arXiv:1207.2541v1 [cs.DM] 11 Jul 2012

A New Weighted Spearman's Footrule as A Measure of Distance between Rankings

Jianwen Chen* Yiping Li* Ling Feng*

Abstract

Many applications motivate the distance measure between rankings, such as comparing top-k lists and rank aggregation for voting, and intrigue great interest to researchers. For example, for a search engine, the use of different ranking algorithms may return different ranking lists. The effect of a ranking algorithm can be estimated by computing the distance (similarity) between the result ranking it returns and the appropriate ranking people expect. People may be interested in only the first few items of result ranking, therefore the metric for measuring the distance should emphasize on the items in higher positions. Besides, in an extreme case, if a result ranking is the total reverse of the expected ranking, then it is considered to be the worst ranking with the maximum distance. Therefore, a metric is called for, which can satisfy both of the two intuitions. To address this problem, we present a weighted metric based on the classical Spearman's footrule metric to measure the distance between two permutations of n objects. This metric can be applied in rank aggregation problem with a polynomial time algorithm, and produces a 2-approximation for adopting the weighted Kendall's tau distance proposed by Farnoud et al.

*Department of Computer Science & Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China. Email: {chen-jw08, liyp09}@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn, fengling@tsinghua.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Measuring the distance between rankings is motivated by many applications, such as comparing top-k lists and rank aggregation for voting, and intrigues great interest to researchers. Spearman's footrule metric [13] and Kendall's tau metric [9] are two most classical ways to measure the distance between two rankings. However, more requirements appear with the spread of applications, which brings challenges to the traditional ways.

For example, in a search engine, the use of different ranking algorithms may return different ranking lists. The effect of a ranking algorithm can be estimated by computing the distance (similarity) between the result ranking it returns and the appropriate ranking people expect. To be noted, the metric of distance should satisfy some requirements. Firstly, people may be interested in only the first few items of result ranking, therefore the metric for measuring the distance should emphasize on the items in higher positions. Besides, in an extreme case, if a result ranking is the total reverse of the expected ranking, then it is considered to be the worst ranking with the maximum distance. Therefore, a metric is called for, which can satisfy both of the two intuitions. To address this problem, we present a weighted metric based on the classic Spearman's footrule metric to measure the distance between two permutations of n objects. This metric follows two intuitions: (i) Changing the order of the top elements should result in a larger contribution to the overall distance than changing the order of the bottom elements; (ii) The maximum distance occurs when one permutation is the reverse of the other.

1.1 Contributions of this paper

This paper proposes a weighted Spearman's footrule metric which can reflect both Intuition (i) and Intuition (ii). It includes the classical Spearman's footrule metric as a special case. When all the weights are set to 1, the weighted Spearman's footrule metric will simplify to the original classical form.

We also extend our metric to compare two rankings which contain different objects, such as $\langle a, b, c, d\rangle$ and $\langle d, b, e, f\rangle$. This situation occurs naturally in the scenario of comparing search results of a search engine or top-k query answers in databases.

We further discuss the application of our weighted Spearman's footrule distance in rank aggregation. Numerous applications in sports, databases, statistics and information retrieval raise the problem of rank aggregation, in which k voters produced k rankings π_1, π_2, ..., π_k on the same set of n elements, the goal is to find a ranking π minimizing the sum of distances $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d(\pi, \pi_i)$, where $d(.)$ is a measure of distance between two ranking lists [1]. In the literature, when adopting the state of the art weighted Spearman's footrule distance proposed in [10], no polynomial time algorithms have been proposed for finding the exact optimal solution for the rank aggregation problem, and approximated algorithms are resorted to. However, adopting our weighted Spearman's footrule distance in the rank aggregation problem leads to a polynomial time solution.

By establishing the Diaconis-Graham inequality in the more general weighted case, we show that our metric and the weighted Kendall's tau metric proposed in [8] are equivalent up to a factor of 2. Further, according to the weighted Diaconis-Graham inequality, the optimal solution for the case using our weighted Spearman's footrule distance in rank aggregation produces a 2-approximation for the case using the weighted Kendall's tau distance proposed in [8].

We hope that the weighted Spearman's footrule metric proposed in this paper will improve a variety of applications in fields such as information retrieval and databases.

1.2 Related Work

Large amount of applications motivate the distance measure between two rankings. In the field of information retrieval, most research is based on ranked lists of items. For example, the output of search engines are ranked lists of documents, the search engines themselves are also ranked based on their performance according to different evaluation criteria, the queries submitted to search engines are again ranked based on their difficulty, and so on. Much research work needs to compare two ranked lists to report their similarity/dissimlarity between them [2, 14, 15, 3] . Similarly, in the database field, some recent research work on top-k queries also needs measuring the distance between two ranked lists [4, 11, 12].

Two classical distance measures between permutations are Spearman's footrule metric [13], which measures the summation of position changes of each elements, and Kendall's tau metric [9], which measures the total number of pairwise inversions needed to convert one permutation into the other. Fagin et al. [7] further extend them for comparing top-k lists.

