EasyChair Preprint

№ 5400

A Survey on the Use of Personalized Model-Based Search Engine

Mohammed Mahdi, Abdul Ahmad, Qais Saif Qassim, Mohammed Ahmed Subhi and Taofiq Adeola Bakare

April 28, 2021

A Survey on the Use of Personalized Model-based Search Engine

Mohammad Najah Mahdi[1], Abdul Rahim Ahmad[2], Qais Saif Qassim[3], Mohammed Ahmed Subhi[4] and Taofiq Adeola Bakare[5]

[1]Informatics and Computing in Energy, Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Selangor, Malaysia
[2]Systems and Network Department, College of Computing and Informatics (CCI), Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Selangor, Malaysia
[3]Ibri College of Technology, Ibri, Sultanate of Oman
[4]Engineering and Built Environment, Universiti Kebangsaan Selangor, Malaysia
[5]Faculty of Engineering and Technology, Multimedia University

mehdi.najah@uniten.edu.my

Abstract. Mostly with growth of the information sector, in particular the World wide web and the mobile Internet, the volume of information that we'll have to contend with is rapidly increasing. To a certain degree, users could get the information they need from the Internet. And in context of these vast availability and proliferation of information, users need an efficient way of finding only important and interesting information. How to optimize usability during information search process is still not addressed. Searching was the key feature of a conventional search engine. There has been insufficient customization in search engines to be used by searchers during the information extraction process. This article thus analysed and discussed the personalized recommendations of searches using a tailored framework that supports search engines. We describe a comprehensive review of the study on search engine customization for web-based queries. The study is partially systematic and, also at end of the study, we discuss the difficulties of personalizing search engines.

Keywords: Information Retrieval, Model-Based Search Engine, Search Engine, Personalized Search Engine.

1 Introduction

The search for information on the Internet has been so popular in recent decades. Online search includes a search engine (SE); however, current search engines are still not personalized as they do not satisfy the individual search needs. They also may not satisfy the personalization criteria. While there is no limit to the growth of information [1], personal interest may be limited to a certain goal. It is essential for the search engine to provide the most reliable and interesting information to users or searchers. Users have different perspectives. These could lead them to having different viewpoints in the same subject or field of knowledge. Although the user can search by keywords or keyword,

the SE may generate search results that reflect some kind of basic filtering, that might be partially represent what was searched for. So how do you get search results to be better personalized? Also, how can a query be better to return more important results? These abilities are now very much needed [2-4]. Personalized web search (PWS) is one of the types of general search strategies aimed at achieving improved search results.
While monitoring the search history of registered users, PWS may change search results user 's preferences. This takes advantage of the information collected to evaluate the SE actions of the user in relation to other data collected from the internet[5, 6].. The study focused on PWS. We reviewed the literature on personalization by considering the following areas of interest: I problems, challenges and limitations in PWS systems and (ii) performance assessment of personalized SE search application. This study also examined the personalized search by reviewing previous research that focuses on SE using shared resources. In addition to this, the paper also suggests several changes to the implementation of PWS.
The remainder of this paper is structured as follow: Section II offers a quick overview of interactive visual surveys, and general guidelines explicitly on conventional personalized SE surveys. Section III outlines the overall architecture and relevant PWS strategies or techniques. This section also includes a brief analysis of the benefits and limitations of these approaches, the methodologies used to classify the information and application considerations. And the last section of this paper contains the identified problems and conclusion

2 Research Background

As stated in the introductory section, with the further growth of the information industry, in particular the Internet industry, the quantity of information is growing exponentially. Consequently, the lack of information can no longer be complained about. Whatever bit of information that we like is already available on the Internet. That being said, when presented with so much content, it becomes quite difficult to determine which information, resulting from the query, is important, can be easily identified, and has the information of interest. There is immediate need to overcome this challenge In the new age of Web 4.0, the origins of information have become more varied. Users are not only inactive receivers of information anymore, but can also be the architect to initiate that information. Traditional SEs are also not efficient in managing the bulk of information emerging in this Web 4.0 period, that already has normalization and integration [7-9].
Social media outlets, like Facebook and Twitter, provide a vast volume of user information. These would be a reference point for most users to begin their investigation because browsing with existing user data is more efficient than the conventional SE. For instance, if we had an account on Facebook, we would have already saved a huge volume of information on our own. Which include demographic information, gender, friends, and interests. Such data, along with existing search and browsing history, establishes a personalized profile from which the social networking platform changes the SE result page to match our interests. Conventional SEs are not designed nor positioned to exploit this form of search; they are somewhat limited to enhance user experience. This really is a disadvantage [10-12].
To understand the effect of personalization on SEs, our research answers two questions:

RQ1: Does a PWS enhance users' comprehension of the above goals?
RQ2: Can PWS users build filters to narrow the results of the search phase?
In the context of the SE, we formulated these research questions on the basis of filtering. With consideration to increasing its target exploration capability, PWS is a constructive strategy to enhance SE efficiency by using filters. The field of PWS has evolved in the last two decades and now has a wide range of methods and techniques that can be used for searching [13-15].
Owing to the exponential growth of PWS and its related fields such as ontology based web personalization, SE, Meta Search, human-computer interaction, cross-system personalization, several conventional survey papers aimed at offering a mostly static description of basic approaches cannot be easily modified.
This is attributable to the consistent growth of PWS technologies [16]. Taking into consideration the relevant work for the proposed interactive research method mentioned in this article, we distinguished between general interactive PWS surveys that concentrate on any study field and conventional PWS surveys in SE techniques[17-19]. To the best of our understanding, hardly any interactive PWS relevant to SE techniques has been established specifically for filters to narrow down the searched results. Over 25 papers on PWS have been collected and analyzed for development and adaptation in the management of data filtering[20], along with component analysis, device development, direction and adaptation of PWS. The articles are included in Table 1 below, which contains the title of the articles, the approaches used, the problems and meanings, the contributions reported and the proposed strategy.

Table 1: Components Analysis, Directions and Adaptation of Personalized Web Search

Ref	Methods	Issues and Definition	The Achievement	Directions and adaptation
[21]	Digital Libraries (DLs)	Investigates the design, compatibility, and model used.	Maintains profiles interoperable user models and complain that can be propagated and reconciliation of user data	Six user model were interoperability presented. Focused on reconciliation of various user attributes through which model interoperability.
[22]	Ontology based PWS	Presents a general review of ontology based PWS.	PWS recommended systems using ontology methods. Also, presented a comprehensive description.	Works on context and user profiling. Sophisticated PWS experiences have been provided with web mining combined with ontology.
[23]	Search Engine Meta Search	Review of ontology based PWS, challenges that selects the Meta SE are studied.	Improve the efficiency of SE, increase the number of result as per the user requirement.	PWS focused on various outcomes, user interface, and importance of the SE member sorted.
[24]	PWS, User profile	Focused on the survey of many efficient PWS methods.	To reduce its applicability that can only operate on repeated queries.	It is required to increase the SE accuracy and minimize the time the userspent.

[25]	Ontology based PWS	Problems connected that provide a review on present research and user modelling in multi-application environments	To facilitate the methods of understanding the users, their interests and their preferences in terms of providing them with PWS.	Directions are: (i) privacy and security in cross-system personalization and (ii) evolutionary, are not sufficiently considered up to now.
[26]	Privacy Personalization Human–computer interaction	Technologies that can assist to minimize privacy risks also helped designers and users to contextualize privacy and personalization.	Analyses the privacy risks associated with various present and prominent personalization direction, social-based personalization, behavioral.	Discussed that frames risks and methods solutions in the intersection between privacy and personalization.
[27]	ODP, Semantic web	Presented several methods to personalize Web SE through searcher modelling by analyzing semantic data.	To increase in size the query based on searcher intense such model can identify the semantic similarity between the previous SE query.	The user interests incorporating to customize the SE results by re-ranking the retrieved results.
[28]	Ontology, Personalization, Information	Presented issues and searching methods also covers overall view of ontology model which is mainly utilized for gathering web information.	Initialization of information gathering according to user profile and ontology to gather web information based on keywords that may be local database.	Discussed the learning concept extract the data in structured format for unstructured input. Also covers basic framework of ontology which focuses on overall data gathering.
[29]	Information Retrieval, Semantic Web, Ontology,	Reviewed various techniques of operations to enhance the efficiency of the data retrieval system.	Established a variety of techniques used in Web Mining by scientists to accomplish Web Personalization.	To minimise brand loyalty and data overload, PWS is a platform that supports consumers with significant competitive advantages.

