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## What is a segment?

"A segment is a part of a web page containing the elements that belong together...

... visually,<br>semantically, and in purpose."

## Use cases

- accessibility enhancements
- enhanced screen readers
- adaptation to small screens
e.g: Shumeet Baluja, "Browsing on small screens: recasting web-page segmentation into an efficient machine learning framework", 2006
$\qquad$
- information retrieval
- content summarization
e.gs: Chitra Pasupathi et al, "Web document segmentation using frequent term sets for summarization", 2012
- page classification/ranking
e.g.: Lidong Bing et al., "Web page segmentation with structured prediction and its application in web page classification", 2012
- similarity assessment
e.g: Marc Teva Law et al., "Structural and visual similarity learning for web page archiving", 2012


## Use cases

- accessibility enhancements
- enhanced screen readers
e.g.: Michael Cormier et al., "Towards an improved vision-based web page segmentation algorithm", 2017
- adaptation to small screens
e.g.: Shumeet Baluja, "Browsing on small screens: recasting web-page segmentation into an efficient machine learning framework", 2006
$\qquad$
- information retrieval
- content summarization
e.g.: Chitra Pasupathi et al., "Web document segmentation using frequent term sets for summarization", 2012
- page classification/ranking
e.g.: Lidong Bing et al., "Web page segmentation with structured prediction and its application in web page classification", 2012
- similarity assessment
e.g: Marc Teva Law et al., "Structural and visual similarity learning for web page archiving", 2012


## Use cases

- accessibility enhancements
- enhanced screen readers
e.g.: Michael Cormier et al., "Towards an improved vision-based web page segmentation algorithm", 2017
- adaptation to small screens
e.g.: Shumeet Baluja, "Browsing on small screens: recasting web-page segmentation into an efficient machine learning framework", 2006
- information retrieval
- content summarization
e.g.: Chitra Pasupathi et al., "Web document segmentation using frequent term sets for summarization", 2012
- page classification/ranking
e.g.: Lidong Bing et al., "Web page segmentation with structured prediction and its application in web page classification", 2012
- similarity assessment
e.g.: Marc Teva Law et al., "Structural and visual similarity learning for web page archiving", 2012


## Use cases

- accessibility enhancements
- enhanced screen readers
e.g.: Michael Cormier et al., "Towards an improved vision-based web page segmentation algorithm", 2017
- adaptation to small screens
e.g.: Shumeet Baluja, "Browsing on small screens: recasting web-page segmentation into an efficient machine learning framework", 2006
- information retrieval
- content summarization
e.g.: Chitra Pasupathi et al., "Web document segmentation using frequent term sets for summarization", 2012
- page classification/ranking
e.g. Lidong Bing etal, "Web page esgmentation with structured predicition and its application in web page classification", 2012
- similarity assessment
e.g.: Marc Teva Law et al., "Structural and visual similarity learning for web page archiving", 2012


## Use cases

- accessibility enhancements
- enhanced screen readers
e.g.: Michael Cormier et al., "Towards an improved vision-based web page segmentation algorithm", 2017
- adaptation to small screens
e.g.: Shumeet Baluja, "Browsing on small screens: recasting web-page segmentation into an efficient machine learning framework", 2006
- information retrieval
- content summarization
e.g.: Chitra Pasupathi et al., "Web document segmentation using frequent term sets for summarization", 2012
- page classification/ranking
e.g.: Lidong Bing et al., "Web page segmentation with structured prediction and its application in web page classification", 2012
- similarity assessment
e.g:: Marc Teva Law et al., "Structural and visual similarity learning for web page archiving", 2012


## Use cases

- accessibility enhancements
- enhanced screen readers
e.g.: Michael Cormier et al., "Towards an improved vision-based web page segmentation algorithm", 2017
- adaptation to small screens
e.g.: Shumeet Baluja, "Browsing on small screens: recasting web-page segmentation into an efficient machine learning framework", 2006
- information retrieval
- content summarization
e.g.: Chitra Pasupathi et al., "Web document segmentation using frequent term sets for summarization", 2012
- page classification/ranking
e.g.: Lidong Bing et al., "Web page segmentation with structured prediction and its application in web page classification", 2012
- similarity assessment
e.g.: Marc Teva Law et al., "Structural and visual similarity learning for web page archiving", 2012


