

Categorical, Ratio, and Professorial Data: The Case for Reciprocal Rank

Alistair Moffat

(ORCID: 0000-0002-6638-0232)

The University of Melbourne

Australia

ammoffat@unimelb.edu.au

Abstract

Search engine results pages are usually abstracted as binary relevance vectors and hence are categorical data, meaning that only a limited set of operations is permitted, most notably tabulation of occurrence frequencies, with determination of medians and averages not possible. To compare retrieval systems it is thus usual to make use of a categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping. A previous paper has argued that any desired categorical-to-numeric mapping may be used, provided only that there is an argued connection between each category of SERP and the score that is assigned to that category by the mapping. Further, once that plausible connection has been established, then the mapped values can be treated as real-valued observations on a ratio scale, allowing the computation of averages. This article is written in support of that point of view, and to respond to ongoing claims that SERP scores may only be averaged if very restrictive conditions are imposed on the effectiveness mapping.

1 Introduction and Background

Researchers often work with datasets of categorical or ordinal observations, on which only a restricted range of operations may be undertaken. In particular, search engine result pages (SERPs), which are typically abstracted as k -element binary vectors that tabulate the relevance or not of the documents placed in positions 1 through k of the answer pages returned by a search system, are categorical data. There is no total ordering of k -element SERPs, and unless we get lucky and happen to have two SERPs that have a relationship captured by a partial ordering, direct comparison of SERPs is not possible. The primary operation that is permitted on categorical data is tabulation of occurrence frequencies, to determine the mode (most frequently occurring value), or to determine the fraction of the data observations that consist of some particular value, where in the case of k -element binary SERPs a “value” is one of the 2^k distinct bit-patterns that can arise. Neither of those tabulations is helpful when seeking to determine whether retrieval system A is demonstrably better than retrieval system B when used for some specific type of search task.

Comparative evaluations of SERPs must thus be guided by pragmatic requirements, and is usually carried out using a numeric *effectiveness mapping* from the categorical universe of possible

k -element SERPs to the real number line.¹ For example, the effectiveness mapping *reciprocal rank* (RR) assigns the score $1/d$ to all SERPs in which the first 1-bit is in rank position d , and assigns a score of zero to the SERP $[0]^k$ containing k zeros.

A wide range of other effectiveness mappings have also been proposed over the years, each of which makes different assumptions about how SERPs are valued relative to each other, based on different models of user behavior. These include precision (Prec), average precision (AP), normalized discounted cumulative gain (NDCG), rank-biased precision (RBP), plus others that the reader will be familiar with. Each of these is a numeric mapping that (in “@ k ” evaluations) maps the categorical set of 2^k different k -item binary vectors to a value on the real line, within the range (by convention) from zero to one inclusive.

The tension between SERPs being categorical data and the desire for numeric comparisons between SERPs then leads to a critical question:

Can any such categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping be used, provided it is argued (by the person planning to employ it) to be a plausible surrogate for SERP “benefit to user” in the context of the given search scenario and the assumed user demographic? And if not, what restrictions limit the choice of effectiveness mappings?

That question has received substantial attention. In range of papers though the last few years one group of authors has presented an opinion that such mappings may only be used if the range of the mapping (that is, the set of numeric values that emerges when the mapping is applied to every one of the 2^k SERPs of k -items) generates a set of points that are equi-spaced on the real line [Fuhr, 2017; Ferrante et al., 2019a,b, 2020, 2021]. Examples detailing the implications of that belief appear in Section 2.

Sakai [2020] and the current author [Moffat, 2022] have argued the contrary – that any categorical-to-numeric mapping may be used in SERP evaluation, provided that it is motivated as reflecting the way in which users are consuming those SERPs. We believe that mappings should be chosen so as to plausibly capture some external assumption in regard to the measurement scenario being pursued, but apart from that connection do not require any intrinsic properties of their own. For example, one possible external assumption might be that users place d times more value on having the first relevant document at rank 1 than they do on having the first relevant document at rank d ; a relationship that then leads directly to RR.

Each other effectiveness mapping similarly corresponds to a model of user behavior, meaning that the score associated with each SERP captures – or at least, approximates – the extent to which it is of benefit to the user that issued the query. From this point of view the user model can be thought of as coming first, and then once the factors that govern the user model have been settled, the desired categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping will emerge [Moffat et al., 2022].

The debate between these two points of view has now percolated into the guidelines provided to conference referees, creating new threads of contention. For example, in November 2022 the SPC members for ECIR 2023 were requested to vet their pools of papers against a set of guidelines that included the (disputed) statement “RR is widely used but difficult to interpret as interval scale,

¹These mappings have been previously referred to as effectiveness metrics, evaluation metrics, and effectiveness measures. To avoid ambiguity with the metric spaces that play an important role in mathematics, and which imply properties not satisfied by sets of SERP effectiveness scores, we make use here of the phrase *effectiveness mapping*.

which would be a requirement for computing the arithmetic averages”, so that the PC Chairs could “instruct all authors of every accepted paper to check and correct if it applies”.²

Most recently, in December 2022, the first group of “RR should be avoided” authors has again argued that measurement is sound only if the numeric mapping involved employs a set of available target points that are uniformly spaced on the real line [Ferrante et al., 2022].

In short, one group of authors in the IR community is strongly opposed to RR (and several other commonly used effectiveness mappings; RR is simply an exemplar that is used here in order to allow a focused discussion) as an experimental tool, and has been seeking to enforce that view across the community. In opposition, a second group of authors believes that there is no basis for such a restrictive view, and that researchers are free to select effectiveness mappings that suit their experimental context, provided only that they are willing to argue the *why* of their choice.

