

Training Datasets Collection and Evaluation of Feature Selection Methods for Web Content Filtering

Roman Suvorov, Ilya Sochenkov, and Ilya Tikhomirov

Institute for Systems Analysis of Russian Academy of Sciences
rsuvorov@isa.ru sochenkov@isa.ru tih@isa.ru

Abstract. This paper focuses on main aspects of development of a qualitative system for dynamic content filtering. These aspects include collection of meaningful training data and feature selection techniques. The Web changes rapidly so the classifier needs to be regularly re-trained. Problem of training data collection is treated as a special case of focused crawling. A simple and easy-to-tune technique was proposed, implemented and tested. The proposed feature selection technique tends to minimize the feature set size without loss of accuracy and to consider interlinked nature of the Web. This is essential to make content filtering solution fast and non-burdensome for end users, especially when content filtering is performed using restricted hardware. Evaluation and comparison of various classifiers and techniques is provided.

Keywords: Dynamic content filtering, text classification, automatic topic identification, active content recognition, feature selection, TF-IDF, thematic importance characteristic, information gain, focused crawling.

1 Introduction

The problem of improper use of the Web has been worrying rather broad categories of people such as employers and parents since the Web came to each house. A number of various attempts to solve it have been proposed by the society: FOSI (former ICRA) content labeling initiative, thematic catalogs of resources, lists of URLs and regular expressions, methods for dynamic content filtering. Due to the nature of the Web only dynamic content filtering can be considered as an adequate solution: all other approaches require heavy and conscientious labor to update databases regularly. The latter task is hardly solvable because of fast growth of the Web and existence of Web-anonymizers.

A good dynamic content filtering system must classify content on-the-fly with high quality and negligible time delay. In most cases its a tradeoff: the faster method is the more often it makes errors. There is a number of commercial systems that declare use of dynamic classification: PureSight Owl ©, Blue Coat WebFilter ©, NetNanny © etc. In most cases content filters detect the following categories of content: purchase of alcohol, tobacco and drugs; web-anonymizers and proxies; chats, forums, instant messengers, dating sites and social networks;

materials with cruelty and criminal information; suicide methods and stories; religious sects; news sites; file sharing sites, warez, video, image and music hostings, torrent trackers; traveling and entertainment; health and beauty; gambling and online games; popularization of various kinds of discrimination; job search websites; adult content; online shops; hobbies: sports, cars, pets etc; sites about weapons purchase and construction.

Summing up, problem of content filtering differs from the text classification in the following aspects.

- Processing time and memory consumption is crucial (web filter performs in real time and often on restricted hardware).
- Depending on situation balance of various classification errors rates may vary (filtering may be configured more or less strict).
- The target data always changes (new lexis can be introduced by users in order to bypass filters).

These differences constrain the classification method to be used: it cannot use complex feature extraction techniques, procedure of the classifier re-training must be simplified.

The research presented in this paper continues the work [1]. We introduce some extensions to the original methods, evaluate them in near-real conditions and compare with other classification methods. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Chapter 2 we describe the modifications proposed to the original method; in Chapter 3 we discuss difficulties with getting data for training evaluation and possible solutions; in Chapter 4 the experiment setup and results are present; in Chapter 5 we sum up the work done and discuss future research.

2 Method

The basis of the method is described in details in [1]. In this paper we propose two modifications that take into account interlinked nature of the Web. These modifications are:

- Take into account categories of Web-sites that are referred to by the currently classified page.
- Tokenize URLs of links found on the classified page and treat these tokens as usual lexis.

The first modification roots in so-called thematic isolation: web pages often refer to pages from the same website or to thematically similar resources. This principle can be generalized by introducing frequency distribution of topics of the referred resources. We propose to treat topics of resources as usual lexical features in context of TIC-based classifier [1]. The corresponding part of the feature set is generated according to the following algorithm.

1. Extract URLs from the body of a page.

2. Extract server domain names from the retrieved URLs.
3. Map domains to topics titles using a gazetteer.
4. Calculate weights as if these titles were usual words.

The most crucial part of this algorithm is the domain-topic mapping. It can be initially constructed from a catalog such as Open Directory Project [2]. Later on it can be iteratively expanded with domains of pages that got class label with high confidence (large margin between rating of a page and the corresponding threshold). Each domain may correspond to multiple topics. Each topic is represented with a unique label constructed from a prefix "url_" and a title of the topic (e.g. adult, chats etc.). The goal of using the prefix is to distinguish topics of the referred pages from the usual lexis.