2.1 Search Engine (SE)

A detailed overview of the basic information searched for is given to the search engines. Generally, only two or three keywords need to be provided in the current SEs. More terms or phrases are necessary to support the query method to extend the reach of the query. Similarly, more detailed information, like location, search history, can all be presented side-by-side with the original query, such as the Google search engine. The SE does the following:

a: Accepts the user's submission of requests, including words or sentences, by specifying the precise details in the action to be viewed on the site by the user. b: Tries to search the database to match the request. c: Organizes and delivers a clickable URL array that matches the request. d: Receive the resubmission of the updated query from the customer if any.

The search engine is a programmer designed to search for information found on the internet. It searches for information using keywords or phrases, and presents a set of

documents (hits). The targets can be linked or unrelated to web sites, images and files [30-32], and some SEs will mine data that is stored in databases or open directories too. Thus, without SEs, it could be difficult to find details on the Internet without having their unique URL[20, 33, 34]. SEs can be categorized into three types[35]; (a) crawler-based, (b) human-powered type, and (c) hybrid types. Details of the categories are given in Table 2:

Table 2: Types of Search Engines

SE Types	Example and Description
Crawler-Based SE	Example: Google. Crawlers access the web, read the details in it, and generate a meta tag. This enable the records to be retrieved by following some hyperlinks to return all the information to the central repository and index the data[35].
Human-Powered SE	Example: Google directory, Yahoo directory, Open directory. Appropriately known as a site directory. More popular due to the dynamic value of human links that are indexed and classified. The content provided is only recorded.
Hybrid SE	Example: MSN Search. This intersects between human-powered and crawler-based directories. When seeking for information, both crawler and human-powered results can be accessed while preferring one method of listing to another[36].

2.2 Research status of search technology based on user personalization model

From its inception, the PWS analysis concentrated on the recommendation of search results and user style polymerization. The personalized user model analysis was not enough to attract the interest of the researchers. Nevertheless, with an increment in the amount of users, which raises the network and user criteria for the precision of the searched data, better user classification polymerization techniques have been proposed to satisfy their needs. Recently, scientists have reported some findings by paying closer attention to personalized models. For example, the authors in Leiberman[37], Gourevitch, et al.[38] established a user information agent approach to the design user models[39, 40].

The idea is to track user activity accurately and to automatically construct a user model structure. This method does not require the user to directly include the data; nevertheless, it can be created based on the user's habits. Fab Comprehensive Literature [41-43] was focused on the contents page ranked division to create user models that were developed using the subjective sort of the user.

Balabanovic[44], Nath and Bhushan[45] are already out of the user's perspective; they are concerned with the content from which the user's specialized subject is to be categorized and filtered out. The material available on the page to be categorized uses a user model to predict whether the user has this perception of page relevance. In the SE user model, Wen[46] suggested a rather more systematic understanding of the user model, such as a representation of the vector and a representation of the conceptual level by using Huffman tree to represent the user model.

Hong[47] has focused on tailored customer-side, fine-grained user modelling services. His contribution is no more whatever the consumer is interested in or not. This is clearly classified into two parts; but, from the user's perspective, it is separated into different classes. This is dependent on the user's interpretation of the content. In addition, Zheng, et al.[48] borrowed a model from someone else to refine the system for the consumer model. A further contribution of these studies and methods is also outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Critical Review of Personalized Search Engine