I’m firmly of that second opinion. My goal in writing this essay is to reiterate my previous “you may use RR if you wish” position, and to provide further information to colleagues who have been puzzled (or, in the case of negative reviewing decisions, feel they have been adversely affected) by this debate.

2 A Brief Quiz

The reader is invited to consider the following sequence of questions, imagining perhaps that they are completing a “how data literate are you?” quiz in the sealed center section of some research journal. In all cases the word “average” refers to the arithmetic mean.

Question 1 What is the average of the following eight numbers?

700, 700, 750, 750, 750, 850, 1000, 1000

(a) 812.5; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 2 What is the average of the following eight monetary amounts?

\$700, \$700, \$750, \$750, \$750, \$850, \$1000, \$1000

(a) \$812.50; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 3 What is the average of the eight amounts listed in Question 2 if it is additionally known that they are the weekly salaries of eight employees?

(a) \$812.50; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 4 What is the average of the eight weekly salaries if it is additionally known that the eight employees are two junior professors, three assistant professors, one associate professor, and

²The email in question is dated 25 November 2022 and is from EasyChair, over the names of the three PC Chairs. The email refers to the guidance as coming from “our ‘official’ ECIR Methodology Chair”, but no such role is listed at <https://ecir2023.org/organisers.html>, and no author is listed in the document either, meaning that the precise origin of the instruction is unknown. At time of writing these “guidelines” remain available at https://docs.google.com/document/d/1taETBOHpnWCAOps-rVDV-j_ecUJSOU7S.

two full professors?

(a) \$812.50; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 5 What is the average of the eight professor’s salaries if it is additionally known that all junior professors are paid \$700 per week, all assistant professors are paid \$750 per week, all associate professors are paid \$850 per week, and all full professors are paid \$1000 per week?

(a) \$812.50; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 6 What is the average of the eight professor’s salaries if it is additionally known that there are no other professorial job titles, and no other professorial salary levels?

(a) \$812.50; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

I imagine that the majority of readers gave a clear “(a)” response to Question 1, and then continued to respond “(a)” even as further information was provided about what it was that was being averaged. Those six “(a)”s are also the answers that I’m arguing for in this essay. Averaging numeric and monetary amounts is a routine operation, and we would probably also feel equally comfortable (for example) if we were to be asked to sum the same sets of values.

That comfort arises because none of Questions 1 to 6 are asking about “average professors”. The question sequence starts by asking about the average of a given set of numbers without mentioning professors at all, and ends by asking about the average salary of a group of professors, with the set of *observations* (the professors’ ranks) being mapped to a set of numeric quantities (the salaries corresponding to those observations) in the form of numbers that have “\$” signs attached. If we were to be asked about the “average professor”, we would shrug our shoulders, and quite properly respond with “(b) it is not appropriate to compute an average”. We would recognize that there is no basis for computing the average of “two junior professors, three assistant professors, one associate professor, and two full professors”, because that is a dataset of *ordinal* observations.³

In opposition to that view of when averaging may be applied, and as part of a direct response to my previous paper [Moffat, 2022] in which I introduced this example of professorial salaries, Ferrante et al. [2022, page 12] write:

“the examples by Moffat on professor salaries [...] are not interval scales, as a consequence means cannot be computed”

Followup emails with Nicola Ferro⁴ in November 2023 have confirmed that it is his belief that Question 6 should be answered “(b)”, because (in his words) “*I understand the numbers do not come from an interval scale*”. Nicola also argues that Questions 1 to 5 must be answered “(c)”, because their formulation doesn’t specify (or doesn’t specify in sufficient detail) what the numbers represent.

³However it *is* permissible to enquire about the median of ordinal observations. For that same set of eight observations, the median professor is an “assistant professor”; and the “median professor’s salary” is the mapped salary value associated with an assistant professor.

⁴My thanks to Nicola for being willing to engage in this conversation.

To tease out the implications of Nicola’s assertions, suppose that \mathcal{U} is the universe from which some given set of numeric observations is being drawn. For example, in the case of the professors’ salaries, $\mathcal{U}_{\text{prof}} = \{\$700, \$750, \$850, \$1000\}$. Nicola’s sequence of answers to Questions 1 to 6 can then be seen as being equivalent to the belief that when $u = |\mathcal{U}|$ is finite and if a dataset of observations drawn from \mathcal{U} (with replacement) is to be averaged, then \mathcal{U} must have the form:

$$\mathcal{U} = \text{equi-interval}(m, c, u) = \{m \cdot k + c \mid k \in \text{range}(u)\}, \quad (1)$$

in which $m, c \in \mathcal{R}$; in which $\text{range}(u) = \{k \in \mathcal{I} \mid 0 \leq k < u\}$; and where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{I} are the sets of real values and integer values respectively. Note the use of equality in Equation 1. Nicola’s assertion is that not only must every value in \mathcal{U} be expressible as a real-valued linear transformation of a corresponding integer, but also that *every such equi-interval mapped value over a dense range of integers $0 \leq k < u$ must be available in \mathcal{U}* . That is, Nicola believes that despite the professors’ salaries all being multiples of $m = \$50$, a dataset of observations over $\mathcal{U}_{\text{prof}}$ may *not* be averaged, because the equi-spaced salaries \$800, \$900, and \$950 are not available; with $\mathcal{U}_{\text{prof}} \neq \text{equi-interval}(m, c, u)$ for every combination of m, c , and u .