However, these two classical metrics don't consider the influence of positions, and they treat the inversions near the head and near the tail of a list equally. Some trials are done by researchers to add weights according to the positions.

Kumar and Vassilvitskii [10] have done a good work toward this direction. The weighted metric proposed by them can reflect the intuition (i), that is, changing the order of top elements in the list plays a larger role than changing the order of the bottom elements. However, their metric lost a very simple and clear intuition in the original metric: the reverse order should produce a maximal distance. In our opinion, Intuition (ii), which is reflected in the original metrics, should be kept in the extended cases. We shall describe the definition of the weighted Spearman's footrule metric proposed in [10] and use an example to illustrate that their metric does not reflect Intuition (ii).

Farnoud et al. [8] further proposes a weighted tau metric based on Intuition (i) and Intuition (ii). However, adopting their weighted Kendall's tau distance in the rank aggregation problem is NP-hard, even when the number of ranking to be aggregated is only 4. Therefore, we try to find an efficient way to address this problem by extending the Spearman's footrule metric.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review the classical Spearman's footrule metric. In Section 3, we present the weighted Spearman's

footrule metric, extend it to compare rankings with different objects in top-k lists, and apply it in the rank aggregation. In Section 4 we prove that our metric and the weighted Kendall's tau metric proposed in [8] are equivalent up to a factor of 2 by establishing the Diaconis-Graham inequality in the weighted case. Then a conclusion is conducted in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we set up some global notation that we shall use throughout the paper, and review the classical Spearman's footrule metric.

Let D be a set of n elements. A permutation σ of D is an ordered sequence of all the elements in D, which can be seen as a bijective function from D onto the set $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. We use $D_\sigma = D$ to denote the domain of σ. For each element x of D_σ, $\sigma(x)$ is the position of x in σ. x is ahead of y or y is after x if $\sigma(x) < \sigma(y)$. For example, if $D = \{a, b, c, d\}$, then $\langle b, c, d, a\rangle$ is a permutation of D, which can be considered as a function σ, $\sigma(a) = 4$, $\sigma(b) = 1$, $\sigma(c) = 2$, $\sigma(d) = 3$.

Let S_D denote the set of all permutations of D. A metric on S_D is a function ρ from $S_D \times S_D$ to $[0, +)$, which satisfies, for any two permutations σ and π, (a) $\rho(\sigma, \pi) \geq 0$ and $\rho(\sigma, \pi) = 0$ if and only if $\sigma = \pi$; (b) $\rho(\sigma, \pi) = \rho(\pi, \sigma)$; (c) $\rho(\sigma, \pi) \leq \rho(\sigma, \delta) + \rho(\delta, \pi)$ for any permutation δ.

One of the classical metrics on permutations is **Spearman's footrule metric**. In Spearman's footrule metric, the distance between two permutations σ and π is defined as $F(\sigma, \pi) = \sum_{x \in D} |\sigma(x) - \pi(x)|$.

Example 2.1. *Let D be a set of 4 objects $\{a, b, c, d\}$. $\sigma = \langle a, c, d, b\rangle$ and $\pi = \langle b, c, a, d\rangle$ are two permutations of D. In Spearman's footrule metric, the distance between σ and π is $F(\sigma, \pi) = |\sigma(a) - \pi(a)| + |\sigma(b) - \pi(b)| + |\sigma(c) - \pi(c)| + |\sigma(d) - \pi(d)| = 6$.*

3 Weighted Spearman's Footrule Metric

In this section, we introduce our weighted Spearman's footrule metric to measure the distance between two permutations, which can reflect both Intuition (i) and Intuition (ii). We further extend our weighted Spearman's footrule metric for comparing top-k lists. At last, we discuss its application in the rank aggregation problem.

3.1 Weighted Spearman's Footrule Metric

We first give the definition of our weighted Spearman's footrule metric. For permutations of the set D with n elements, $n - 1$ weights $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-1}$ are introduced, with $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \ldots \geq w_{n-1} > 0$. Among them, weight w_i is used to measure the contribution of moving an element from position i to position

$i+1$ or from position $i+1$ to position i to the overall distance. For any two positions i and j, let

$$C_F(i,j) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} w_k & \text{if } i < j; \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j; \\ \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} w_k & \text{if } i > j \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

be the contribution of moving an element from position i to position j. For permutations σ and π, the contribution of moving element x is $C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x))$. For the weighted Spearman's footrule metric, the distance between permutations σ and π is defined as

$$F^w(\sigma, \pi) = \sum_{x \in D} C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)). \tag{2}$$

Proposition 3.1. *The distance defined in Formula (2) makes S_D into a metric space.*