The second modification makes a sense because human-readable URLs become more widespread (e.g. <http://example.com/catalog/pages-on-some-topic> instead of <http://example.com/catalog.php?topicId=19567>). Similar ideas were developed in [3, 4]. We propose to tokenize URLs found in the body of the page and to treat all the extracted tokens as a part of usual lexis.

3 Data Sets

Good evaluation of a method for content filtering is not a trivial task because of absence of reliably marked data sets. Such standard datasets for text categorization and clustering as 20 Newsgroups and Reuters-21578 don't fit the task because they contain only textual features (no hyperlinks and markup) and sets of labels used in these corpora differ from ones that make sense for content filtering (they are less thematic and more associative). Public access lists are updated rarely and contain addresses of pages that have been disappeared or have been sold to another owner. That's why it's not a good idea to collect pages from such lists.

There is a couple of ways to overcome this issue:

- Use unsupervised methods of machine learning (datasets marking is not necessary).
- Use methods that require few examples to learn (in this case datasets can be marked manually).
- Introduce a technique of collecting datasets that don't require much additional manual marking.

In modern conditions such corpora cannot be easily created because the Web changes rapidly and it's necessary to retrain the filter periodically in order to fit it to the current state of the Web. Moreover, when training on a small dataset one cannot guarantee that recall of the lexis-based filter in real life will be the same as during experimental evaluation.

Therefore we have chosen the latter way. We created a special web crawler to collect web pages only on the topics of interest. This crawler addresses the focused crawling problem [5–7]. However, this problem in general is very difficult.

Our goal was to create a rather simple system that collects pages on the specified topic and needs no or almost no manual configuration.

General algorithm of this crawler contains two major steps: seed URLs collection and recursive crawling.

To collect seed URLs we applied the following approach. An expert tries to find web pages on the topic of interest using global search engines and writes down most productive queries. Then the system automatically sends these queries to other popular global search engines and collects addresses of the found pages. Duplicate URLs are then removed from the resulting list.

Then the system recursively crawls the specified amount of pages starting from ones in the seed list according to the following rules:

- Web sites are walked in breadth-first order.
- If a seed URL points to a root page (its path and query string are empty) then the system will crawl recursively the referred pages.
- If a seed URL points to a non-root page (path or query are not empty) then the system will download it but will not proceed recursively. We decided to do so to reduce amount of candidate pages.
- If the current page is a seed page then the system will extract K keywords from it and add them to the list T containing keywords that describe the topic of interest.
- If the current page is not a seed page then:
 1. Extract list P of K its keywords.
 2. If $|P \cap T| < M$, where M is a minimal number of keywords set by an expert, then stop processing the current page.
 3. Update T using P (details of this step will be described later).

Addresses found in the current page are enqueued for crawling with no regard to the topic of the page. It's done so because there is no topic-relevant order of walking the web site and thus we cannot guarantee that non-relevant pages don't refer to relevant ones and vice versa. There are works on more advanced focused crawling [5–7] that try to reduce amount of considered pages.

The list of keywords of a page consists of K stems of tokens that have the greatest TF-IDF rating [8]. We used Snowball algorithm [9] to extract stems. IDF's were calculated over rather large subsets of English and Russian Wikipedia. If the table of IDF's does not contain a stem, the corresponding token will be ignored. The table of IDF's was built using POS-tagging and contains only stems of verbs, nouns and adjectives. Thus, the stopwords, numbers and misspelled words are naturally filtered out from the list of keywords of a page.

If the current page belongs to the topic of interest and is not a seed page, list of topic keywords T will be updated according to the following algorithm.

1. For each keyword w in the list P of the current page do
 - (a) if w in T then increment its weight by 1;
 - (b) otherwise add to T new record for this word with weight 1.
2. If reduction of T has not been performed for R times, reduce it. The reduction consists of two steps:

- (a) remove from T $|T| - Max_T$ entries that have the smallest weights;
- (b) decrease weights of the rest entries by the maximal weight of the removed ones.

In other words, T is a list of pairs $(word, weight)$ where $weight$ is amount of pages that used $word$ since the last reduction of T .