In particular, in Question 5 there is still uncertainty as to what values might be possible as salaries and the possibility that $\mathcal{U}_{\text{prof}}$ might yet satisfy Equation 1, which is why Nicola’s answer to Question 5 is “(c)”; but that uncertainty is dispelled by the additional information provided in Question 6, thus leading to the switch to answer “(b)”. Pursuing the same argument one step further, if the three extra options \$800, \$900, and \$950 are also “available” as weekly salaries (for example, because a small number of year-long merit-based bonus payments of either \$50 or \$100 per week are determined at the start of each year) but happen to not be visible in this current set of observations (because none of the current professors are being paid a bonus), then the averaging in Question 6 *would* (presumably) be permitted, because the salary universe would now be equal to $\text{equi-interval}(\$50, \$750, 9)$.

My main point in introducing the professors’ salaries was that similar questions can be posed in connection with SERP effectiveness scores [Moffat, 2022]. Let’s continue the quiz.

Question 7 What is the average of the following eight numbers?

$$0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 1$$

(a) 0.5; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 8 What is the average of the eight numbers in Question 7 if it is additionally known that they are effectiveness scores associated with eight SERPs of length $k = 3$ via the use of a categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping?

(a) 0.5; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 9 What is the average of the eight mapped SERP scores in Question 8 if it is additionally known that there is one SERP with no relevant document by depth $k = 3$, three that have their first relevant document at depth three, two that have their first relevant document at depth two, and two that have their first relevant document at depth one?

(a) 0.5; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

Question 10 What is the average of the eight SERP scores in Question 9 if it is additionally known that SERPs with no relevant document by depth $k = 3$ are always assigned a score of 0 and that SERPs with the first relevant document at depth d are always assigned a scores of $1/d$; and thus that there are no other SERP scores available when $k = 3$?


(a) 0.5; or (b) it is not appropriate to compute an average; or (c) insufficient information has been provided in the question to allow the choice between options “(a)” and “(b)” to be made.

In response to this second set of questions, I again argue that “(a)” is the appropriate answer throughout. My basis for that statement remains that it is the *numbers* that are being averaged, and that just as Questions 1 to 6 were not attempting to compute an average professor, *there is no suggestion at all in Questions 7 to 10 that SERPs are being averaged*. Search engine result pages are *categorical* data, even when abstracted as k -vectors over $\{0, 1\}$, and hence may not be averaged, just as the professors’ ranks (ordinal data) may not be averaged. Furthermore, it isn’t even possible to compute the median SERP across a set of observations, since SERPs *do not possess a total order*. As a simple example to support that claim, consider the two 5-element SERPs $S_1 = [1, 1, 0, 0, 0]$ and $S_2 = [0, 0, 1, 1, 1]$, in which the document order is from left to right. There is no innate ordering possible between these two SERPs (one has more early relevance, the other has more total relevance) and different effectiveness mappings are free to assign their scores in either order. In particular, RR prefers the first of those two SERPs, with $RR(S_1) = 1.0 > 0.3333 = RR(S_2)$; whereas $Prec@5$ prefers the second SERP, with $Prec@5(S_2) = 0.6 > 0.4 = Prec@5(S_1)$.


If any of us were to be provided with the set of SERPs that was observed in an IR experiment and asked to calculate either the average or the median of the set, we would have no option but to shrug and quite properly answer “(b) it is not appropriate”. It is the *mapped SERP scores* that are being averaged in Questions 8 to 10, not the SERPs themselves. Nor is there any suggestion at all that the effectiveness mapping can or may be inverted once that average score has been computed, to determine a SERP that corresponds to it. The effectiveness mapping is many-to-one, and inversion is neither possible nor sensible.

In opposition to my view of Questions 7 to 10, Nicola answers “(c)” to Question 7, and then “(b)” to Questions 8 through 10. The explanation he provides for this response is that from Question 8 onwards there is explicit mention of a categorical-to-numeric mapping, implying (in his opinion) that the average may not be computed. Nor does the universe of possible values $\mathcal{U}_{RR3} = \{0, 1/3, 1/2, 1\}$ that is employed in these questions fit the form required by Equation 1, providing (presumably) another reason for Nicola to answer “(b)” to Question 10.


Figure 1 illustrates the situations embedded in the two sequences of questions. Each part shows a *ruler*, and a set of associated *tick-points* with their corresponding *numeric labels*. As well, the mapped values corresponding to the sets of eight data observations are shown. In Figure 1(a) the salaries of the eight professors are depicted, along with their average. The average salary of the eight professors has a clear and tangible physical interpretation – it is the fulcrum point at which the data items become symmetric in a weighted sense, to bring the “balance beam” into equilibrium. That is, “averaging” has a compelling (and useful, if you like see-saws!) analogy in the physical world, namely the identification of fulcrums for balance beams. In this physical correspondence there is no requirement whatsoever that the observations being averaged must be



(a) Averaging eight professorial salaries.



(b) Averaging eight RR@3 effectiveness scores.



(c) Averaging eight Prec@3 effectiveness scores.

Figure 1. Averaging sets of values: (a) the four professorial salary levels, and the distribution of the eight observations assumed in Questions 1 to 6; (b) the four RR@3 scores possible for SERPs of length $k = 3$, and the distribution of the eight observations assumed in Questions 7 to 10; and (c) the same eight SERPs, but now assessed using the effectiveness mapping Prec@3.

located at the ruler’s equi-interval labeled tick-points, and the mapping being used can place the items anywhere. Nor is there any requirement that every marked tick-point on the ruler must be capable of having an item placed on it.

Figure 1(b) provides a similar picture in connection with Questions 7 to 10, taking (for concreteness) the eight SERPs to be $[0, 0, 0]$, $[0, 0, 1]$, $[0, 0, 1]$, $[0, 0, 1]$, $[0, 1, 0]$, $[0, 1, 1]$, $[1, 0, 0]$, and $[1, 1, 0]$.⁵ A balance point can always be identified, regardless of where on the balance beam the data observations are placed, and can be identified even if some tick-points are unavailable to host “weights”.