Example 3.1. *Let $D = \{a, b, c, d\}$, $\sigma = \langle a, c, d, b\rangle$, and $\pi = \langle b, c, a, d\rangle$. The introduced weights are w_1, w_2, w_3. Then, for the distance between σ and π, the contribution of moving element a is $C_F(\sigma(a), \pi(a)) = w_1 + w_2$. Similarly, $C_F(\sigma(b), \pi(b)) = w_1 + w_2 + w_3$, $C_F(\sigma(c), \pi(c)) = 0$, $C_F(\sigma(d), \pi(d)) = w_3$. The weighted distance between σ and π is $F^w(\sigma, \pi) = 2w_1 + 2w_2 + 2w_3$.*

By setting monotone decreasing weights $w_1 > w_2 > \cdots > w_{n-1} > 0$, the weighted Spearman's footrule metric can reflect the intuition that changing the order of the top elements should produce a larger contribution to the overall distance than changing the order of the bottom elements.

Example 3.2. *Let $D = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{10}\}$, $\sigma_1 = \langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, , a_{10}\rangle$, $\sigma_2 = \langle a_5, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1, a_6, a_7, a_8, a_9, a_{10}\rangle$, $\sigma_3 = \langle a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_{10}, a_9, a_8, a_7, a_6\rangle$. σ_2 represents the permutation obtained from changing the order of the first five elements of σ_1, and σ_3 represents the permutation obtained from changing the order of the last five elements of σ_1. The introduced weights are w_1, w_2, ..., w_9. Then, $F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = 2w_1 + 4w_2 + 4w_3 + 2w_4$, $F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_3) = 2w_6 + 4w_7 + 4w_8 + 2w_9$. $w_1 > w_2 > \ldots > w_9$ implies $F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) > F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_3)$, which reflects the intuition that changing the order of the top elements produces a larger contribution to the overall distance than changing the order of the bottom elements.*

The classical Spearman's footrule metric reflects the intuition that the reverse order produces a maximal distance. This intuition is kept in our weighted Spearman's footrule metric.

Proposition 3.2. *The weighted Spearman's footrule distance $F^w(\sigma, \pi)$ defined in (2) attains its maximum value when π is the reverse of σ. The maximum value is $2\sum_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} k(w_k + w_{n-k}) + nw_{n/2}$ when n is even, and $2\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} k(w_k + w_{n-k})$ when n is odd.*

Proof. See APPENDIX. □

The position weighted Spearman's footrule metric proposed in [10] does not ensure that the reverse order produces a maximum distance.

We first review the position weighted Spearman's footrule metric proposed in [10]. For two permutations σ and π with n objects, $n-1$ weights $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots, \delta_{n-1}$ are introduced to model the costs of swaps between two adjacent positions. δ_i is the cost of swapping an element at position i with an element at position $i+1$. Let $p_1 = 0$ and for $1 < i \leq n$, $p_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \delta_j$, and $\overline{p}_x(\sigma, \pi) = \frac{p_{\sigma(x)} - p_{\pi(x)}}{\sigma(x) - \pi(x)}$ is the average cost that x encountered in moving from position $\sigma(x)$ to $\pi(x)$, where $\overline{p}_x(\sigma, \pi) = 1$ if $\sigma(x) = \pi(x)$. Then, Kumar and Vassilvitskii [10] define the position weighted version of Spearman's footrule (F_δ) as follows:

$$F_\delta(\sigma, \pi) = \sum_{x \in D} \overline{p}_x(\sigma, \pi) \Big| \sum_{y:\sigma(y) \leq \sigma(x)} \overline{p}_y(\sigma, \pi) - \sum_{y:\pi(y) \leq \pi(x)} \overline{p}_y(\sigma, \pi) \Big| \qquad (3)$$

The following example shows that the position weighted Spearman's footrule metric defined in (3) does not ensure that the reverse order produces a maximum distance.

Example 3.3. *Let $D = \{a, b, c\}$, $\sigma = \langle a, b, c \rangle$, $\sigma_1 = \langle b, c, a \rangle$, $\sigma_2 = \langle c, b, a \rangle$. The introduced weights are $\delta_1 = 3$, $\delta_2 = 2$. Then, for σ_1, $\overline{p}_a(\sigma, \sigma_1) = 2.5$, $\overline{p}_b(\sigma, \sigma_1) = 3$, $\overline{p}_c(\sigma, \sigma_1) = 2$, we get $F_\delta(\sigma, \sigma_1) = 25$. For σ_2, $\overline{p}_a(\sigma, \sigma_2) = 2.5$, $\overline{p}_b(\sigma, \sigma_2) = 1$, $\overline{p}_c(\sigma, \sigma_2) = 2.5$, we get $F_\delta(\sigma, \sigma_2) = 17.5$. σ_2 represents the reverse of σ. $F_\delta(\sigma, \sigma_2) < F_\delta(\sigma, \sigma_1)$ shows that the position weighted Spearman's footrule metric F_δ does not ensure that the reverse order produces a maximum distance.*

3.2 Comparing Top k Lists

We now discuss modifications of the weighted Spearman's footrule metric F^w for the case when we only have the top k members of the ordering.

