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Abstract—We have proposed an information filtering system using index word selection from a document set based on the topics included in a set of documents. This method narrows down the particularly characteristic words in a document set and the topics are obtained by Sparse Non-negative Matrix Factorization. In information filtering, a document is often represented with the vector in which the elements correspond to the weight of the index words, and the dimension of the vector becomes larger as the number of documents is increased. Therefore, it is possible that useless words as index words for the information filtering are included. In order to address the problem, the dimension needs to be reduced. Our proposal reduces the dimension by selecting index words based on the topics included in a document set. We have applied the Sparse Non-negative Matrix Factorization to the document set to obtain these topics. The filtering is carried out based on a centroid of the learning document set. The centroid is regarded as the user’s interest. In addition, the centroid is represented with a document vector whose elements consist of the weight of the selected index words. Using the English test collection MEDLINE, thus, we confirm the effectiveness of our proposal. Hence, our proposed selection can confirm the effectiveness of our proposal. In Sections 4 and 5, we have detailed our related works and an explanation of the method we have proposed. In this paper, we propose a method to select the index words focusing on the topics included in a set of documents for the construction of a document vector from a document set which can be applied to the information filtering system based on the user’s interest. Moreover, we verify the effectiveness of our index word selection for improvement of the information filtering accuracy. This index word selection uses the Non-negative Matrix Factorization with Sparseness Constraints (NMFSC) [2] and Chi-square value method. The NMFSC adds a sparseness constraint to the Non-negative Matrix Factorization (NMF) [3] so that it makes the characteristics of the basis and coefficient of NMF more comprehensive than with the NMF itself. Our proposal selects some words from each basis of the NMFSC, which are referred to as keywords, and the frequently co-occurring words with the keywords as index words. Keywords are significant in the representation of the documents and the frequently co-occurring words also have significant features in the representation of the topics. In addition, when the NMF is applied to a document set, it has been reported that the topics included in the document set can be obtained [4] [5].

In the following sections, we have presented an overview of related works and an explanation of the method we have proposed. In Sections 4 and 5, we have detailed our experimental procedures using the test collection “MEDLINE” [6] and discussed our results. Lastly, we present our conclusions.
and future work.

II. RELATED WORKS

Traditionally, the focus has been on changing the space constructed by words into one constructed by latent semantics to reduce the dimension of a document vector. The Latent Semantic Analysis (LSA) [7] is a popular method to analyze and extract the latent semantics of the documents and reduce the dimension focusing on the variance of the words’ weight. The Independent Component Analysis (ICA) has also been reported to enable the retrieval of the latent semantics of the documents by evaluating the independence of a basis which describes the features of a document set [8]. We have reported on a method which reduces the dimension by projecting the space into the one structured by independent components [9].

It has also been reported that the NMF can extract the topics included in a document set [4]. Xu. W. et al. proposed the document clustering using the topics obtained by the NMF [10]. It is the one of the application examples that the NMF is applied for documents. M.W. Berry et al. introduced some NMF’s applications and they applied the NMF for text mining to extract topics as one of the NMF’s applications [11]. Tsuge et al. have proposed a method for dimension reduction by projecting the space into the one structured from the bases obtained by the NMF [5]. Above researches reported that the bases of the NMF represented the topics included in the document set if the NMF is applied to a document set.

Concerning with the NMF, other variations of the NMF were also studied. Attention was focused on the sparseness of the variations for the elements of the bases and coefficients. P. O. Hoyer proposed Non-negative Sparse Coding (NNSC) [12]. This method adds a small reconstruction error with a sparseness criterion to the objective function defined as the Euclidian least-square function, realizing the addition of the properties of sparseness for the bases and coefficients. Liu et al. proposed Sparse Nonnegative Matrix Factorization (SNMF) [13]. This method used a divergence term instead of the Euclidean objective function used in NNSC. Moreover, the NMFSC, which is used in this paper, is a more recent work related to the sparseness for the bases and coefficients. Liu et al. proposed a method for dimension reduction by projecting the space into the one structured by independent components of the NMF.