In Figure 1(a) the fact that the underlying observations are ordinal, and that there are just four distinct observations possible, means that if a different salary mapping is applied to this dataset the stacks might shift sideways to new points on the number line, but cannot change their height, nor “swap over” and shift past each other. On the other hand, in Figure 1(b) the underlying observations are categorical, and there are $2^3 = 8$ different possibilities, six of which appear in this dataset. A different $k = 3$ effectiveness mapping might thus give rise to as many as six different stacks for this set of observations, and as many as eight stacks in general. Moreover, the stacks for $[1, 0, 0]$ and $[0, 1, 1]$ might appear in either order along the number line, whereas (making reasonable assumptions about the partial ordering on SERPs) the other six stacks may “slide” and perhaps even “combine”, but may not “swap over”. See Moffat and Mackenzie [2023] for discussion of the extent to which this “freedom to swap” is available.

Figure 1(c) gives one such alternative mapping for the same set of SERPs, now using $\text{Prec}@3$. Because $|\mathcal{U}_{\text{Prec}3}| = 4$ too, there are still at most four stacks, but they have different memberships, a consequence of the greater freedom associated with categorical data. In this second configuration we have $\mathcal{U}_{\text{Prec}3} = \{0, 1/3, 2/3, 1\} = \text{equi-interval}(1/3, 0, 4)$, a mapping that is compliant with Equation 1. However Nicola hedges when asked about this specific situation, writing [the answer] “*is (b) because you explicitly say it is a categorical scale; however, if I do not use the information about the categorical scale, I would say (a) because ... the objects (runs) are equi-spaced*”. Needless to say, I believe that the $\text{Prec}@3$ scores may be averaged in exactly the same way that the $\text{RR}@3$ scores may be. In both cases the average continues to have a direct physical interpretation, and the fact that $\text{RR}@3$ and $\text{Prec}@3$ stack the SERPs differently on the number line, assign different scores, and yield different average scores is of no consequence, because *they employ different effectiveness mappings, and are thus measuring different things*. And neither of them is claimed to be “averaging SERPs”.

In terms of the extremes of the set of mapped values, $\min(\mathcal{U})$ and $\max(\mathcal{U})$, most researchers would agree that a SERP with no relevance, $[0]^k$, is a natural *bottom* element to the SERP categories, and is thus normally mapped to zero. Other SERPs might also be assigned a score of zero, but $[0]^k$ *will* have a score of zero. Similarly, a SERP that is all relevant, $[1]^k$ is a natural *top* element to the SERP categories, and is thus normally mapped to the maximum score (typically 1.0, or approaching 1.0 in the limit as k increases). Other SERPs might also be assigned a maximal score, but $[1]^k$ *will* have a maximal score. That is, despite SERPs not possessing a total order, there is a partial order, with *top* and *bottom* elements that bookend the range of values generated by any plausible categorical-to-numeric mapping that might be employed in IR evaluation.

⁵A set of SERPs can always be placed into lexicographic order. Lexicographic ordering happens to agree with the ordering induced by RR , but, in general, mapped score orderings are not preserved. As a simple example of that, note that $\text{Prec}@3([0, 1, 1]) \not\leq \text{Prec}@3([1, 0, 0])$.

To summarize the arguments presented in this section: SERPs are categorical data, and hence the only directly permissible operation is tabulation of frequencies, which is unhelpful in IR experimentation. We may not even ask about the median of a set of SERPs. But each plausible model of the interactions that take place as users consume SERPs gives rise to a corresponding categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping. All such mappings share a common natural zero point, and give rise to up to 2^k different mapped scores in a many-to-one manner. The set of SERP scores derived from each such mapping may then be legitimately averaged without any implication that the SERPs themselves are being averaged, nor that the mean score may be converted back to a SERP. And the mapping process is valid even if the numeric values that the universe of 2^k different SERPs transform to are not evenly-spaced on the number line.

Supporting that position is the clear fact that in the physical analogy expressed via Figure 1 there is no requirement that the objects placed on the balance beam be located solely at the equi-spaced labeled tick-points on the ruler; and nor is there any constraint that renders the averaging process improper if there are labeled tick-points at which none of the weights will ever be placed. That is, there is a clear physical analogy that supports the correctness of answer “(a)” to all ten questions in the data survey.

Of course, if the mapping changes and (in the context of Figure 1) the target points of some or all of the red arrows shift, then the fulcrum point is likely to also need to shift. But that is perfectly sensible – the average is determined *after* the mapping is applied to the set of observations, and there is *no suggestion at all* being made here that the average is (or even should be) invariant to the categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping that has been chosen. Such invariance is simply not possible in connection with categorical (SERPs) or even ordinal (professorial ranks) data.

3 Interval Scales Versus Equi-Interval Scales

Presuming that the reader has absorbed the arguments that were presented in Section 2, they may now be somewhat puzzled. If, as I have asserted, SERPs are categorical data, but may be mapped to the real number line via some defended choice of non-reversible categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping, and if all plausible mappings on SERPs have a defined zero point, then what are interval scales, and why do they need to be considered?

Let’s start with what an interval scale is. The best example of interval scale data is the one I noted in my previous paper [Moffat, 2022], Unix timestamps. The Unix operating system measures time as elapsed seconds, starting at 0:00:00am on 1 January 1970. The current time a few minutes ago was 1694942015, and sixty seconds prior it was 1694941955. In an interval scale measurement system the actual raw measurements may not be especially informative (for example, the ten-digit numbers provided in the previous sentence) unless the zero point is also of significance to the observer. But *differences* between observations provide information; furthermore, *ratios of differences* may be computed and also provide information. For example (dropping six leading digits, to make the numbers manageable), $2015 - 1955 = 60$ and represents an interval (in seconds) that can be correctly stated as being 1.5 times longer than the interval between 2310 and 2350.