The need for defining distances between top k lists arises naturally in many applications when only top k lists are available. Formally, suppose D is a set of n elements, a top k list is an ordered sequence of a subset S of D with k elements. Here, θ can be considered as a function from domain S to $[k] = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. We use D_θ to denote the domain of θ. If θ is a top k list and σ is a permutation with m elements, $m \geq k$, then σ is said to be an extension of θ, denoted as $\sigma \succeq \theta$, if $\sigma(x) = \theta(x)$ for all $x \in D_\theta$.

For top k lists θ_1 and θ_2, the minimizing weighted Spearman's footrule distance $F^w_{min}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ between θ_1 and θ_2 is defined to be the minimum value of $F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$, where σ_1 and σ_2 are any two permutations of $D_{\theta_1} \cup D_{\theta_2}$ and $\sigma_1 \succeq \theta_1$, $\sigma_2 \succeq \theta_2$. Similarly, the maximizing weighted Spearman's footrule distance $F^w_{max}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ and the averaging weighted Spearman's footrule distance $F^w_{avg}(\theta_1, \theta_2)$ can be defined by using the maximum and average value of $F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$ respectively.

Proposition 3.3. *For any two top k lists θ_1 and θ_2, $F^w_{min}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = F^w_{avg}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = F^w_{max}(\theta_1, \theta_2) = F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$, where σ_1 and σ_2 are any permutations of $D_{\theta_1} \cup D_{\theta_2}$ with $\sigma_1 \succeq \theta_1$ and $\sigma_2 \succeq \theta_2$.*




Figure 1: Minimum Cost Matching in Rank Aggregation

Proof. See APPENDIX. □

3.3 Application in Rank Aggregation

Next, we discuss the application of our weighted Spearman's footrule metric in the rank aggregation problem: given a set of rankings $\pi_1, \pi_2, \ldots, \pi_k$ on the same set D of n objects, find the ranking π that minimizes the total disagreement $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d(\pi, \pi_i)$, where $d(.)$ is a measure of distance between two ranking lists.

When adopting the traditional Spearman's footrule distance, the rank aggregation problem can be computed in polynomial time by converting it into an equivalent minimum cost matching problem in weighted bipartite graph [6]. Kumar and Vassilvitskii [10] have shown that the minimum cost matching formulation [6] no longer applies when adopting their position weighted Spearman's footrule distance (Formula (3)). Their work doesn't give a polynomial algorithm for finding the exact optimal solution for the rank aggregation problem, and resort to approximate algorithm. However, applying our weighted Spearman's footrule distance in the rank aggregation problem is straightforward. Our goal is to find a permutation π that minimizes $\sum_{i=1}^{k} F^w(\pi, \pi_i)$. This problem is modeled using a weighted bipartite graph G with two sets of nodes. The first set has a node for each element in D, and the second set has a node for each possible rank in $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, as shown in Figure 1. Each element x and rank j are connected with an edge (x, j) whose weight $w(x, j) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} C_F(\pi_i(x), j)$. Then π is given by the minimum cost matching of G, where a one-to-one correspondence between all the elements in D and all the ranks in $[n]$ (each element x in D is mapped into one and only one rank j in $[n]$ by an edge) is found with a minimum summation of weights of its edges. Finding such matching can be done in $O(n^{2.5})$, where n is the number of elements in D.

Example 3.4. *Let $D = \{a, b, c\}$, $\pi_1 = \langle a, b, c\rangle$, $\pi_2 = \langle b, c, a\rangle$, $\pi_3 = \langle b, a, c\rangle$. The introduced weights are $w_1 = 1.5$, $w_2 = 1$. Then a bipartite graph can be constructed in Figure 1, and the weights of the edges are listed. For example, $w(a, 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} C_F(\pi_i(a), 1) = 0 + 2.5 + 1.5 = 4$. According to Figure 1, we find the minimum cost matching is $\{(a, 2), (b, 1), (c, 3)\}$, thus $\pi = \langle b, a, c\rangle$.*

4 Diaconis-Graham Inequality

Another classical metric on permutations is Kendall's tau. Diaconis and Graham presented an inequality (called Diaconis-Graham Inequality) showing that the classical Spearman's footrule metric and the classical Kendall's tau metric are equivalent up to a factor of 2 [5]. Farnoud et al. [8] have proposed a weighted Kendall's tau metric which can reflect both Intuition (i) and Intuition (ii). In this section, we extend the Diaconis-Graham Inequality to the more generalized weighted case, which establishes the relationship between our weighted Spearman's footrule distance and the weighted Kendall's tau distance proposed by [8]. When all the weights are set to 1, it simplifies to the classical form.