The crawling algorithm has the following configuration parameters:

- K - amount of keywords to extract from each page;
- Max_T - maximal amount of terms representing the topic of interest to remember (maximal size of T);
- M - minimal amount of keywords of a page that need to be in T for this page to be added to the dataset;
- R - amount of pages to process before next reduction of T .

This algorithm allows for collecting web pages on the restricted topic that is specified by a set of initial pages (seeds). Periodical updates and reductions of T give some freedom to the crawler: it can slightly diverge from initial topic. How significant the divergence is allowed is specified by configuration parameters. We don't have a technique to estimate these parameters automatically by the moment. Furthermore, we're in doubt that such technique can exist because of the vicious circle: to build a classifier we already need a classifier. Fortunately these parameters seem to be rather easy for an expert to set.

4 Evaluation

The aim of the evaluation within this work is to estimate quality of content filtering in conditions that are rather close to real life. To achieve this goal we collected about 170000 web pages on 17 topics (10000 pages per topic) in English and Russian (5000 pages in each language) according to the technique described in Chapter 3. These topics are:

- Adult content - resources with pornographic and erotic videos, images and animations.
- Chats and forums - resources for chatting on non-professional topics and dating including most popular social networks.
- Criminals - resources exposing violent and related to criminal materials.
- Drugs - resources on how to purchase drugs including legal ones (spice, alcohol, tobacco) or how to make them at home.
- Entertainment - websites with advertisements and recommendations on spare time.
- Online games - browser games, MMORPG, online shooters, racing games, online casino.
- Health - resources "for women", articles on wellness, fitness, health etc.
- Hostings - sites for sharing files, videos and images (including torrents).
- Jobs - resources with job descriptions and advertisements.
- Pets - resources on pets care.

- Proxy - Web-anonymizers, lists of proxy servers and virtual private networks.
- Sect - materials containing information on possibly dangerous religious sect stories, meetings, ceremonies etc.
- Shopping - online shops, and auctions.
- Sports - news about sports events, articles for sports lovers.
- Suicide - suicide methods, stories of self-murderers.
- Tech - news about modern technologies (IT, cars etc).
- Weapons - information on how to buy, use or create weapons at home.

The topics above are considered as "bad". The system must block documents of these topics. We also added to the dataset about 20000 pages collected from Wikipedia and other informational resources. These pages are considered to be "good" and should not be blocked.

We treat this problem as multi-class and single-label classification problem. It means that the system must assign not more than one label to each document. If no labels are assigned to a document, it is considered to be "good" and is not blocked. We reduce the multi-class problem to a set of binary problems using "one-vs-all" technique.

Quality of classification is measured with macro-averaged precision, recall and F1-measure.

The following combinations of features were used during the experiment:

- Base - only usual lexis.
- Cat&Tok - Base feature set extended with categories and tokens of links.

The results are present in table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of classifiers and feature extraction techniques

Classifier	Feature set	Precision			Recall			F1		
		Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg
nTIC	Base	0.739	0.972	0.895	0.918	0.994	0.968	0.819	0.983	0.929
nTIC	Cat&Tok	0.812	0.986	0.934	0.909	0.988	0.963	0.878	0.986	0.948
SVM	Base	0.98	0.999	0.996	0.962	0.996	0.988	0.971	0.997	0.992
SVM	Cat&Tok	0.98	0.999	0.996	0.953	0.996	0.985	0.973	0.997	0.991

The most difficult categories were "Jobs", "Adult" and "Sect", probably because of their breadth and fuzzy boundaries. The easiest ones were "Sports", "Games" and "Drugs".

As one can see, the extended feature set yields 7% increase in precision and 2% increase in F1. SVM performs better than nTIC on most categories, but it trains about 3 times slower and requires 2 times more memory in production. Memory consumption can become a bottleneck when working with many categories.

Often content filtering solutions work on hardware that is far from state-of-the-art (e.g. in schools, on smartphones). It means that resources consumption should be reduced as much as possible. Each category needs memory for feature selection and classifier model: e.g. if we have about 100000 features, we need about 500KB for classifier model and about 100KB to represent a document. This means that if we have 50 categories (as most modern content filters do), we need about 25MB of working memory only to classify a page (not to mention additional memory needed for preprocessing). Memory is a very scarce resource on most mobile devices. Furthermore, smaller feature set allows for faster classification.