Various methods to extract the most significant words from a document or document set have been proposed. Here, we describe two of the works most closely related to ours. First, Matsuo and et al. [14] have used co-occurrence to extract important words from a document. In this research, the bias of the probabilistic distributions between the co-occurrence and the appearance of the most frequent words in the document were measured. Such frequent words are referred to as keywords. They have evaluated the bias by chi-squared measure and selected the most important words. However, if we extract the keywords from a document set only by term frequency, some words included in a few documents which identify minor topics in a corpus tend to be ignored. Since our goal is to construct document vectors of all the documents in a corpus, words included in the minor topics cannot be ignored.

Next, Osawa and et al. [15] have proposed a method to select the most important words from WWW using the Key Graph based on the most frequent words. They have evaluated the significance of the words by their co-occurrence using a graph structure between the most frequent and other words.

Our proposal selects some words which represent the features of the topics. The words have maximum weight within each basis of the NMFSC and are referred to as the keywords instead of the most frequent words used in a previous report [12]. In addition, we selected other words related to the topics. The selection is performed according to the chi-squared measure between each word and the key words. We finally regarded the keywords and words selected by chi-squared measure as the index words.

III. TOPIC-BASED INDEX WORDS SELECTION

In this section, a document vector, a user profile, the NMFSC for the documents and selection of the index words using the chi-squared measure are explained.

A. Document vector and User profile

A document vector is a column vector of which the elements are the weights of the words in a corpus. The \( i \)th document vector \( \mathbf{d}_i \) denotes

\[
\mathbf{d}_i = [\omega_{i1}, \omega_{i2}, \ldots, \omega_{in}]^T \quad (1)
\]

where \( \omega_{ij} \) signifies the weight for the \( j \)th word in the \( i \)th document. \( V \) signifies the number of words and \( [\cdot]^T \) signifies transposition. In this paper, \( \omega_{ij} \) is determined by the tf-idf method and calculated as

\[
\omega_{ij} = tf_{ij} \log \left( \frac{N}{df_j} \right) \quad (2)
\]

where \( tf_{ij} \) denotes the frequency of the \( j \)th word in the \( i \)th document, \( df_j \) denotes the number of documents including the \( j \)th word and \( N \) denotes the number of documents. The tf-idf method regards the words which appear frequently in a few documents as the characteristic features of the documents. In addition, the \( N \) document vectors are denoted as \( \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{d}_N \) and the term-document matrix \( \mathbf{D} \) is defined as follows:

\[
\mathbf{D} = [\mathbf{d}_1 \mathbf{d}_2 \cdots \mathbf{d}_N] \quad (3)
\]

A user profile describes a user’s interest. We define \( \mathbf{u} \) as a column vector of which the element consists of the weight of word, as is expressed in Eq. (2).

\[
\mathbf{u} = [u_1 \ u_2 \cdots \ u_v]^T \quad (4)
\]

If the \( i \)th word is included in the interesting documents, the value of \( u_i \) takes high value. On the other hand, if the \( i \)th word exists in the uninteresting ones, the value of \( u_i \) dose low value. In addition, the user profile is constructed using a centroid of the documents as follows:

\[
\mathbf{u} = \alpha \sum_{\mathbf{d}_k \in \mathbf{D}_1} \mathbf{d}_k - \beta \sum_{\mathbf{d}_k \not\in \mathbf{D}_1} \mathbf{d}_k \quad (5)
\]
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are coefficients for each document, $D_I$ and $D_U$ denotes the document set including the interesting documents and uninteresting ones respectively. This formula is referred to the Rocchio's formula [16].

**B. NMFSC for the documents and keyword extraction**

The NMFSC adds the sparseness constraint for the bases and coefficients to the NMF. The NMF approximately factorizes a matrix of which all the elements have non-negative values into two matrices with elements having non-negative values. If the NMF is applied to a document set, it has been reported that the bases represent the topics included in the document set [4]. By using the NMFSC and not the NMF in our proposal, the keywords of the topics are considered to be highlighted since only some words of each basis have weight.