In this paper, we use $[x; y]$ to denote an inversion $\sigma(x) < \sigma(y)$ with $\pi(x) > \pi(y)$, and $I(\sigma, \pi)$ to denote the set of all the possible inversions in σ and π. In Kendall's tau metric, the distance between σ and π is defined as $K(\sigma, \pi) = |I(\sigma, \pi)|$, where $|\cdot|$ denote the number of elements in a set.

Example 4.1. *Let D be a set of 4 objects $\{a, b, c, d\}$. $\sigma = \langle a, c, d, b\rangle$ and $\pi = \langle b, c, a, d\rangle$ are two permutations of D. In Kendall's tau metric, four inversions $[a; c]$, $[a; b]$, $[c; b]$and $[d; b]$ are needed to bring σ to π, so $K(\sigma, \pi) = 4$.*

In a celebrated result, Diaconis and Graham [5] showed that these two metrics differ by at most a constant factor.

Theorem 4.1. *Fall all $\sigma, \pi \in S_D$, $K(\sigma, \pi) \leq F(\sigma, \pi) \leq 2K(\sigma, \pi)$.*

Farnoud et al. [8] have extended Kendall's tau metric to the weighted case which can reflect both Intuition (i) and Intuition (ii). A permutation can be obtained from another one by a sequence of adjacent inversions. For permutations of the set D with n elements, $n - 1$ weights $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-1}$ are introduced, with $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \ldots \geq w_{n-1} > 0$. Weight w_i is used to measure the contribution of swapping an element at position i with the element at position $i + 1$ to the overall distance. For an inversion η that swaps two adjacent elements at position i and $i + 1$, we use $w_\eta = w_i$ to denote the contribution of the inversion, and we also denote η as $(i, i + 1)$. For permutations σ and π, suppose $s = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_m)$ is a sequence of adjacent inversions that takes σ to π. We call s a **transforming sequence** from σ to π, and $C_K(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} w_{\eta_i}$ the **length** of transforming sequence s. For the weighted tau metric [8], let Θ be the set of all possible transforming sequences from σ to π, the distance between σ and π is defined as

$$K^w(\sigma, \pi) = \min_{s \in \Theta} C_K(s). \tag{4}$$

The transforming sequence from σ to π with the shortest length is called the shortest transforming sequence. The distance defined in Formula (4) makes S_D into a metric space. It is analogous to the distance between two points in a plane, which is the length of the shortest path that connects them.

In the following, we provide an insertion sort based algorithm to compute the weighted Kendall's tau distance, based on which we shall further set up the Diaconis-Graham inequality for the weighted case.

Algorithm 1 Insertion sort based algorithm

Input: permutation $\sigma = \langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \rangle$, stored in array A[1..n];
permutation $\pi = \langle a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n \rangle$, stored in array B[1..n];
$w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{n-1}$

Output: the shortest path needed to bring σ to π; $K^w(\sigma, \pi)$

```
path = a null list //path is the shortest transforming sequence from σ to π
weight = 0 // weight is used to store K^w(σ, π)
for i = n-1 down to 1 do
  key = A[i]
  j = i + 1
  while j ≤ n and π(key) > π(A[j]) do
    A[j-1] = A[j]
    put (j-1, j) to the end of path
    weight = weight + w_{j-1}
    j = j + 1
  end while
  A[j-1] = key
end for
print path
print weight
```

Let $\sigma = \langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n \rangle$, $\pi = \langle a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_n \rangle$. In our insertion sort based algorithm, we start from the second last element in σ, and handle a_{n-1}, ..., a_1 successively. When it's turn for a_i to be handled, a_{i+1}, ..., a_n have been sorted according to their order in π. a_i is compared with each element x after it successively. If $\pi(a_i) > \pi(x)$, x is moved forward by one position. This corresponds to the adjacent inversion of a_i and x which is added to the end of the shortest transforming sequence, and the corresponding weight is accumulated to compute the overall distance between σ and π. This process is repeated until a certain element x is met such that $\pi(a_i) < \pi(x)$, then, a_i is placed before x. Next, it's turn for a_{i-1}, and so on, until a_1 is handled. The final accumulated adjacent inversions form the shortest transforming sequence from σ to π, and the accumulated weights are the weighted Kendall's tau distance between σ and π. The correctness of the algorithm can be proved by using induction on the number of elements in the permutations.

Next, we set up the Diaconis-Graham inequality in the weighted case.

Theorem 4.2. *For all σ, $\pi \in S_D$, $K^w(\sigma, \pi) \leq F^w(\sigma, \pi) \leq 2K^w(\sigma, \pi)$.*

Proof. We prove the right hand side of the inequality first. Let $s = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_m)$ be a shortest transforming sequence from σ to π. s transforms from $\sigma = \pi_0$ to π_1 to π_2 to ... to $\pi_m = \pi$. We use induction on m.

If $m = 0$, then $\sigma = \pi = \pi_0$, $F^w(\sigma, \pi) = 0$, and $K^w(\sigma, \pi) = 0$. This proves the base case.

