CS 5614: (Big) Data Management Systems

B. Aditya Prakash

Lecture #12: Finding Similar Items
Scene Completion Problem
Scene Completion Problem
Scene Completion Problem

10 nearest neighbors from a collection of 20,000 images
Scene Completion Problem

10 nearest neighbors from a collection of 2 million images
A Common Metaphor

- Many problems can be expressed as finding “similar” sets:
  - Find near-neighbors in high-dimensional space

Examples:

- Pages with similar words
  - For duplicate detection, classification by topic
- Customers who purchased similar products
  - Products with similar customer sets
- Images with similar features
  - Users who visited similar websites
Problem for Today’s Lecture

- **Given:** High dimensional data points $x_1, x_2, \ldots$
  - **For example:** Image is a long vector of pixel colors
    \[
    \begin{bmatrix}
    1 & 2 & 1 \\
    0 & 2 & 1 \\
    0 & 1 & 0
    \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow [1 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0 \ 2 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0]
    \]
- **And some distance function** $d(x_1, x_2)$
  - Which quantifies the “distance” between $x_1$ and $x_2$
- **Goal:** Find all pairs of data points $(x_i, x_j)$ that are within some distance threshold
  \[d(x_i, x_j) \leq s\]
- **Note:** Naïve solution would take $O(N^2)$ 😞
  where $N$ is the number of data points
- **MAGIC:** This can be done in $O(N)$!! How?
Relation to Previous Lecture

- Last time: Finding frequent pairs

Naïve solution:
Single pass but requires space quadratic in the number of items

\[ N \ldots \text{number of distinct items} \]
\[ K \ldots \text{number of items with support } \geq s \]

A-Priori:
First pass: Find frequent singletons
For a pair to be a frequent pair candidate, its singletons have to be frequent!
Second pass:
Count only candidate pairs!
Relation to Previous Lecture

- **Last time:** Finding frequent pairs
- **Further improvement:** PCY

- **Pass 1:**
  - Count exact frequency of each item:
  - Take pairs of items \{i,j\}, hash them into \(B\) buckets and count of the number of pairs that hashed to each bucket:

  
  **Basket 1:** \{1,2,3\}
  **Pairs:** \{1,2\} \{1,3\} \{2,3\}

  
  **Items 1…N**

  **Buckets 1…B**
Relation to Previous Lecture

- **Last time:** Finding frequent pairs
- **Further improvement:** PCY

- **Pass 1:**
  - Count exact frequency of each item:
  - Take pairs of items \( \{i,j\} \), hash them into \( B \) buckets and count of the number of pairs that hashed to each bucket:

- **Pass 2:**
  - For a pair \( \{i,j\} \) to be a candidate for a frequent pair, its singletons \( \{i\}, \{j\} \) have to be frequent and the pair has to hash to a frequent bucket!
Relation to Previous Lecture

- Last time: Finding frequent pairs

- Further improvement: PCY

  - Pass 1:
    - Count exact frequency of each item:
    - Take pairs of items \( \{i,j\} \), hash them into buckets and count the number of pairs that hashed to each bucket:

  - Pass 2:
    - For a pair \( \{i,j\} \) to be a candidate for a frequent pair, its singletons have to be frequent and its hash has to be frequent to a frequent bucket!

Previous lecture: A-Priori

Main idea: Candidates

Instead of keeping a count of each pair, only keep a count of candidate pairs!

Today’s lecture: Find pairs of similar docs

Main idea: Candidates

- Pass 1: Take documents and hash them to buckets such that documents that are similar hash to the same bucket
- Pass 2: Only compare documents that are candidates (i.e., they hashed to a same bucket)

Benefits: Instead of \( O(N^2) \) comparisons, we need \( O(N) \) comparisons to find similar documents
FINDING SIMILAR ITEMS
Distance Measures

- **Goal:** Find near-neighbors in high-dim. space
  - We formally define “near neighbors” as points that are a “small distance” apart
- For each application, we first need to define what “distance” means
- **Today:** Jaccard distance/similarity
  - The Jaccard similarity of two sets is the size of their intersection divided by the size of their union:
    \[
    sim(C_1, C_2) = \frac{|C_1 \cap C_2|}{|C_1 \cup C_2|}
    \]
  - Jaccard distance: \[d(C_1, C_2) = 1 - \frac{|C_1 \cap C_2|}{|C_1 \cup C_2|}\]
  
  ![Diagram](VT-CS-5614)