Ref	Methods/Techniques	Description	S: Strengths, B: Weaknesses
[49]	Researched models proposed for web semantics, IR methods, information gathering techniques emotional outputs of SE actions online.	The improved search experience, making the users to the to retrieve relevant results easier, was obtained by smaller queries.	S: performance of cognitive agent based Web was improved. B: More research is required to be done.
[50]	Suggested the evaluation model that describes the aspect of a SE.	Presented methods of evaluating SEs to easily suit the user's need by formulating user oriented metrics that compare fresh and duplicate results in SE.	S: Performance of SEs were identified by the statistical patterns that further refined the evaluation model. B: A larger scale study involving many users should confirm the validity of the model.
[51]	The implementation of an approach that personalized delivery was described by considering the relevance of content that suits the user's need.	Using automated personalized delivery, the achievement supports the user to search for new contents.	S: Method has the ability to collect and process the stream of new information. B: Implementation of automatic portals in other sectors including culture.
[52]	Built a custom context-dependent SE web model utilizing semantic relationships.	PWS Context-Dependent named "Sama SE" that provided an optimized model for indexing and matching the terms collected from the retrieved documents and submitted a searches.	S: Suggest that the precision, recall, and F-measure of Sama SE are higher, and it is fall-out is lower compared to the other ST method. B: Depends on results collected by Google.
[53]	Presented a framework of an academic SE with personalized ranking SEs result mechanism.	To improve and enhance the quality of research paper searching, an academic SE capability.	S: Result of the experiment proposed that the PWS result ranking mechanism performed better than original result ranking. B: Can be destined to have a limited field of research filed.
[54]	Mining user behaviour of characteristics with agent for information retrieval.	Puts a meta PWS mechanism with the use of the agent technology on ontology.	Mining user behaviour of characteristics with agent for information retrieval.
[55]	Using WordNet, a personalized user model, collecting the related sentences from the actual text document, was implemented to form a description.	Semantic personalized IR, which encourages the efficient retrieval of semantic information from the Internet, has been proposed for the utilisation of Semantic Web applications.	S: Improved the accuracy of the IR since the system depends on the Semantic Web technology. B: Proposed system was not implemented for searching.

3 CHALLENGES

Numerous studies on user profile modelling has been designed to enhance personalized familiarization and eliminate unnecessary experiences that have some-times arisen between the user and the system. However, a lot of work also needs to be done to enhance the simulation of the user profile, which will prevent mal-functioning of the device.

This could be accomplished by delivering correct services to the customer at the required place and time, although some difficulties persist in achieving these objectives. How users specifically search, from which SEs select information according to their experience and interest, for whatever they need efficiently. How can users, in particular mobile users, be helped to access accurate and relevant information? Most of the suggested approaches have failed, in one way or another, to deal effectively with such challenges. Based on conventional SE technology, the process of obtaining experience with mobile users is not good sufficient. Traditional IR technology typically takes into account only reasonably common requirements; does not effectively meet the more complex query request of the user associated with its context as well as the intent of the search. Personalized IR technology is the answer to this issue. It takes full account of the customer and the disparity between different users of different services by balancing their specific needs[56]. Construction of the user's personalised model, to fit their desires and preferences, has therefore become essential. We further streamlined this by sorting information tools for further classification, acting on the various suggested users, to fit their preferences and information needs.

4 Conclusion

In this study, we addressed personalised user-based SE as well as how to allow users to search efficiently, find references to their own preferences and experience. How to help users navigate their personalised search easily and precisely. Most of the approaches previously used, including traditional SE methods, have not been able to solve the problem. We studied the PWS and various user interface designs. In order to facilitate experimentation, the interface should provide prompt input on the possible actions of the user. The primary contribution of this article is the general view of existing techniques on personalized user-based search engines and the method for filtering the results of the search process. We then highlighted the detailed methods and key characteristics used to define the methodology used to collect and execute the data. The recommendations made in this article may act as a guide to the development of an interface that encourages progress in all aspects and phases of the user search process. Effective filter interfaces that are designed to help users express effective requests, aid them to understand the searched results and, if necessary, encourage query modifications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is a part of a project submitted to Universiti Tenaga Nasional (UNITEN) internal grant no J510050783 (2018). Many thanks to the Innovation & Research Management Center (iRMC), UNITEN who provided their assistance and expertise during the research.