## Approaches

| Category | Name | Document type | Publication |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOM-only | VIPS | Web page | Cai et al., <br> "Extracting Content Structure for Web Pages based on Visual Representation", 2003 |
|  | HEPS | Web page | Manabe et al., <br> "Extracting Logical Hierarchical Structure of HTML Documents Based on Headings", 2015 |
| Visual | Cormier et al. | Web page | Cormier et al., <br> "Purely vision-based segmentation of web pages for assistive technology", 2016 |
|  | MMDetection | Photo | Chen et al., <br> "MMDetection: Open mmlab detection toolbox and benchmark", 2019 |
| Hybrid | Meier et al. | Newspaper page | Meier et al., "Fully convolutional neural networks for newspaper article segmentation", 2017 |
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## Webis Web Segments 2020

- first crowd-sourced dataset for Web Page Segmentation
- assembled through

Amazon Mechanical Turk


- 8490 pages, 5 annotators per page
$\rightarrow 42450$ human segmentations
- Fusion of human segmentations for page based on area agreement $\rightarrow$ ground truth
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Segments are regarded as clusters of atomic elements:

- pixels
- edgesfine and edges coarse (Canny edge detection)
- nodes (in the DOM tree)
- characters
$\longrightarrow$ Precision $\left(P_{\mathrm{B}^{3}}\right)$, Recall $\left(R_{\mathrm{B}^{3}}\right)$ and $F$-score $\left(F_{\mathrm{B}^{3}}\right)$ can be calculated between two segmentations
$\longrightarrow$ different atomic elements cover variety of algorithm performance aspects Kiesel et al., "Web Page Segmentation from First Principles", 2020


## Terms

Precision: how many of the elements in an algorithm segment also belong to one segment in the ground truth?

Recall: how many of the elements in a ground truth segment are grouped together in one algorithm segment?

F-score: harmonic mean of precision and recall
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- Webis Web Segments 2020 based on Webis Web Archive 17
- high level of completeness and reproduction accuracy within Webis Web Archiver
- archived pages can be reproduced in automated Chromium browser
- any segmentation algorithm written in JavaScript can be run on the archived web page $\rightarrow$ highly consistent input
$\longrightarrow$ Contribution: TypeScript/JavaScript port of VIPS
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CSSBox（VIPS－Java）
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Approaches, Evaluations and Results

## Overview

1. Evaluation of all algorithms + single-segment baseline against the ground truth
2. Parameter analyses: VIPS and Cormier et al.
3. Visual/hybrid segmentations fit to DOM nodes
4. Cross-evaluation (algorithm similarity)
5. Min-vote ensemble (combining algorithm segmentations)

## DOM-only approach: VIPS
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- fixed set of rules down to element level
- Permitted Degree of Coherence (PDoC) influences granularity


## Results: VIPS
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| 5 | 13.5 | 0.35 | 0.70 | 0.38 | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.68 |
| $\Delta$ | -66.7 | -0.11 | +0.34 | +0.06 | -0.19 | +0.35 | +0.18 |
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- oversegmentation (ground truth: 9.1 segments)
$\longrightarrow$ high precision, low recall, low F-score
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## Reason:

- PDoC > 6 applies rules targeting specific element types
$\longrightarrow$ outdated, detrimental to segmentation quality
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PDoC 5:

- applied rules target only coarse page divisions
$\longrightarrow$ oversegmentation reduced; lower precision, but much higher recall, increased $F_{B^{3}}$
$\longrightarrow$ VIPS (PDoC 5) is best single algorithm
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Cormier et al.
$\left(s_{\text {min }}=45, t_{l}=512\right)$

## Results: Cormier et al.
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## DOM fitting: example


original

fitted

## Results: Cormier et al. - DOM fitting
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- Reduced oversegmentation and increased precision (pixels) and recall (characters)
$\longrightarrow F_{B^{3}}$ matches VIPS for pixels and comes closer for characters
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## Visual approach: MMDetection

- NOT a Web Page Segmentation algorithm!
- ... in fact, not an algorithm by itself $\rightarrow$ machine learning toolkit
- designed for real-world object detection
 and instance segmentation (i.e. segmenting real-world images)
- offers high-performance, pre-trained, state-of-the-art neural network models
- currently leads Microsoft COCO challenge in instance segmentation
$\longrightarrow$ transfer to Web Page Segmentation possible?


