In practice, it is much more computationally efficient to represent the sub-networks as an additional dimension of a tensor.

More specifically, the score of item  $j$  in query  $i$  can be computed using the scoring function  $f_n$  as follows:

$\mathbf{x}_i^Q \in \mathbb{R}^M$	The query feature vector of query $i$ . Items in the same query share the same query features.
$\mathbf{x}_{ij}^I \in \mathbb{R}^{K_1+K_2}$	The item feature vector of item $j$ in query $i$ . It can be further split into $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}$ .
$\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_1}$	The slice of item feature vector representing features whose scale remain the same in all cases.
$\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{K_2}$	The partition of item features whose scale can vary at prediction time (to which our method is scale invariant). Note that the partition of features which have scaling issue is known. Here $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ denotes positive real numbers.
$\mathbf{x}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^J$	The feature vector of the item $j$ in query $i$ , where $J = M + K_1 + K_2$ . It is the concatenation of $\mathbf{x}_i^Q$ and item features $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^I$ .
$y_{ij}$	Labeled score of item $j$ in query $i$ where $y_{ij} = 1$ for the relevant item and $y_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.
$D_i$	The number of items in a query $i$ .
$N$	The total number of queries in the dataset.

**Table 4: Notations used in this paper.**

$$f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ij}) = f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}) \quad (3)$$

$$f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}) = \langle \mathbf{w}, (\mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S})) \rangle \quad (4)$$

where,  $\mathbf{f}_s : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^L$ . Here  $\mathbf{f}_s$  compresses the query features by projecting them to  $\mathbb{R}^L$  with  $L < M$ ,  $\otimes_{kron}$  is the Kronecker product,  $\mathbf{w}$  is a weight parameter to tune, and  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  represents the inner product operator. In the rest of this section, we proof that the ranking function  $f_n$  theoretically guarantees scale-invariance in features  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}$ .

Given two items  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{ik}$  in the same query  $i$ , the score difference between  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{ik}$  (and hence the ordering between the two items) is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ij}) - f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ik}) \\ &= \left( f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}) \right) \\ & \quad - \left( f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,S}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Now assume the scale of  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}$  increases by  $c > 0$  times, i.e.  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^{I,S} = c\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}^{I,S} = c\mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,S}$  where  $c$  is a scaling factor which can take any positive value. Then the score difference of these two items after the scale change is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}) - f_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}) \\
&= \left( f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^I) \right) \\
&\quad - \left( f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}^I) \right) \quad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we would like to prove the following:

**THEOREM A.1.** *The score difference between  $\mathbf{x}_{ij}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{ik}$  does not change before and after scaling, i.e.  $f_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}) - f_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}) = f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ij}) - f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ik})$ .*

**PROOF.**

$$\begin{aligned}
& f_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}) - f_n(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}) \\
&= \left( f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^{I,S}) \right) \\
&\quad - \left( f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) + f_w(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}^{I,S}) \right) \\
&= f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&\quad - f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) - \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ik}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&= f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&\quad - f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) - \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{c}\mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&= f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&\quad + \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(c) \right) \rangle > \\
&\quad - f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) - \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&\quad - \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(c) \right) \rangle > \\
&= f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,F}) + \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{x}_{ij}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&\quad - f_d(\mathbf{x}_i^Q, \mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,F}) - \langle \mathbf{w}, \left( \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_i^Q) \otimes_{kron} \log(\mathbf{x}_{ik}^{I,S}) \right) \rangle > \\
&= f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ij}) - f_n(\mathbf{x}_{ik}). \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Therefore, the proposed ranking function gives the same score difference for two items in the same search with or without scaling. The difference of scores is invariant to the scale change. Also, observe that the scale-invariance property is independent of the loss function of the network, meaning we can apply any state-of-the-art loss when training the network.

Accordingly, the ranking of a list of items based on this ranking function is scale invariant as well. In query  $i$ , assume we have scores  $f_n(\mathbf{x}_{i1})$ ,  $f_n(\mathbf{x}_{i2})$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $f_n(\mathbf{x}_{iD_i})$ . Then a score function for query  $i$ , denoted  $\pi_i$ , is a bijective function from  $\{1, 2, \dots, D_i\}$  to  $\{1, 2, \dots, D_i\}$ :

$$\pi_i : \{1, 2, \dots, D_i\} \succ \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, D_i\} \quad (8)$$

where,  $\succ \rightarrow$  indicates bijection. Here the items are ranked according to scores in descending order, i.e. our ranking function  $\pi$  satisfies  $f_n(\mathbf{x}_{i\pi_i^{-1}(1)}) \succ = f_n(\mathbf{x}_{i\pi_i^{-1}(2)}) \succ = \dots \succ = f_n(\mathbf{x}_{i\pi_i^{-1}(D_i)})$ . The notation  $\pi_i^{-1}(j)$  indicates the index of the item ranked in the  $j$ -th place in the query by the ranking function  $\pi_i$ .

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009