References

1. T. T. Dao, T. N. Hoang, X. H. Ta, and M. C. H. B. Tho, "Knowledge-based personalized search engine for the Web-based Human Musculoskeletal System Resources (HMSR) in biomechanics," Journal of biomedical informatics, vol. 46, pp. 160-173, 2013.
2. K. W.-T. Leung, W. Ng, and D. L. Lee, "Personalized concept-based clustering of search engine queries," IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering, vol. 20, pp. 1505-1518, 2008.

3. L. Dongfei and D. Jianguo, "The Design and Implementation of Personalized Search Engine Based on Bilingual Translation," in 2008 ISECS International Colloquium on Computing, Communication, Control, and Management, 2008, pp. 472-476.
4. R. Umagandhi and A. Senthilkumar, "Time dependent approach for query and url recommendations using search engine query logs," IAENG International Journal of Computer Science, vol. 40, 2013.
5. J.-F. Xu, Z.-B. Zhao, and T.-R. Qiu, "Personalized search engine based on granular computing," in 2008 IEEE International Conference on Granular Computing, 2008, pp. 690-694.
6. C. Costa and M. Y. Santos, "Big Data: State-of-the-art concepts, techniques, technologies, modeling approaches and research challenges," IAENG International Journal of Computer Science, vol. 43, pp. 285-301, 2017.
7. L. Dong-Fei and D. Jian-Guo, "The Design and Research of User Interest Model in Personalized Search Engine," in 2009 Asia-Pacific Conference on Information Processing, 2009, pp. 639-642.
8. X.-d. Chen and L. Huang, "The research of personalized search engine based on users' access interest," in 2009 Asia-Pacific Conference on Computational Intelligence and Industrial Applications (PACIIA), 2009, pp. 337-340.
9. M. N. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, R. Ismail, M. A. Subhi, M. M. Abdulrazzaq, and Q. S. Qassim, "Information Overload: The Effects of Large Amounts of Information," in 2020 1st. Information Technology To Enhance e-learning and Other Application (IT-ELA, 2020, pp. 154-159.
10. F. Akhlaghian, B. Arzanian, and P. Moradi, "A personalized search engine using ontology-based fuzzy concept networks," in 2010 International Conference on Data Storage and Data Engineering, 2010, pp. 137-141.
11. J. Cao, Y. Tang, and B. Lou, "Personalized meta-search engine design and implementation," in 2010 3rd International Conference on Computer Science and Information Technology, 2010, pp. 305-307.
12. M. N. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, R. Ismail, and M. A. Subhi, "Improving Big Data Technologies with Visual Faceted Search," in 2020 8th International Conference on Information Technology and Multimedia (ICIMU), 2020, pp. 44-49.
13. Y. Shu-hong and W. Fu-liang, "Study on Personalized Search Engine Based on Files," in 2010 International Conference on Internet Technology and Applications, 2010.
14. J. Gong, "Analysis the idea of personalized search engine based on user behavior," in 2010 International Conference on Computer Application and System Modeling (ICCASM 2010), 2010, pp. V5-450-V5-452.
15. L. Zhongbao, "Research of a personalized search engine based on user interest mining," in 2010 International Conference on Intelligent Computing and Integrated Systems, 2010, pp. 512-515.
16. C. Lili, "The Study of Personalized Search Engine Based on Chinese-English Bilingual Translation," in 2010 International Conference on E-Product E-Service and E-Entertainment, 2010, pp. 1-4.
17. A. Annadurai and A. Annadurai, "Architecture of personalized web search engine using suffix tree clustering," in 2011 International Conference on Signal Processing, Communication, Computing and Networking Technologies, 2011, pp. 604-608.
18. M. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, and R. Ismail, "Similarity Search Techniques in Exploratory Search: A Review," in TENCON 2018-2018 IEEE Region 10 Conference, 2018, pp. 2193-2198.
19. M. N. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, and R. Ismail, "Evaluating search results in exploratory search," 2018.