The NMF approximately factorizes a matrix into two matrixes such as:

$$D \approx WH \cdots (6)$$

where $W$ is an $V \times r$ matrix containing the basis vectors $w_j$ as its columns and $H$ is an $r \times N$ matrix containing the coefficient vectors $h_i$ as its rows. $r$ is determined as satisfying the following:

$$\sqrt{(N + V) \cdot r < N \cdot V} \cdots (7)$$

In addition, equation (6) is also denoted as:

$$d_k \approx Wh_k \cdots (8).$$

This means $d_k$ is the linear combination of $W$ weighted by the elements of $h_k$.

Given a term-document matrix $D$, the optimal factors $W$ and $H$ are determined as minimizing the Frobenius norm between $V$ and $WH$. The Frobenius norm between $V$ and $WH$ is denoted as:

$$F = \|D - WH\|^2_F \cdots (9)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. In order to minimize $F$, the following updates are iterated until $F$ converges:

$$\tilde{H}_{ij} = H_{ij} \frac{(W^T V)_{ij}}{(W^T WH)_{ij}} \cdots (10)$$

$$\tilde{W}_{ij} = W_{ij} \frac{(V H^T)_{ij}}{(WHH^T)_{ij}} \cdots (11)$$

where $\tilde{H}$ and $\tilde{W}$ denote updated factors, and $X_{ij}$ denotes the $ij$ element of matrix $X$. The NMFSC adds the sparseness constraint to the NMF. The sparseness of each basis can be evaluated by

$$\text{sparseness}(w_i) = \frac{\sqrt{V} - \left(\sum |w_{kj}| / \sqrt{\sum w_{kj}^2}\right)}{\sqrt{V} - 1} \cdots (12).$$

This function evaluates to unity if and only if $w_i$ contains a single non-zero element, and takes a value of zero if and only if all the elements are equal. The sparseness measure of $h_i$ can be also defined. However, since our proposal focuses on the bases, we applied the sparseness constraint only to the bases. The NMFSC devises the update equation to fill the sparseness using a projection operator which enforces sparseness.

Here, we represent the algorithm of the NMFSC, as follows:

1. Initialize $W$ and $H$ to random positive matrices.
2. Project each column of $W$ to be non-negative with an unchanged L2 norm and L1 norm set to achieve the desired sparseness.
3. Iterate following steps until equation (9) converges.
   i. Set $\tilde{W} := W - \mu_N(WH - V)H^T$, where $\mu_N$ is a small positive constant.
   ii. Project each column of $\tilde{W}$ to be non-negative with an unchanged L2 norm and L1 norm set to achieve the desired sparseness. L1 norm mentioned above is determined by substituting the L2 norm of each column of $W$ for Eq. (12).
   iii. $H_{ij}$ is updated by Eq. (10). Next, the projection operator which enforces sparseness by setting the L1 norm is defined as follows. Here, for the given vector $x$, the closest non-negative vector $s$ can be determined with a given L1 norm and L2 norm.

   1. Set $s_i := x_i + (L_1 - \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j) / \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j$.
   2. Set $Z := \{0\}$.
   3. Iterate the following steps:
      i. Set $m_i := 0$ if $i \in Z$. Otherwise, set $m_i := m_i + \alpha (s_i - m_i)$, where $\alpha \geq 0$ is selected such that the resulting $s$ satisfies the L2 norm constraint.
      ii. If all elements of $s$ are non-negative, return $s$, end.
      iii. Set $Z := Z \cup \{i: s_i < 0\}$.
      iv. Set $s_i := 0$, $\forall i \in Z$.
      v. Calculate $c := (\sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i - L_1) / (\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j - \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i)$.
      vi. Set $s_i := s_i - c$, $\forall i \in Z$.
      vii. Go to i.