Next suppose that the proposition is true for $m = k$, we consider the case

when $m = k+1$. In this case, let $s_1 = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_k)$ be the sub sequence of the first k adjacent inversions of the transforming sequence $s = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_k, \eta_{k+1})$. Then, s_1 is a shortest transforming sequence from $\sigma = \pi_0$ to π_k, (otherwise, suppose s_1' is a shortest transforming sequence from σ to π_k, then s_1' and the last adjacent inversion η_{k+1} of s will become a transforming sequence from σ to π with a shorter length than s, a contradiction). Then, by the inductive hypothesis,

$$F^w(\sigma, \pi_k) \leq 2K^w(\sigma, \pi_k) \tag{5}$$

We consider the last inversion η_{k+1} in s which brings π_k to $\pi_{k+1} = \pi$. Suppose the i-th element x and the $i+1$-th element y in π_k are swapped in the last inversion. For the weighted Kendall's tau metric, we have

$$K^w(\sigma, \pi) = K^w(\sigma, \pi_k) + w_i \tag{6}$$

For the weighted Spearman's footrule metric, we first consider x. If $\sigma(x) \leq \pi_k(x)$, $C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)) = C_F(\sigma(x), \pi_k(x)) + w_i$; otherwise, $C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)) = C_F(\sigma(x), \pi_k(x)) - w_i$. Summarizing both cases, we have

$$C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)) \leq C_F(\sigma(x), \pi_k(x)) + w_i \tag{7}$$

Similarly,

$$C_F(\sigma(y), \pi(y)) \leq C_F(\sigma(y), \pi_k(y)) + w_i \tag{8}$$

The other elements are not moved in the last inversion, so

$$C_F(\sigma(z), \pi(z)) = C_F(\sigma(z), \pi_k(z)) \text{ for all } z \in D \setminus \{x, y\} \tag{9}$$

Thus, by combining (7), (8) and (9), we get

$$F^w(\sigma, \pi) \leq F^w(\sigma, \pi_k) + 2w_i \tag{10}$$

Finally, from (5) (6) and (10), we get

$$F^w(\sigma, \pi) \leq 2K^w(\sigma, \pi) \tag{11}$$

This closes the induction.

Next we prove the left hand side of the inequality.

Recall that we use $[x; y]$ to denote the inversion $\sigma(x) < \sigma(y)$ with $\pi(x) > \pi(y)$. According to our insertion sort based algorithm, each inversion $[x; y]$ corresponds to an adjacent swapping occurring at some position i, denoted as $s_{[x;y]} = (i, i+1)$, and its contribution to the overall distance $K^w(\sigma, \pi)$ is $w_{[x;y]} = w_i$.

Here, we further call $[x; y]$ a **Type I** inversion if $\pi(x) \geq \sigma(y)$ and a **Type II** inversion if $\pi(x) \leq \sigma(y)$. Thus, every inversion is either a **Type I** or **Type II** inversion and some inversions may be of both types.

If $[x; y]$ is a **Type I** inversion, then we must have $\sigma(x) < \sigma(y) \leq \pi(x)$. For a fixed x, according to the insertion sort based algorithm, $s_{[x;y_1]} \neq s_{[x;y_2]}$ if $y_1 \neq y_2$. Let $A = \{s_{[x;y]} \Big| [x; y] \text{is a } \textbf{Type I} \text{ inversion}\}$, then $A \subset \{(\sigma(x), \sigma(x) +$

$1), (\sigma(x)+1, \sigma(x)+2), \ldots, (n-1, n)\}$, $|A| \leq \pi(x) - \sigma(x)$. Since $w_{\sigma(x)} \geq w_{\sigma(x)+1} \geq \ldots \geq w_{n-1}$, We have

$$\sum_{y:[x;y]\text{is a } \textbf{Type I} \text{ inversion}} w_{[x;y]} \leq C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)) \tag{12}$$

Similarly, if $[x; y]$ is a **type II** inversion, then $\pi(y) < \pi(x) \leq \sigma(y)$. For a fixed y, we have

$$\sum_{x:[x;y]\text{is a } \textbf{Type II} \text{ inversion}} w_{[x;y]} \leq C_F(\sigma(y), \pi(y)) \tag{13}$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} F^w(\sigma, \pi) &= \sum_{x \in D} C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)) \\ &= \sum_{\pi(x) > \sigma(x)} C_F(\sigma(x), \pi(x)) + \sum_{\pi(y) < \sigma(y)} C_F(\sigma(y), \pi(y)) \\ &\geq \sum_{[x;y]\text{is a } \textbf{Type I} \text{ inversion}} w_{[x;y]} + \sum_{[x;y]\text{is a } \textbf{Type II} \text{ inversion}} w_{[x;y]} \\ &\geq K^w(\sigma, \pi) \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

□

Adopting the classical Kendall's tau distance in the rank aggregregation problem is NP-hard, even when the number of rankings to be aggregated is only 4 [6]. Adopting the weighted Kendall's tau distance (4) is also NP-hard, since the classical Kendall's tau distance is a special case of the weighted Kendall's tau distance when all the weights are set to 1. The Diaconis-Graham inequality we set up for the weighted case ensures that the optimal solution for the case adopting the weighted Spearman's footrule distance is 2-approximation for the case adopting the weighted Kendall's tau distance.