  - 3 in intersection
  - 8 in union
  - Jaccard similarity = 3/8
  - Jaccard distance = 5/8
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Task: Finding Similar Documents

- **Goal:** Given a large number (in the millions or billions) of documents, find “near duplicate” pairs

- **Applications:**
  - Mirror websites, or approximate mirrors
    - Don’t want to show both in search results
  - Similar news articles at many news sites
    - Cluster articles by “same story”

- **Problems:**
  - Many small pieces of one document can appear out of order in another
  - Too many documents to compare all pairs
  - Documents are so large or so many that they cannot fit in main memory
3 Essential Steps for Similar Docs

1. **Shingling**: Convert documents to sets

2. **Min-Hashing**: Convert large sets to short signatures, while preserving similarity

3. **Locality-Sensitive Hashing**: Focus on pairs of signatures likely to be from similar documents
   - **Candidate pairs!**
The Big Picture

Docum-ment → Shingling → Min Hashing → Locality-Sensitive Hashing

The set of strings of length $k$ that appear in the document

Signatures: short integer vectors that represent the sets, and reflect their similarity

Candidate pairs: those pairs of signatures that we need to test for similarity
Shingling

Step 1: **Shingling:** Convert documents to sets

The set of strings of length $k$ that appear in the document
Documents as High-Dim Data

- **Step 1: Shingling:** Convert documents to sets

  - **Simple approaches:**
    - Document = set of words appearing in document
    - Document = set of “important” words
    - Don’t work well for this application. *Why?*

- **Need to account for ordering of words!**
- **A different way:** *Shingles!*
Define: Shingles

- A $k$-shingle (or $k$-gram) for a document is a sequence of $k$ tokens that appears in the doc
  - Tokens can be characters, words or something else, depending on the application
  - Assume tokens = characters for examples

- **Example:** $k=2$; document $D_1 = abcab$
  - Set of 2-shingles: $S(D_1) = \{ab, bc, ca\}$
  - **Option:** Shingles as a bag (multiset), count $ab$ twice: $S'(D_1) = \{ab, bc, ca, ab\}$
Compressing Shingles

- To **compress long shingles**, we can **hash** them to (say) 4 bytes

- **Represent a document by the set of hash values of its** $k$-shingles
  
  - **Idea:** Two documents could (rarely) appear to have shingles in common, when in fact only the hash-values were shared

- **Example:** $k=2$; document $D_1 = \text{abcab}$
  
  Set of 2-shingles: $S(D_1) = \{ab, bc, ca\}$

  Hash the singles: $h(D_1) = \{1, 5, 7\}$
Similarity Metric for Shingles

- **Document** $D_1$ **is a set of its k-shingles** $C_1 = S(D_1)$
- Equivalently, each document is a 0/1 vector in the space of $k$-shingles
  - Each unique shingle is a dimension
  - Vectors are very sparse

- **A natural similarity measure is the Jaccard similarity:**

$$sim(D_1, D_2) = \frac{|C_1 \cap C_2|}{|C_1 \cup C_2|}$$
Working Assumption

- Documents that have lots of shingles in common have similar text, even if the text appears in different order

- **Caveat:** You must pick $k$ large enough, or most documents will have most shingles
  - $k = 5$ is OK for short documents
  - $k = 10$ is better for long documents
Motivation for Minhash/LSH

- Suppose we need to find near-duplicate documents among $N=1$ million documents

- Naïvely, we would have to compute pairwise Jaccard similarities for every pair of docs
  - $N(N-1)/2 \approx 5 \times 10^{11}$ comparisons
  - At $10^5$ secs/day and $10^6$ comparisons/sec, it would take 5 days

- For $N = 10$ million, it takes more than a year...
MinHashing

Step 2: **Minhashing**: Convert large sets to short signatures, while preserving similarity
Encoding Sets as Bit Vectors

- Many similarity problems can be formalized as finding subsets that have significant intersection

- Encode sets using 0/1 (bit, boolean) vectors
  - One dimension per element in the universal set

- Interpret set intersection as bitwise AND, and set union as bitwise OR

- Example: $C_1 = 10111; C_2 = 10011$
  - Size of intersection = 3; size of union = 4,
  - Jaccard similarity (not distance) = $3/4$
  - Distance: $d(C_1, C_2) = 1 - \text{(Jaccard similarity)} = 1/4$
# From Sets to Boolean Matrices

**Rows** = elements (shingles)

**Columns** = sets (documents)

- 1 in row $e$ and column $s$ if and only if $e$ is a member of $s$

- Column similarity is the Jaccard similarity of the corresponding sets (rows with value 1)