Following the above steps, we obtained the sparse bases which represent the topics included in the document set. In addition, our proposal picks up some words which have maximum weight from each basis as the keywords of the respective topic. These keywords are part of the reconstructed index words. Here, each keyword is denoted by $g$ and a set of those keywords by $G$.

**C. Selection of the index words as related to the topics**

In order to select index words related to the topics based on the keywords, we used the chi-squared measure. In this work, the chi-squared measure evaluates the distribution bias between the co-occurrence of the keywords and each word as well as the appearance of the keywords. Here, $t$ denotes the words other than the keywords in a corpus. If there is a large bias between the co-occurrence probability of the word $t$ and the keywords $G$ and the appearance probability of $G$, the chi-squared measure is deemed high. If the word $t$ is used generally throughout the corpus, i.e., if the word $t$ occurs with all the keywords evenly across the text, the co-occurrence probability distribution is not biased. Therefore, the chi-squared measure of the word $t$ is low. Since important words are considered to occur with some
specified keywords, we can judge whether the word \( t \) is important or not by evaluating the chi-squared measure. In other words, if we select a word whose chi-squared measure is high, the word is considered to be closely concerned with the keywords and expresses a feature of the topic.

The expected probability \( p_g \) denotes an unconditional probability of a keyword \( g \) in the set of keywords \( G \). Here, \( n_t \) denotes the frequency of the co-occurrence of the word \( t \) and the set of the key words \( G \). The frequency of the co-occurrence of the word \( t \) and the keyword \( g \) (\( g \in G \)) is denoted as \( freq(t,g) \). In this paper, we have defined the co-occurrence as being when each key word \( g \) and the word \( t \) are included in the same document. In addition, since the corpus is constructed by documents, we have defined \( p_g \) as follows:

\[
p_g = \frac{\text{the number of documents including } g}{\text{total number of documents including } G} \quad \ldots (13).
\]

Thus, \( \chi^2(t) \), which is the chi-squared measure for a word \( t \), is defined as:

\[
\chi^2(t) = \sum_{g \in G} \left( \frac{freq(t,g) - n_t p_g}{n_t p_g} \right)^2 \ldots \ldots (14).
\]

After calculating the \( \chi^2(t) \) for each word \( t \), we selected the words whose chi-squared measure are added to the keywords \( G \) as the reconstructed index words. This method expects to cover the words whose chi-squared measures are high to the index words until the number of index words reached 30% or 50% of the total number of words. In addition, we tried the experiment when the index words consisted of only the keywords. Finally, we reconstructed the document vectors with these index words in order to make the user profile and evaluated the filtering accuracy of the profile. A user profile was constructed using Eq. (5), and coefficients \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) in Eq. (5) were determined as:

\[
\alpha = 1, \beta = \frac{N_l}{N_u} \ldots (15)
\]

where \( N_l \) and \( N_u \) denote the number of documents related and unrelated to the query respectively. Similarities as defined by the inner product between a user profile and documents were adopted in order to classify the documents. The similarity \( Sim \) between the user profile \( u \) and the document \( d \), was defined as:

\[
Sim = u^T d_i.
\]

If the similarity \( Sim \) was more than 0, the document \( d \) was regarded to have association. In addition, in constructing the user profile, we performed a leave-one-out method and evaluated by the percentage of the correct determination of associations. This method is referred to as “NMFSC”. The experimental process is described in the following steps:

**Step1.** Construct the document vectors with the vector space model.

**Step2.** Apply the NMFSC to the document vectors and obtain hundreds of bases.

**Step3.** Extract the keywords whose weight is the highest in each basis and set those words to index words.

---

### Table 1. Organization of the experimental data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th># of related Doc.</th>
<th>Query content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>The crystalline lens in vertebrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>The effects of pesticide on the bone marrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Effect of azathioprine on LE, particularly in regard to renal lesions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Separation anxiety in infancy and in preschool children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hereditary implications of prolonged neonatal obstructive jaundice associated with liver pathology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7,014. We used the SMART stop list [17] when removing the stop words.