5 Conclusions

We have introduced a new weighted Spearman's footrule metric to measure the distance between two permutations, which can reflect both Intuition (i) and Intuition (ii). The Diaconis-Graham inequality is set up for the more general weighted case, based on which we draw a conclusion that the optional solution for the rank aggregation problem when adopting the weighted Spearman's footrule metric produces a 2-approximation for the problem when adopting the weighted Kendall's tau metric.

References

[1] N. Ailon, M. Charikar, and A. Newman. Aggregating inconsistent information: Ranking and clustering. *Journal of ACM*, 2008.

[2] C. Buckley and E. M. Voorhees. Retrieval evaluation with incomplete information. In *SIGIR*, 2004.

[3] B. Carterette. On rank correlation and the distance between rankings. In *SIGIR*, 2009.

[4] G. Das, V. Hristidis, N. Kapoor, and S. Sudarshan. Ordering the attributes of query results. In *SIGMOD*, 2006.

[5] P. Diaconis and R. L. GRAHAM. Spearman's footrule metric as a measure of disarray. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B (Methodological)*, 1977.

[6] C. Dwork, R. Kumar, M. Naor, and D. Sivakumar. Rank aggregation methods for the web. In *WWW*, 2001.

[7] R. Fagin, R. Kummar, and D. Sivakumar. Comparing top k lists. In *SODA*, 2003.

[8] F. Farnoud, B. Touri, and O. Milenkovic. Novel distance measures for vote aggregation. In *arXiv:1203.6371v1*, 2012.

[9] M. G. Kendall. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika*, 30:81–93, 1938.

[10] R. Kumar and S. Vassilvitskii. Generalized distance between rankings. In *WWW*, 2010.

[11] M. A. Soliman and I. F. Ilyas. Ranking with uncertain scores. In *ICDE*, 2009.

[12] M. A. Soliman, I. F. Ilyas, and D. Martinenghi. Ranking with uncertain scoring functions: Semantics and sensitivity measures. In *SIGMOD*, 2011.

[13] C. Spearman. The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American journal of psychology*, pages 72–101, 1904.

[14] E. Yilmaz and J. A. Aslam. Estimating average precision with incomplete and imperfect judgements. In *CIKM*, 2006.

[15] E. Yilmaz, J. A. Aslam, and S. Robertson. A new rank correlation coefficient for information retrieval. In *SIGIR*, 2008.

APPENDIX

Propostion 3.2. *The weighted Spearman's footrule distance $F^w(\sigma,\pi)$ defined in (2) attains its maximum value when π is the reverse of σ. The maximum value is $2\sum_{k=1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} k(w_k+w_{n-k})+nw_{n/2}$ when n is even, and $2\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} k(w_k+w_{n-k})$ when n is odd.*

Proof. Suppose that σ and π are two permutations of D with n elements. We need to prove that when $\pi^{-1}(n) = \sigma^{-1}(1)$, $\pi^{-1}(n-1) = \sigma^{-1}(2)$, ..., $\pi^{-1}(1) = \sigma^{-1}(n)$, the distance between σ and π attains its maximum value.

Suppose that π' is a permutation which has a maximum distance from σ. If $\pi'^{-1}(n) \neq \sigma^{-1}(1)$, then we can move $\sigma^{-1}(1)$ to the last position by adjacent inversions successively. In this process, for each adjacent inversion with a weight w, the contribution of moving $\sigma^{-1}(1)$ adds w, and the contribution of moving the swapped element adds or subtracts w. Therefore, the weighted Spearman's footrule distance between σ and the permutation obtained from moving $\sigma^{-1}(1)$ backward is not decreasing. When $\sigma^{-1}(1)$ is swapped to the last position, we get a permutation which has a maximum distance from σ. So, the maximum distance can be obtained by a permutation π with $\pi^{-1}(n) = \sigma^{-1}(1)$.