The second series of experiments addresses this issue: its goal is to determine how quality of classification decreases after various feature selection techniques applied. During this series quality indices were evaluated over four-dimensional grid using SVM classifier with linear kernel. Dimensions were:

- Category (the same as above).
- Technique for feature selection (Inverse Document Frequency, Thematic Importance Characteristic, Information Gain) [10, 11].
- N - amount of top-rated features to include into the resulting feature set;
- Threshold - amount of documents that must use a feature in order for it to be significant (not considered as noise).

Results of the second series of evaluation are present in table 2. The present quality indices are macro-averaged over categories. Threshold values are also omitted for brevity (only the best values are taken into account).

Table 2. Results of experiments on feature selection

Technique	IDF			nTIC			IG		
	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
5 000	0.977	0.948	0.962	1	0.852	0.921	0.99	0.83	0.908
10 000	0.983	0.962	0.972	0.981	0.955	0.968	0.99	0.908	0.951
100 000	0.992	0.975	0.984	0.995	0.951	0.972	0.997	0.958	0.977

5 Future Work

In this work we evaluated and compared two classifiers, two techniques for feature extraction and three techniques for feature set reduction (feature selection) in near-real conditions. Techniques for feature extraction address the idea of using interlinked nature of the Web and thematic isolation to improve classification quality. Methods for feature selection address need of deploying content filtering systems on any hardware (including old servers and mobile devices). Thematic

Importance Characteristic gains better accuracy with small feature sets. Feature selection technique is not that important with middle-scale and large feature sets (all techniques show similar performance).

Also, a simple and easy-to-tune method for thematic web crawling is proposed and applied for collection of training data. The method is based on metasearch, keyword extraction and IDF term weighting.

Main direction of the future work is development of heterogeneous filter. It should include functional classifier, analyzer of graphical content and take into account user behavior. Functional classification should improve detection of forums, shops and other types of resources that don't have very specific lexis. It also probably will allow to strip out only parts of pages that contain, say, dirty advertisements. Analysis of graphics should improve detection of violent materials and pornography resources that don't use text to describe images or videos.

Acknowledgments. The project is supported by Russian Foundation for Basic Research grant 12-07-33012. The described work is performed within the Exactus Expert [12,13] project and is used in the TSA WebFilter software.

References

1. Suvorov, R., Sochenkov, I., Tikhomirov, I.: Method for pornography filtering in the web based on automatic classification and natural language processing. In: elezn, M., Habernal, I., Ronzhin, A., eds.: *Speech and Computer*. Volume 8113 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer International Publishing (2013) 233–240
2. Inc., A.: Open directory project. <http://www.dmoz.org>
3. Baykan, E., Henzinger, M., Marian, L., Weber, I.: Purely url-based topic classification. In: *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on World Wide Web. WWW '09*, New York, NY, USA, ACM (2009) 1109–1110
4. Shih, L.K., Karger, D.R.: Using urls and table layout for web classification tasks. In: *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on World Wide Web. WWW '04*, New York, NY, USA, ACM (2004) 193–202
5. Aggarwal, C.C., Al-Garawi, F., Yu, P.S.: Intelligent crawling on the world wide web with arbitrary predicates. In: *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on World Wide Web*, ACM (2001) 96–105
6. Jamali, M., Sayyadi, H., Hariri, B.B., Abolhassani, H.: A method for focused crawling using combination of link structure and content similarity. In: *Web Intelligence, 2006. WI 2006. IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on*, IEEE (2006) 753–756
7. Altıngövd, İ.S., Ulusoy, O.: Exploiting interclass rules for focused crawling. *Intelligent Systems, IEEE* **19**(6) (2004) 66–73
8. Salton, G., McGill, M.J.: *Introduction to modern information retrieval*. (1983)
9. Porter, M.F.: *Snowball: A language for stemming algorithms* (2001)
10. Liu, T., Liu, S., Chen, Z., Ma, W.Y.: An evaluation on feature selection for text clustering. In: *ICML*. Volume 3. (2003) 488–495
11. Mitchell, T.: *Machine Learning*. McGraw Hill (1997)
12. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Vybornova, O.: Technologies for semantic analysis of scientific publications. In: *Intelligent Systems (IS), 2012 6th IEEE International Conference*. (Sept 2012) 058–062

13. Osipov, G., Smirnov, I., Tikhomirov, I., Shelmanov, A.: Relational-situational method for intelligent search and analysis of scientific publications. In: Proceedings of the Integrating IR Technologies for Professional Search Workshop. (2013) 57–64