- **Typical matrix is sparse!**

**Each document is a column:**

- **Example:** $\text{sim}(C_1, C_2) = ?$
  
  - Size of intersection = 3; size of union = 6, Jaccard similarity (not distance) = $3/6$
  
  - $d(C_1, C_2) = 1 - (\text{Jaccard similarity}) = 3/6$
Outline: Finding Similar Columns

- **So far:**
  - Documents $\rightarrow$ Sets of shingles
  - Represent sets as boolean vectors in a matrix

- **Next goal:** Find similar columns while computing small signatures
  - Similarity of columns $==$ similarity of signatures
Outline: Finding Similar Columns

- Next Goal: Find similar columns, Small signatures

- Naïve approach:
  - 1) Signatures of columns: small summaries of columns
  - 2) Examine pairs of signatures to find similar columns
    - Essential: Similarities of signatures and columns are related
  - 3) Optional: Check that columns with similar signatures are really similar

- Warnings:
  - Comparing all pairs may take too much time: Job for LSH
    - These methods can produce false negatives, and even false positives (if the optional check is not made)
Hashing Columns (Signatures)

- **Key idea:** “hash” each column $C$ to a small signature $h(C)$, such that:
  - (1) $h(C)$ is small enough that the signature fits in RAM
  - (2) $\text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ is the same as the “similarity” of signatures $h(C_1)$ and $h(C_2)$

- **Goal:** Find a hash function $h(\cdot)$ such that:
  - If $\text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ is high, then with high prob. $h(C_1) = h(C_2)$
  - If $\text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ is low, then with high prob. $h(C_1) \neq h(C_2)$

- Hash docs into buckets. Expect that “most” pairs of near duplicate docs hash into the same bucket!
Min-Hashing

- **Goal:** Find a hash function $h(\cdot)$ such that:
  - if $\text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ is high, then with high prob. $h(C_1) = h(C_2)$
  - if $\text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ is low, then with high prob. $h(C_1) \neq h(C_2)$

- Clearly, the hash function depends on the similarity metric:
  - Not all similarity metrics have a suitable hash function

- There is a suitable hash function for the Jaccard similarity: It is called **Min-Hashing**
Min-Hashing

- Imagine the rows of the boolean matrix permuted under random permutation $\pi$

- Define a “hash” function $h_{\pi}(C) = \text{the index of the first (in the permuted order } \pi) \text{ row in which column } C \text{ has value 1}:

  $$h_{\pi}(C) = \min_\pi \pi(C)$$

- Use several (e.g., 100) independent hash functions (that is, permutations) to create a signature of a column.
Min-Hashing Example

### Permutation \( \pi \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Input matrix (Shingles x Documents)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array}
\]

### Signature matrix \( M \)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
2 & 3 & 7 & 3 \\
6 & 4 & 6 & 4 \\
7 & 3 & 7 & 3
\end{array}
\]

- 2\text{nd} element of the permutation is the first to map to a 1
- 4\text{th} element of the permutation is the first to map to a 1
The Min-Hash Property

- **Choose a random permutation** \( \pi \)
- **Claim:** \( \Pr[h_{\pi}(C_1) = h_{\pi}(C_2)] = sim(C_1, C_2) \)
- **Why?**
  - Let \( X \) be a doc (set of shingles), \( y \in X \) is a shingle
  - **Then:** \( \Pr[\pi(y) = \min(\pi(X))] = 1/|X| \)
    - It is equally likely that any \( y \in X \) is mapped to the \( \min \) element
  - Let \( y \) be s.t. \( \pi(y) = \min(\pi(C_1 \cup C_2)) \)
  - **Then either:** \( \pi(y) = \min(\pi(C_1)) \) if \( y \in C_1 \), or \( \pi(y) = \min(\pi(C_2)) \) if \( y \in C_2 \)
  - So the prob. that both are true is the prob. \( y \in C_1 \cap C_2 \)
  - \( \Pr[\min(\pi(C_1))=\min(\pi(C_2))] = |C_1 \cap C_2|/|C_1 \cup C_2| = sim(C_1, C_2) \)

One of the two cols had to have 1 at position \( y \)
Similarity for Signatures

- We know: \( \Pr[h_\pi(C_1) = h_\pi(C_2)] = \text{sim}(C_1, C_2) \)
- Now generalize to multiple hash functions

- The \textit{similarity of two signatures} is the fraction of the hash functions in which they agree