After $\sigma^{-1}(1)$ is swapped to the last position, we swap $\sigma^{-1}(2)$ with the elements after it successively to the second last position, and so on, until $\sigma^{-1}(n)$ is put in the first position. During this process, when it's turn for $\sigma^{-1}(i)$ to be handled, we have got a permutation π with $\pi^{-1}(n) = \sigma^{-1}(1)$, $\pi^{-1}(n-1) = \sigma^{-1}(2)$, ..., $\pi^{-1}(n-i+2) = \sigma^{-1}(i-1)$. $\sigma^{-1}(i)$ is swapped with the elements after it successively until it is placed at position $n-i+1$. For each swapping with position k and $k+1$, if $k < i$, the contribution of moving $\sigma^{-1}(i)$ subtracts weight w_k, while the contribution of moving the swapped element x adds w_k ($\sigma(x) > i > k$); if $k \geq i$, the contribution of moving $\sigma^{-1}(i)$ adds weight w_k, and the contribution of moving the swapped element adds or subtracts w_k. In both cases, the weighted Spearman's footrule distance between σ and the permutation obtained from moving $\sigma^{-1}(i)$ backward is not decreasing. At last, we get a permutation with a reverse order from σ that attains the maximum distance from σ. The maximum distance can be computed by using Formula (2). □

Proposition 3.3. *For any two top k lists θ_1 and θ_2, $F^w_{min}(\theta_1,\theta_2) = F^w_{avg}(\theta_1,\theta_2) = F^w_{max}(\theta_1,\theta_2) = F^w(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)$, where σ_1 and σ_2 are any permutations of $D_{\theta_1} \cup D_{\theta_2}$ with $\sigma_1 \succeq \theta_1$ and $\sigma_2 \succeq \theta_2$.*

Proof. Let σ_1, σ_2 be two permutations of $D = D_{\theta_1} \cup D_{\theta_2}$ with $\sigma_1 \succeq \theta_1$ and $\sigma_2 \succeq \theta_2$.

If each of σ_1 and σ_2 has only one more element than θ_1 and θ_2, then, there is only one possible case for σ_1 and σ_2, the conclusion is obviously true.

Otherwise, we first prove that for any permutation σ_2' which is obtained from σ_2 by swapping two adjacent elements $x \in \theta_1 \setminus \theta_2$, $y \in \theta_1 \setminus \theta_2$, $F^w(\sigma_1,\sigma_2) = F^w(\sigma_1,\sigma_2')$. Here, in σ_2 and σ_2', x and y are both ordered after all the elements in D_{θ_2}.

Now,

$$F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = C_F(\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2(x)) + C_F(\sigma_1(y), \sigma_2(y)) + \sum_{z \in D \setminus \{x,y\}} C_F(\sigma_1(z), \sigma_2(z)) \tag{15}$$

$$F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2') = C_F(\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2'(x)) + C_F(\sigma_1(y), \sigma_2'(y)) + \sum_{z \in D \setminus \{x,y\}} C_F(\sigma_1(z), \sigma_2'(z)) \tag{16}$$

For all $z \in D \setminus \{x, y\}$, $\sigma_2(z) = \sigma_2'(z)$, so

$$\sum_{z \in D \setminus \{x,y\}} C_F(\sigma_1(z), \sigma_2(z)) = \sum_{z \in D \setminus \{x,y\}} C_F(\sigma_1(z), \sigma_2'(z)) \tag{17}$$

For x and y, we have $\sigma_1(x) \leq k < \sigma_2(x)$, $\sigma_1(x) \leq k < \sigma_2'(x)$, $\sigma_1(y) \leq k < \sigma_2'(y)$, $\sigma_1(y) \leq k < \sigma_2'(y)$. If $\sigma_2(x) < \sigma_2(y)$, then $\sigma_2'(x) > \sigma_2'(y)$, we have

$$C_F(\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2'(x)) = C_F(\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2(x)) + w_{\sigma_2(x)} \tag{18}$$

$$C_F(\sigma_1(y), \sigma_2'(y)) = C_F(\sigma_1(y), \sigma_2(y)) - w_{\sigma_2(x)} \tag{19}$$

where $w_{\sigma_2(x)}$ is the contribution of moving x from position $\sigma_2(x)$ to $\sigma_2(x) + 1$ to the overall distance. Notice that $w_{\sigma_2(x)}$ is also the contribution of moving y from position $\sigma_2(y)$ to $\sigma_2(y) - 1$.

From (18) and (19), we get

$$C_F(\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2'(x)) + C_F(\sigma_1(y), \sigma_2'(y)) = C_F(\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2(x)) + C_F(\sigma_1(y), \sigma_2(y)) \tag{20}$$

Similarly, (20) is also true for the case $\sigma_2(x) > \sigma_2(y)$.

From (15), (16), (17) and (20), we get $F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = F^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2')$.

Now, for each permutation σ_2^* of $D = D_{\theta_1} \cup D_{\theta_2}$ with $\sigma_2^* \succeq \theta_2$, we have $K^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = K^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2^*)$, since σ_2^* can be obtained from σ_2 by a finite adjacent swapping of elements in $\theta_1 \setminus \theta_2$. Then, by symmetry, for each permutation σ_1^* of $D = D_{\theta_1} \cup D_{\theta_2}$, $\sigma_1^* \succeq \theta_1$, $K^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) = K^w(\sigma_1, \sigma_2^*) = K^w(\sigma_2^*, \sigma_1) = K^w(\sigma_2^*, \sigma_1^*) = K^w(\sigma_1^*, \sigma_2^*)$. □