The NMFSC was applied to these document vectors and hundreds of bases which were considered to characterize the topics included in the document set were obtained. We tried to obtain 100 bases, 300 bases and 500 bases. The numbers of extracted bases denote about 10%, 30% and 50% of the number of documents, respectively. The keywords which represented a topic were selected depending on the weight of the word in each basis. We tried to select as many keywords from each basis and the total number was about 1,000 words. In addition, these keywords were set to a part of the index words. Then, using these keywords, we calculated the chi-squared measure for each word and added the words whose chi-squared measures were high to the index words until the number of index words reached 30% or 50% of the total number of words. In addition, we tried the experiment when the index words consisted of only the keywords. Finally, we reconstructed the document vectors with these index words in order to make the user profile and evaluated the filtering accuracy of the profile. A user profile was constructed using Eq. (5), and coefficients \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) in Eq. (5) were determined as:

\[
\alpha = 1, \beta = \frac{N_l}{N_u} \ldots (15)
\]

where \( N_l \) and \( N_u \) denote the number of documents related and unrelated to the query respectively. Similarities as defined by the inner product between a user profile and documents were adopted in order to classify the documents. The similarity \( Sim \) between the user profile \( u \) and the document \( d \), was defined as:

\[
Sim = u^T d_i.
\]

If the similarity \( Sim \) was more than 0, the document \( d \) was regarded to have association. In addition, in constructing the user profile, we performed a leave-one-out method and evaluated by the percentage of the correct determination of associations. This method is referred to as “NMFSC”. The experimental process is described in the following steps:

**Step1.** Construct the document vectors with the vector space model.

**Step2.** Apply the NMFSC to the document vectors and obtain hundreds of bases.

**Step3.** Extract the keywords whose weight is the highest in each basis and set those words to index words.
Step 4. Calculate the chi-squared measure by (14).
Step 5. Assign the words whose chi-squared measure is high to the index words.
Step 6. Reconstruct the document vectors with the selected index words.
Step 7. Construct the user profile.
Step 8. Perform the recommendation for documents using the user profile.

For comparison, we tried three other methods. One method was based on the term frequency in a corpus. The method, which was similar to [9], extracted the words whose total term frequency in the corpus was the highest as the keywords. We extracted the same number of keywords from the various bases to obtain a total of 1,000 words. This method is referred to as “TF”. The next method was LSA which is a popular method to reduce the dimension of the document vectors by projecting them in the word space into spaces structured by latent semantics. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) is often used to obtain the latent semantics and the singular vectors are considered to represent the latent semantics. The singular vectors are obtained by applying SVD to a term-document matrix as follows:

\[
D = UV^T \quad \ldots (16)
\]

where row vectors U, V are singular vectors. \( \Sigma \) is a diagonal matrix whose elements are singular values \( \sigma_i, \) \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, p \) where \( p \) means the number of singular vectors, which correspond with \( \sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2 \geq \ldots \geq \sigma_p \). We selected the \( k \) singular vectors with the largest singular values. In addition, \( k \) was determined by a cumulative contribution ratio \( r_k \) defined as:

\[
r_k = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i^2 / \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sigma_j^2 \quad \ldots (17)
\]

Now \( r_k \) was set to 0.7, 0.8, and 1.0. Then, the document vectors were projected into the space structured by the latent semantics. This method is referred to as “LSA”. The other method uses the total words as the index words. This method is referred to as “ORIG”. The numbers of document vector’s dimension for each method are presented in Table 2. “NMFS500” denotes the results of experiments in which 500 bases were extracted by the NMFS, as are “NMFS300” and “NMFS100”. Moreover, “Key” means that the index words consist only of keywords, and “30%” and “50%” means that the number of index words is about 30% and 50%, respectively, of the total number of words included in the document set. The figures “0.7”, “0.8” and “1.0” of LSA denote the cumulative contribution ratios. In addition, Table 2 presents the number of keywords extracted from each topic, i.e. each basis of the NMFS, for NMFS500, NMFS300 and NMFS100. The differences of the number of the dimension for the same percentage cause why the words were removed depending on the frequency or chi-squared measure respectively. Hence, we selected the words which have the same frequency or chi-squared measure even though the number of the selected words exceeded the determined percentage. Moreover, if the exceedance went over 3%, the number of the words was less than the determined percentage.