Unix times are normally thought of as being integers, but from a measurement point of view there is no requirement that they be restricted to integral values, and fractional values are also completely fine. Thus the interval from 2380.5 to 2396.4 is 1.5 times longer than the interval from 2320.5 to 2331.1, because $(2396.4 - 2380.5)/(2331.1 - 2320.5) = 1.5$. Moreover, if an alternative

reference time was chosen, for example, 2:22:22am on December 22, 2022, all of the raw measurements would change, but the differences, and ratios, between them, would be invariant. And if the measurement units altered from seconds to (say) tenths of seconds, both the raw measurements and their differences would change, but the ratios between the differences would again remain constant. This example highlights the essential property of interval scale observations, namely that the zero point may be arbitrary, but that ratios of differences between pairs of observations hold constant, regardless of where the zero is placed and regardless of what the measurement unit is. When measuring time at the granularity of minutes or seconds or hours or days (but not years, because of the irregularity introduced by leap years) two different measurement systems will have this property of being consistent in terms of ratios of differences. We handle these scale and origin transformations dozens of times every day, and (as one further example) know that a meeting scheduled for 3:00pm–4:30pm tomorrow is 1.5 times longer than one that is scheduled for 10:15am–11:15am today.

In an interval scale each unit change in the measurement must have the same interpretation, regardless of where in the scale it occurs. Those unit changes can be denoted by equally-spaced tick marks on a ruler and then be labeled with corresponding equally-spaced numeric measurements, as was shown in the examples provided in Figure 1. But must a given set of observations (professorial ranks mapped to salaries, or SERPs mapped to effectiveness scores, or seconds since 0:00:00am on January 1, 1970) be required to *only* fall on the equi-interval tick marks of some specific ruler in order for the measurement (and more particularly, an average of measurements) to be possible or valid? No! The observations can fall anywhere, and we can still measure them, and then still average those measurements. Indeed, the constancy of ratios of differences that is guaranteed by an interval scale means that we may infer additional ticks on the ruler *anywhere that they might be helpful*. If the salary ruler is labeled and ticked every \$100, we may infer tick points at \$50 intervals as well, by taking ratios at intervals that are 0.5 long relative to the original tick intervals.⁶ Or we can infer tick marks every \$10, by taking ratios at intervals that are 0.1 long relative to the original tick intervals. Indeed, we can infer a tick that corresponds to the exact position on the ruler of *any object being measured*, including a salary of \$765.43 per week, or an RR score of $1/7 \approx 0.1429$, or a time that is 314.159 seconds after 0:00:00am on January 1 1970.

We are not changing the scale when we add such “pro-rata” ticks to the ruler, nor are we changing the previous equally-spaced unit labels. We are simply employing the existing ruler, and our knowledge that it measures an interval scale (and thus that ratios of differences have a valid interpretation) to strategically add further ticks, so as to measure objects whose size is not one of the original tick points on the ruler. I’ll say it again: *new tick-points can be placed anywhere on the ruler, and once they have been labeled in a proportionate manner, are first-class citizens, possessing the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities as the original equi-spaced ticks*. An interval scale does *not* require that all valid measurements be at the places on the ruler where the original evenly-spaced unit tick-marks arose. Nor does it require that every original tick-point be attainable as an observation.

In contrast to this flexible interpretation of interval scale measurement, Fuhr [2017] and Ferrante et al. [2021] espouse the more rigid requirement that is documented in Equation 1. They require that the tick-marks and their labels must only be at uniform intervals on the ruler; that

⁶And that is exactly the process that was used to place some of the elements of Figure 1.

every mapped observation must exactly align with one of those equi-spaced tick-marks; and that every tick-mark that appears on the ruler must be capable of being such a measurement point.

In particular, Ferrante et al. [2022] assert that the professorial salaries shown in Figure 1(a) are not “interval scale” because the red arrows denoting the range of the mapping are not equi-spaced on the number line – see the quotes already provided in Section 2. Ferrante et al. claim support for their interpretation from the original work in this area, that of Stevens [1946], who in connection with interval scales wrote “*equal intervals of temperature are scaled off by noting equal volumes of expansion*”, and “*to devise operations for equalizing the units of the scales*”. But in my opinion both of those quotes refer to the starting configuration of the ruler, and the overarching question that determines the scale of measurement: if the original tick-points are equi-spaced on the ruler, then can equi-spaced numeric labels be inferred, and if so, are those labels equi-spaced numerically? I do *not* believe that Stevens’ comments imply a further mandate that every data observation must fall at an equi-spaced tick-point on the ruler; and nor that they imply that every equi-spaced label on the original ruler must be available as an observation value.