- \textbf{Note:} Because of the Min-Hash property, the similarity of columns is the same as the expected similarity of their signatures
Min-Hashing Example

Permutation $\pi$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input matrix (Shingles x Documents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature matrix $M$

$\begin{bmatrix}
2 & 3 & 7 & 3 \\
6 & 4 & 6 & 4 \\
7 & 3 & 7 & 3 \\
\end{bmatrix}$

Similarities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>2-4</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col/Col</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig/Sig</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Min-Hash Signatures

- Pick K=100 random permutations of the rows
- Think of \( \text{sig}(C) \) as a column vector
- \( \text{sig}(C)[i] = \) according to the \( i \)-th permutation, the index of the first row that has a 1 in column \( C \)
  \[
  \text{sig}(C)[i] = \min (\pi_i(C))
  \]
- **Note:** The sketch (signature) of document \( C \) is small bytes!

- **We achieved our goal!** We “compressed” long bit vectors into short signatures
Implementation Trick

- Permuting rows even once is prohibitive
- Row hashing!
  - Pick $K = 100$ hash functions $k_i$
  - Ordering under $k_i$ gives a random row permutation!
- One-pass implementation
  - For each column $C$ and hash-func. $k_i$ keep a “slot” for the min-hash value
  - Initialize all $\text{sig}(C)[i] = \infty$
  - Scan rows looking for 1s
    - Suppose row $j$ has 1 in column $C$
    - Then for each $k_i$:
      - If $k_i(j) < \text{sig}(C)[i]$, then $\text{sig}(C)[i] \leftarrow k_i(j)$

How to pick a random hash function $h(x)$?

Universal hashing:

$$h_{a,b}(x)=((a \cdot x + b) \mod p) \mod N$$

where:

- $a,b$ ... random integers
- $p$ ... prime number ($p > N$)
Locality Sensitive Hashing

Step 3: *Locality-Sensitive Hashing:* Focus on pairs of signatures likely to be from similar documents.

**Candidate pairs:** those pairs of signatures that we need to test for similarity.

- **Shingling:** The set of strings of length $k$ that appear in the document.
- **Min-Hashing:** Signatures: short integer vectors that represent the sets, and reflect their similarity.
- **Locality-Sensitive Hashing:** Candidate pairs: those pairs of signatures that we need to test for similarity.
**Goal:** Find documents with Jaccard similarity at least $s$ (for some similarity threshold, e.g., $s=0.8$)

**LSH – General idea:** Use a function $f(x,y)$ that tells whether $x$ and $y$ is a candidate pair: a pair of elements whose similarity must be evaluated.

**For Min-Hash matrices:**
- Hash columns of signature matrix $M$ to many buckets.
- Each pair of documents that hashes into the same bucket is a candidate pair.
LSH: First cut

- Let’s say you get the following signature matrix after minhashing:

```
2  1  4  1
1  2  1  2
2  1  2  1
```
Candidates from Min-Hamming

- Pick a similarity threshold $s$ ($0 < s < 1$)

- Columns $x$ and $y$ of $M$ are a *candidate pair* if their signatures agree on at least fraction $s$ of their rows:

  $$M(i, x) = M(i, y)$$

  for at least frac. $s$ values of $i$

  - We expect documents $x$ and $y$ to have the same (Jaccard) similarity as their signatures
LSH for Min-Hash

- **Big idea**: Hash columns of signature matrix $M$ several times

- Arrange that (only) **similar columns** are likely to **hash to the same bucket**, with high probability

- **Candidate pairs** are those that hash to the same bucket
Partition $M$ into $b$ Bands

Signature matrix $M$

$b$ bands

$r$ rows per band

One signature
Partition M into Bands

- Divide matrix $M$ into $b$ bands of $r$ rows

- For each band, hash its portion of each column to a hash table with $k$ buckets
  - Make $k$ as large as possible

- *Candidate* column pairs are those that hash to the same bucket for $\geq 1$ band

- Tune $b$ and $r$ to catch most similar pairs, but few non-similar pairs
Hashing Bands

Columns 2 and 6 are probably identical (candidate pair)

Columns 6 and 7 are surely different.

Matrix $M$

Buckets

$r$ rows

$b$ bands
Simplifying Assumption

- There are **enough buckets** that columns are unlikely to hash to the same bucket unless they are **identical** in a particular band.