## Results: MMDetection
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| fitted | 14.7 | 0.67 | 0.38 | 0.35 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.56 |
| $\Delta$ | -237.5 | +0.20 | -0.03 | +0.02 |  | +0.10 | +0.08 |
| VIPS <br> $($ PDoC 5) | 13.5 | 0.35 | 0.70 | 0.38 | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.68 |

- Real-world image segmentation does not directly transfer well
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## Reasons:

- segmenting real-world objects found in images on web pages
- neural network model not trained on web pages


## Results: MMDetection - DOM fitting
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| $\Delta$ | $-\mathbf{2 3 7 . 5}$ | $+\mathbf{0 . 2 0}$ | -0.03 | +0.02 | - | $+\mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ | +0.08 |
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|  | pixels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variant | \# segments | $P_{B^{3}}$ | $R_{B^{3}}$ | $F_{B^{3}}$ | $P_{B^{3}}$ | $R_{B^{3}}$ | $F_{B^{3}}$ |
| original | 252.2 | 0.47 | 0.41 | 0.33 | 0.80 | 0.44 | 0.48 |
| fitted | 14.7 | 0.67 | 0.38 | 0.35 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.56 |
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- $\mathbf{9 4 . 2 \%}$ reduction in segment count
- best precision for pixels across all single algorithms
- $F_{B^{3}}$ approaches VIPS for pixels
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## Algorithm cross-evaluation

- $F_{\mathrm{B}^{3}}$ expresses segmentation similarity (interpreted as quality when comparing to ground truth)
$\longrightarrow$ possibility of expressing similarity between algorithms

| $F_{B^{3}}$ | $S$ |  |  |  | $F_{B^{3}}$ | $S$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S^{*}$ | VIPS | HEPS | Cormie | MMDet. | $S^{*}$ | VIPS | HEPS | Cormier | MMDet |
| VIPS | 1.00 | 0.41 | 0.51 | 0.31 | VIPS | 1.00 | 0.48 | 0.60 | 0.41 |
| HEPS | 0.41 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.31 | HEPS | 0.48 | 1.00 | 0.43 | 0.36 |
| Cormier | 0.51 | 0.50 | 1.00 | 0.37 | Cormier | 0.60 | 0.43 | 1.00 | 0.40 |
| MMDet. | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.37 | 1.00 | MMDet. | 0.41 | 0.36 | 0.40 | 1.00 |
| pixels |  |  |  |  | characters |  |  |  |  |

## Min-vote ensemble
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- Applying segmentation fusion (used in ground truth creation) to algorithm segmentations
- Min-vote@n, $n \in[1,2,3,4]=$ number of algorithm segmentations that put a given element in a segment
- Initially evaluated for paper with unoptimized parameters
- now: optimized parameters, fitted segmentations $\rightarrow$ what improvements do we see?



| Popcash |  | Repter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% | Sign Up Now! |  |
| (1) | Stateaning money in less then 10 minuter |  |
| Publishers | furmane |  |
| Maximize your revenue with PopCash.Net | Enat |  |
| now to stanty | Crase Acoout |  |
| Leam More sout Oiv Atianegesal |  |  |





$$
n=2
$$


ground truth

## Results: Min-vote ensemble
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| $\Delta$ | -16.9 | -0.02 | +0.13 | +0.02 | -0.05 | +0.12 | +0.04 |
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { VIPS } \\ (\text { PDoC 5) } \end{gathered}$ | 13.5 | 0.35 | 0.70 | 0.38 | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.68 |

- influence of optimized parameters and fitting
- segment count cut in half, only minor losses in precision
- Min-vote@2 beats VIPS, provides best overall results
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| MMDetection (fitted) | 14.7 | 0.67 | 0.38 | 0.35 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.56 |
| HEPS | 35.8 | 0.39 | 0.54 | 0.32 | 0.72 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| Meier et al. (fitted) | 7.0 | 0.56 | 0.39 | 0.26 | 0.66 | 0.48 | 0.42 |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| VIPS <br> (PDoC 5) | 13.5 | 0.35 | 0.70 | $\mathbf{0 . 3 8}$ | 0.74 | 0.76 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 8}$ |
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| MMDetection <br> (fitted) | 14.7 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ | 0.38 | 0.35 | $\mathbf{0 . 8 0}$ | 0.54 | 0.56 |
| HEPS | 35.8 | 0.39 | 0.54 | 0.32 | 0.72 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| HEP | 0.56 | 0.39 | 0.26 | 0.66 | 0.48 | 0.42 |  |
| Meier et al. <br> (fitted) | 7.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Summary: Contributions

- First implementation of VIPS in TypeScript/JavaScript (ported from Java)
- First comparison of segmentation performance on large dataset
- Analyses of all algorithms, with in-depth parameter discussions:
- VIPS: Highlighting relationship between PDoC and rules
- Cormier et al.: Revealing parameter interactions
- Promising combination of DOM information with visual segmentation, has benefits beyond fair evaluation treatment
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## Outlook

- There are more approaches to be evaluated!
- Analysis of performance by web page genre
- DOM-based segmentations: incorporate HTML5/ARIA tags
- New hybrid approaches combining visual segmentation strategies with DOM information


## Thank you!