In my opinion the three rulers shown in Figure 1 *do* all have the property underlying Stevens’ words: tick-points that are the same “distance” apart have labels that are the same “value” apart. Some of the measurement values do not align with the currently-drawn tick-points, that is correct. But as has already been discussed, the first two rulers can be proportionately “sub-tick-pointed” to *any required level of detail* (twenty decimal places if necessary, exceeding the resolution of even double arithmetic) so as to carry out the required measurements. Provided that ratios of differences are preserved, *we can put ticks and labels, and hence allow measurement, anywhere we want on the ruler.* And, similarly, *we can remove from the ruler any tick points and their corresponding labels that will not be needed when determining the mapped measurements derived from a set of observations.*

To make this distinction concrete, I return to the professor’s salaries and the restrictions implied by Equation 1. Ferrante et al. require that if an ordinal-to-numeric salary mapping is to permit averaging, then either equi-interval salaries of \$700, \$800, \$900, and \$1000 (or similar) must be used; or several new grades of professor need to be introduced, to allow salaries at all other multiples of \$50 between \$700 and \$1000; or some combination between these two. That is, Ferrante et al. regard mapped salary levels of \$700, \$800, \$900, and \$1000 as being “averagable” given a set of “professorial job title” observations; and (would presumably) also regard mapped salary levels of \$700, \$801, \$902, and \$1003 as being “averagable”. But they regard averaging as being inappropriate for the salary mapping that led to Question 6 (namely, \$700, \$750, \$850, and \$1000), even though the ruler could equally have been ticked and labeled at intervals of \$50; and for the same reason would, I presume, regard a salary mapping to the values \$701, \$800, \$900, and \$1000 to also be non-averagable, even though the ruler could equally have been ticked and labeled at intervals of \$1.

In short, I’m bemused by the position that has been advocated by Ferrante et al., and I firmly believe that the extraneous “interval scale” constraints (captured via Equation 1, in line with Nicola Ferro’s answers to the quiz questions) are neither required nor helpful. Certainly, in the balance beam physical analogy (Figure 1) there is no requirement that the weights on the beam be placed solely at a set of equi-spaced labeled tick-points on the ruler in order for the fulcrum point to be determinable; and nor is the averaging process rendered improper by the presence of labeled tick-points on the ruler at which none of the weights can ever be placed.

All of which means that (in my opinion) effectiveness mappings like RR, AP, NDCG, RBP_{0.8} and so on may be used with a clear conscience – provided, of course, that the user model behind the selected mapping can be argued as matching the task type and the behavior of the people carrying out that task. Of course, the things being averaged must be numbers. As I noted last year [Moffat, 2022], we can’t average international dialing prefixes such as “+1”, “+61”, and “+40”. And nor can we average food additive codes such as “414”, “950”, and “260”. In both of those examples the observations are categorical, just like SERPs. We may average the numbers that result from the application of a suitable (and argued for) categorical-to-numeric mapping if we have reason to do so, but the observations themselves cannot be averaged.

4 Ratio Scales

My next point suggests that there really is no need to be concerned about what is and what is not an interval scale, and it is this: *effectiveness mappings usually have a defined zero point, and hence effectiveness scores are ratio scale data*. In interval scale data the location of the zero point is arbitrary, meaning that the computation of ratios of measurement differences is permitted (because differences are origin independent), but that the computation of ratios of actual measurements is not appropriate. But in ratio scale data the fixing of the zero point means that ratios may be computed on score *values* as well as on score *differences*. For example, it is not appropriate to state that 20° is “twice as hot as” 10° if we are measuring temperature using Celsius or Fahrenheit, both of which interpret “temperature” as being interval scale observations. In those two measurement systems we are only permitted to say that 20° is “10° hotter” than 10°, taking differences to do so. But we are permitted to say that 20° is “twice as hot as” 10° if the temperatures are being measured in degrees Kelvin, which has a fixed zero point, and is thus a ratio scale. (Noting, of course, that 20° Kelvin is a different temperature to 20° Fahrenheit, and that 20° Celsius is different again).

Salaries also have a defined and unambiguous zero point. That means that in the context of the professorial salaries supposed by Questions 1 to 6 (that is, in the context established by one given ordinal-to-numeric mapping) it is both defensible and informative to compute ratios and make statements such as “at that university an assistant professor earns three-quarters the salary of a full professor”. It is equally valid to compute a difference and write “at that university an associate professor earns \$100 more per week than does an assistant professor”. Neither of those statements is invariant to the mapping, and if the salary scales change, or a different university is considered, the relativities may well change too. But *in the context of the specified mapping*, such statements are legitimate.

With those examples in hand, let’s now turn back to categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mappings. It was noted in Section 2 that the binary k -vector $[0]^k$ is almost always mapped to a score of zero. And zero does indeed have a fixed and identified meaning when evaluating SERP effectiveness – it denotes the absence of usefulness. Hence, if the effectiveness mapping being applied to a set of SERPs is one that maps $[0]^k$ to zero, then the set of mapped effectiveness scores constitutes *ratio scale* data in the context provided by that mapping. And that means, for example, that we are permitted to state (for that specified mapping) that an effectiveness score of 0.6 is “1.5 times larger” than an effectiveness score of 0.4, as well as being permitted to state that it is “0.2 bigger”. But it is also important to note that such statements *do not and must not* be used to make claims

such as “if $M_1(S_1)$ is 1.5 times bigger than $M_1(S_2)$, then $M_2(S_1)$ will also be 1.5 times bigger than $M_2(S_2)$ ”, where S_1 and S_2 are two SERPs, and $M_1(\cdot)$ and $M_2(\cdot)$ are two effectiveness mappings. As with the professor’s salaries, conclusions are not, and never can be, invariant to the mapping.

To summarize this argument: if the effectiveness mapping in use assigns a score of zero to useless SERPs (that is, those that are $[0]^k$), then discussion of interval measures is irrelevant, because – strictly within the context established by that effectiveness mapping – the (broader) power of ratio scales may be applied to the set of SERP scores. Nor are the categorical-to-numeric mappings $\text{Precc}@k$ and $\text{RBP}_{0.5}$ any different in this regard. Yes, they do happen to have the property that (when there are k or more relevant documents in the collection) the mapped scores are a dense equi-spaced set of points on the number line, satisfying Equation 1. But it is *still* not possible to make claims such as “if $\text{Precc}@k(S_1)$ is 1.5 times bigger than $\text{Precc}@k(S_2)$, then $\text{RBP}_{0.5}@k(S_1)$ will also be 1.5 times bigger than $\text{RBP}_{0.5}@k(S_2)$ ”. As was noted in Section 2, SERPs themselves are *categorical* data, and it is simply impossible for there to be any order-based, interval-based, or ratio-based invariance. The bottom line here is that *each different effectiveness mapping is measuring a different thing*.