- Hereafter, we assume that “**same bucket**” means “**identical in that band**”

- Assumption needed only to simplify analysis, not for correctness of algorithm.
Example of Bands

Assume the following case:

- Suppose 100,000 columns of $M$ (100k docs)
- Signatures of 100 integers (rows)
- Therefore, signatures take 40Mb
- Choose $b = 20$ bands of $r = 5$ integers/band

**Goal:** Find pairs of documents that are at least $s = 0.8$ similar
C₁, C₂ are 80% Similar

- Find pairs of $\geq s = 0.8$ similarity, set $b = 20$, $r = 5$

- Assume: $\text{sim}(C₁, C₂) = 0.8$
  - Since $\text{sim}(C₁, C₂) \geq s$, we want $C₁, C₂$ to be a candidate pair: We want them to hash to at least 1 common bucket (at least one band is identical)

- Probability $C₁, C₂$ identical in one particular band: $(0.8)^5 = 0.328$

- Probability $C₁, C₂$ are not similar in all of the 20 bands: $(1-0.328)^{20} = 0.00035$
  - i.e., about 1/3000th of the 80%-similar column pairs are false negatives (we miss them)
  - We would find 99.965% pairs of truly similar documents
C₁, C₂ are 30% Similar

- **Find pairs of** \( s \geq 0.8 \) similarity, set \( b=20, \ r=5 \)
- **Assume**: \( \text{sim}(C₁, C₂) = 0.3 \)
  - Since \( \text{sim}(C₁, C₂) < s \) we want \( C₁, C₂ \) to hash to **NO common buckets** (all bands should be different)
- **Probability \( C₁, C₂ \) identical in one particular band**: \( (0.3)^5 = 0.00243 \)
- **Probability \( C₁, C₂ \) identical in at least 1 of 20 bands**: \( 1 - (1 - 0.00243)^{20} = 0.0474 \)
  - In other words, approximately 4.74% pairs of docs with similarity 0.3% end up becoming **candidate pairs**
    - They are **false positives** since we will have to examine them (they are candidate pairs) but then it will turn out their similarity is below threshold \( s \)
LSH Involves a Tradeoff

- **Pick:**
  - The number of Min-Hashes (rows of $M$)
  - The number of bands $b$, and
  - The number of rows $r$ per band

  to balance false positives/negatives

- **Example:** If we had only 15 bands of 5 rows, the number of false positives would go down, but the number of false negatives would go up
Analysis of LSH – What We Want

Similarity $t = \text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ of two sets

Probability of sharing a bucket

No chance if $t < s$

Probability = 1 if $t > s$
What 1 Band of 1 Row Gives You

Remember:
Probability of equal hash-values = similarity

Probability of sharing a bucket

Similarity $t = \text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ of two sets
$b$ bands, $r$ rows/band

- Columns $C_1$ and $C_2$ have similarity $t$
- Pick any band ($r$ rows)
  - Prob. that all rows in band equal = $t^r$
  - Prob. that some row in band unequal = $1 - t^r$

- Prob. that no band identical = $(1 - t^r)^b$
- Prob. that at least 1 band identical = $1 - (1 - t^r)^b$
What $b$ Bands of $r$ Rows Gives You

Probability of sharing a bucket

Similarity $t = \text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$ of two sets

$s \sim (1/b)^{1/r}$

$1 - (1 - t^r)^b$

At least one band identical

No bands identical

Some row of a band unequal

All rows of a band are equal
Example: $b = 20; r = 5$

- **Similarity threshold** $s$
- **Prob. that at least 1 band is identical:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$1-(1-s^r)^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.9996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Picking $r$ and $b$: The S-curve

- Picking $r$ and $b$ to get the best S-curve
  - 50 hash-functions ($r=5$, $b=10$)

Red area: False Negative rate
Purple area: False Positive rate
LSH Summary

- Tune $M, b, r$ to get almost all pairs with similar signatures, but eliminate most pairs that do not have similar signatures.

- Check in main memory that candidate pairs really do have similar signatures.

- Optional: In another pass through data, check that the remaining candidate pairs really represent similar documents.
Summary: 3 Steps

- **Shingling:** Convert documents to sets
  - We used hashing to assign each shingle an ID

- **Min-Hashing:** Convert large sets to short signatures, while preserving similarity
  - We used *similarity preserving hashing* to generate signatures with property $\Pr[h_{\pi}(C_1) = h_{\pi}(C_2)] = \text{sim}(C_1, C_2)$
  - We used hashing to get around generating random permutations

- **Locality-Sensitive Hashing:** Focus on pairs of signatures likely to be from similar documents
  - We used hashing to find candidate *pairs* of similarity $\geq s$