Table 2. The numbers of document vector’s dimension for each method. “DIM” denotes the number of document vector’s dimension and “# for each” denotes the number of the keywords extracted from each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>DIM</th>
<th># for each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NMFS500</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS300</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS100</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Experimental results

The percentages of an accurate determination of our method for each query are presented in Tables 3. The description in the table follows the ones in Table 2. In addition, the keywords of NMFS300 and TF are presented in Table 4 for discussion on the differences between NMFS and TF. The examples in the Table 4 are the 20 keywords which has the most document frequency. Fig 1 shows the number of keywords for each document frequency with respective methods.

V. DISCUSSION

Comparing the results of our proposal shown in Tables 3, our proposal could obtain more accurate associations in all of the experiments. The reason may be that this method enables selection of the necessary words to represent a document appropriately. Focusing on the results of No.1, the accuracy rises about 10% above the ORIG accuracy when the number of bases and index words are set to 300 and 30% respectively. As with previous results, the accuracies improve about 5% from ORIG for the result of No.8 when setting the number of bases and index words as 500 bases and 30% of the total index words, Table 4. Comparison of the document frequency of the keywords for NMFS300 and TF. “df” denotes the document frequency of each word.
In this paper, we have proposed a method of selecting index words in order to construct a document vector based on the topics by using the NMFSC and then applying these selected index words to a filtering system based on the user’s interest. As a result, the filtering accuracies could be improved when setting the appropriate number of topics and index words respectively. This work showed that our method could obtain the minority topics and cover the index words included in the documents related to these minority topics. Covering the index words to characterize the document for separation was considered to be significant.

We will have to evaluate the advantage of our proposal’s character, we focus the selected index words, especially the difference from ones of TF. Focusing the Table 4, the keywords of “TF” are the words which have larger document frequency than the one of “NMFSC300”. This notes that “TF” collects the keywords covering documents more widely than the NMFSC. Moreover, considering with the results presented in Fig 1, “NMFSC” extracts a lot of keywords which have less document frequency than “TF”. In the figure, the index words obtained by TF include the most words whose document frequency is about 20. In contrast, the number of index words obtained by the NMFSC peaks around the ones whose document frequency less than 5. Especially, the keywords that are appeared in only a document are extracted a lot. This notes our method can cover the minor topics uncovered by term frequency in the document set. The aim of selection of the necessary words which previous methods could not obtain in order to construct a document vector was achieved when considered with the various topics included in a document set.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

In this paper, we have proposed a method of selecting index words in order to construct a document vector based on the topics by using the NMFSC and then applying these selected index words to a filtering system based on the user’s interest. As a result, the filtering accuracies could be improved when setting the appropriate number of topics and index words respectively. This work showed that our method could obtain the minority topics and cover the index words included in the documents related to these minority topics. Covering the index words to characterize the document for separation was considered to be significant.

We will have to evaluate the advantage of our proposal’s character, we focus the selected index words, especially the difference from ones of TF. Focusing the Table 4, the keywords of “TF” are the words which have larger document frequency than the one of “NMFSC300”. This notes that “TF” collects the keywords covering documents more widely than the NMFSC. Moreover, considering with the results presented in Fig 1, “NMFSC” extracts a lot of keywords which have less document frequency than “TF”. In the figure, the index words obtained by TF include the most words whose document frequency is about 20. In contrast, the number of index words obtained by the NMFSC peaks around the ones whose document frequency less than 5. Especially, the keywords that are appeared in only a document are extracted a lot. This notes our method can cover the minor topics uncovered by term frequency in the document set. The aim of selection of the necessary words which previous methods could not obtain in order to construct a document vector was achieved when considered with the various topics included in a document set.
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