Finally, there is one more issue to address. Ferrante et al. [2021] proceed to describe the *intervalization* process that is summarized in Table 1. A conventional IR experiment can be thought of as following steps 0 to 3 of that experimental sketch, leading to sets of scores that, in line with my arguments here, may then be averaged or compared in other ways. But having claimed that in general such sets of real-valued effectiveness scores may *not* be averaged, Ferrante et al. propose the “amelioration” shown at steps 4 and 5. Their suggestion is that the scores be converted to ordinal integers, by assigning a rank between 1 (for the lowest possible score) and 2^k (or less, depending on the effectiveness mapping, for the highest possible score) to each possible numeric value that can arise from the chosen categorical-to-numeric mapping when applied to the universe of 2^k binary k -element SERP abstractions. And that those score ranks, which as is noted in the table, are now *ordinal* data, be converted back to effectiveness scores by dividing each rank by the number of distinct scores arising, that is, by dividing by $u = |\mathcal{U}|$.

In this proposal if $M(\cdot)$ is the effectiveness mapping selected in step 0 and applied in step 3, first the universe of all possible mapped values $\mathcal{U} = \{M(S) \mid S \in \{[0, 1]\}^k\}$ is computed; then the cardinality of that set $u = |\mathcal{U}|$ is determined; and then each SERP S observed in the experiment is represented by a “new” score $M'(\cdot)$ computed as

$$M'(S) = \frac{\text{rank}(M(S), \mathcal{U}) - 1}{u - 1},$$

where $\text{rank}(s, \mathcal{U})$ returns the integer value $|\{x \mid x \in \mathcal{U} \wedge x \leq s\}|$; and where the ostensible goal is to convert non-equi-interval observations to equi-interval observations via a non-linear transformation from the real number line to the real number line.⁷ For example, in the case of the $\text{RR}@3$ mapping that was depicted in Figure 1(b), we have $\mathcal{U}_{\text{RR}3} = \{0, 1/3, 1/2, 1\}$, and thus $u = 4$; which in turn means that the adjusted mapping $M'(\cdot)$ assigns each SERP S one of *equi-interval* $(1/3, 0, 4) = \{0, 1/3, 2/3, 1\}$, “sliding” the stack of observations at $1/2$ in Figure 1(b) rightward, to sit at $2/3$. This new effectiveness mapping could be used in an IR experiment, yes, *provided it is argued for based on a plausible model of user behavior*. But it no longer reflects the user model associated with $\text{RR}@3$; it measures SERP usefulness via a different user model.

⁷Which is not a permissible operation for either interval scale data or ratio scale data.

Step	Activity	Observations and measurement scale
0	Design experiment; identify documents, topics, and queries; select and justify retrieval effectiveness mapping.	—
1	Carry out experiment, collect SERPs created by system(s) in response to queries.	Document k -vectors, one per system per query; <i>categorical</i> data.
2	Collect relevance judgments, then apply them to the document k -vectors.	Binary k -vectors, one per system per query; <i>categorical</i> data.
3	Apply effectiveness mapping chosen at step 0 (categorical-to-numeric) to the binary k -vectors, with $[0]^k \rightarrow 0$.	Numeric scores, one per system per query; <i>ratio</i> data.
4	Transform each mapped score to its rank position in the sorted list of all possible scores possible for that mapping when applied to binary k -vectors.	Score ranks relative to \mathcal{U} , the universe of possible scores for the mapping chosen at step 0; <i>ordinal</i> data.
5	Transform SERP ranks to the range $[0, 1]$ using equi-interval ordinal-to-numeric mapping.	Mapped score ranks in the range $[0, 1]$; <i>ratio</i> data again.

Table 1. Experimental structure suggested by Ferrante et al. [2021]. Steps 0 to 3 are the standard IR experimental methodology; steps 4 and 5 are then added by Ferrante et al. The commentary at the right is my analysis of the data that is created by each step.

The annotations in the right column in Table 1 make clear what, in my opinion, is happening: step 3 creates ratio scale values that, by virtue of and in the context of the user model associated the chosen effectiveness mapping, are believed to represent user satisfaction with observed SERPs. Those ratio scale values are then being deliberately stripped of their ratio-based relativities (step 4). Instead, the scores are distorted into a new arrangement (step 5) that possesses the same ordering, yes, but associates different scores; thus undermining the interpretability of the experimental results.

Ferrante et al. [2021] further note that in certain cases $M'(S) = c \cdot M(S)$ for a multiplicative constant $c > 0$ and all binary k -vectors S . For example, provided there are at least k relevant documents, both $\text{Precc}@k$ and $\text{RBP}_{0.5}@k$ (the RBP mapping, with parameter $\phi = 0.5$ and calculation limited to a SERP length of k) have this property. On the other hand, RR does not, as is evident in the previous example. But even when this property holds for two mappings $M_1(\cdot)$ and $M_2(\cdot)$, they will *still* not be ratio-of-difference invariant or ratio-invariant with respect to each other. *Every categorical-to-numeric effectiveness mapping, whether equi-interval or not, is measuring something different.*

As I argued previously [Moffat, 2022], I doubt the need for the intervalization process. Yes, it is another way of developing new effectiveness mappings that might be argued for and then used; but no, those new mappings do not possess any innate properties that make them, absent of any discussion of users and their behavior, preferable to the mappings they are derived from.

Intervalization most certainly does *not* result in order-based, ratio-of-difference-based, or ratio-based score invariance across different effectiveness mappings. That simply isn't possible, because the SERPs themselves are *categorical data*.

5 The Case For Reciprocal Rank

I'll admit to not being a great fan of RR as a way of assessing SERP usefulness. It is a relatively blunt instrument, and for strongly top-weighted evaluations I'd probably use $RBP_{0.5}$ as a measurement tool, so that score ties are broken by taking into account the position of any subsequent relevant documents after the first. Diaz [2023] has also recently considered how to add sensitivity to RR while retaining a strong focus on the head of the SERP.

On the other hand, I'm also willing to accept that for some applications RR might be exactly the right way to assess user perceptions of SERP usefulness. For example, mention was made in Section 1 of search tasks in which "users place d times more value on having the first relevant document at rank 1 than they do on having the first relevant document at rank d " – which, by the way, is a statement about relativities that directly corresponds with the use of ratio scales.

Most importantly of all, I'd like my colleagues in the IR community to be able to use RR (or AP, or NDCG, or $RBP_{0.8}$, and so on) in their evaluations if they wish to. To satisfy me they need to provide a justification as to *why* they have chosen some particular effectiveness mapping, preferably grounded in a discussion about user behavior; and in my opinion that rationale is an important component of the experimental design (step 0 in Table 1). But once they have made that argument (and it has been accepted as plausible) they should be able to report their results and present their papers at conferences without being concerned that they may have erred in some nebulous way that they don't understand, and without attracting "methodology" criticisms that they don't deserve.

Also worth noting is that recent work with Joel Mackenzie [Moffat and Mackenzie, 2023] has led to a proposal for comparing sets of SERPs (in other words, comparing systems over a set of topics) via any *innate pairwise SERP orderings* that can be identified. As was discussed in Section 2, there is no total ordering of binary k -vectors, with the example $S_1 = [1, 1, 0, 0, 0]$ versus $S_2 = [0, 0, 1, 1, 1]$ used to defend the claim that SERPs are categorical data. But there are also many sub-chains and partial-orderings of SERPs. For example, the two 5-vectors $S_3 = [1, 0, 1, 1, 0]$ and $S_4 = [0, 1, 0, 0, 1]$ probably *can* be ordered – at least for all plausible effectiveness mappings $M(\cdot)$ – as being $M(S_3) \not\prec M(S_4)$, with S_3 possessing both more total relevance, and also unambiguously earlier relevance. That is, we cannot imagine any user-based model for SERP consumption under which a user would find S_4 more useful than S_3 . This proposal is based on the "Rule 1" and "Rule 2" relationships I have previously written about [Moffat, 2022], and leads to a technique we dub IPSO for carrying out mapping-agnostic system comparisons in some circumstances. Diaz and Ferraro [2022] have also considered "metric free" comparisons.

Finally, at a more abstract level of experimental commentary, note that Zobel [2022] has recently pondered the degree to which batch evaluations of the type considered in detail here should be relied on as a way of assessing search performance; and discusses the extent to which any numeric measurement can be employed as a reliable surrogate for what is, fundamentally, a qualitative human-oriented goal.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported under the Australian Research Council’s Discovery Projects funding scheme (project DP190101113). A number of colleagues have contributed their thoughts in response to drafts, including Joel Mackenzie, Justin Zobel, Paul Thomas, and Tetsuya Sakai.

References

- F. Diaz. Best-case retrieval evaluation: Improving the sensitivity of reciprocal rank with lexicographic precision, 2023. arXiv:2306.07908v1.
- F. Diaz and A. Ferraro. Offline retrieval evaluation without evaluation metrics. In *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 599–609, 2022.
- M. Ferrante, N. Ferro, E. Losiouk, and S. Pontarollo. Scales of evaluation measures: From theory to experimentation. In *Proc. Italian Inf. Retr. Wrkshp.*, pages 10–11, 2019a.
- M. Ferrante, N. Ferro, and S. Pontarollo. A general theory of IR evaluation measures. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 31(3):409–422, 2019b.
- M. Ferrante, N. Ferro, and E. Losiouk. How do interval scales help us with better understanding IR evaluation measures? *Information Retrieval*, 23(3):289–317, 2020.
- M. Ferrante, N. Ferro, and N. Fuhr. Towards meaningful statements in IR evaluation: Mapping evaluation measures to interval scales. *IEEE Access*, 9:136182–136216, 2021.
- M. Ferrante, N. Ferro, and N. Fuhr. Response to Moffat’s comment on “Towards meaningful statements in IR evaluation: Mapping evaluation measures to interval scales”. arXiv2212.11735, 2022.
- N. Fuhr. Some common mistakes in IR evaluation, and how they can be avoided. *SIGIR Forum*, 51(3): 32–41, 2017.
- A. Moffat. Batch evaluation metrics in information retrieval: Measures, scales, and meaning. *IEEE Access*, 10:105564–105577, 2022.
- A. Moffat and J. Mackenzie. How much freedom does an effectiveness metric really have? arXiv:2309.09477, 2023.
- A. Moffat, J. Mackenzie, P. Thomas, and L. Azzopardi. A flexible framework for offline effectiveness metrics. In *Proc. ACM Int. Conf. on Research and Development in Information Retrieval (SIGIR)*, pages 578–587, 2022.
- T. Sakai. On Fuhr’s guideline for IR evaluation. *SIGIR Forum*, 54(1):12:1–12:8, 2020.
- S. S. Stevens. On the theory of scales of measurement. *Science*, 103(2684):677–680, 1946.
- J. Zobel. When measurement misleads: The limits of batch assessment of retrieval systems. *SIGIR Forum*, 56(1):1–20, 2022.