20. M. N. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, R. Ismail, H. Natiq, and M. A. Mohammed, "Solution for Information Overload Using Faceted Search-A Review," IEEE Access, 2020.
21. A. Nika, T. Catarci, Y. Ioannidis, A. Katifori, G. Koutrika, N. Manola, et al., "A survey of context-aware cross-digital library personalization," in International Workshop on Adaptive Multimedia Retrieval, 2010, pp. 16-30.
22. K. Jammalamadaka and I. Srinivas, "A survey on ontology based web personalization," Int. J. Res. Eng. Technol, vol. 2, pp. 163-167, 2013.
23. P. Naval and S. Priyanka, "A survey on personalized meta search engine," International Journal, vol. 2, 2012.
24. G. Akhila and R. Prasanth, "A survey on personalized web search," Int. J. Adv. Res. Trends Eng. Technol.(IJARTET) II, 2015.
25. M. Viviani, N. Bennani, and E. Egyed-Zsigmond, "A survey on user modeling in multi-application environments," in 2010 Third International Conference on Advances in Human-Oriented and Personalized Mechanisms, Technologies and Services, 2010, pp. 111-116.
26. E. Toch, Y. Wang, and L. F. Cranor, "Personalization and privacy: a survey of privacy risks and remedies in personalization-based systems," User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction, vol. 22, pp. 203-220, 2012.
27. P. Jay, P. Shah, K. Makvana, and P. Shah, "Review on web search personalization through semantic data," in 2015 IEEE International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Technologies (ICECCT), 2015, pp. 1-6.
28. N. Borse, S. Patil, N. Agrawal, and R. Pachlor, "Survey on A Personalized Ontology Model for Web Information Gathering."
29. K. Sridevi and R. Umarani, "Web personalization approaches: a survey," International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer and Communication Engineering, vol. 2, pp. 1533-1539, 2013.
30. A. Schuth, "Search engines that learn from their users," 2016.
31. D. Sullivan, "How search engines work," SEARCH ENGINE WATCH, at http://www. searchenginewatch. com/webmasters/work. html (last updated June 26, 2001)(on file with the New York University Journal of Legislation and Public Policy), 2002.
32. G. Chen, Z. Lu, Z. Zhang, and Z. Sun, "Research on Hybrid Modified Cuckoo Search Algorithm for Optimal Reactive Power Dispatch Problem," IAENG International Journal of Computer Science, vol. 45, pp. 328-339, 2018.
33. S. Goel and S. Yadav, "Search engine evaluation based on page level keywords," in Advance Computing Conference (IACC), 2013 IEEE 3rd International, 2013, pp. 870-876.
34. N. K. Leung and S. K. Lau, "No More" Keyword Search" or FAQ: Innovative Ontology and Agent Based Dynamic User Interface," IAENG International Journal of Computer Science, vol. 33, 2007.
35. H. Agrawal and S. Yadav, "Search Engine Results Improvement--A Review," in Computational Intelligence & Communication Technology (CICT), 2015 IEEE International Conference on, 2015, pp. 180-185.
36. M. Levene, An introduction to search engines and web navigation: John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
37. H. Leiberman, "An agent that assists web browsing," in Proceedings of IJCAI-95, Montreal, Canada. Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, 1995.
38. G. Gourevitch, T. Luttinen, V. Boctor, W. De Graaf, and L. Zhao, "Using e-mail message characteristics for prioritization," ed: Google Patents, 2017.
39. U. D. Nodelman and E. J. Horvitz, "Continuous time bayesian network models for predicting users' presence, activities, and component usage," ed: Google Patents, 2010.

40. M. N. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, and R. Ismail, "Improving faceted search results for web-based information exploration," International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology, vol. 10, pp. 1143-1152, 2020.
41. Y. Wang, H. Bu, and Y. Qiu, "The flexible integration of inference algorithm based on users' preference," in Proceedings of 2011 International Conference on Electronic & Mechanical Engineering and Information Technology, 2011, pp. 2671-2674.
42. M. Pazzani and D. Billsus, "Learning and revising user profiles: The identification of interesting web sites," Machine learning, vol. 27, pp. 313-331, 1997.
43. S. Rahimi, B. Gupta, and K. Adya, "A Novel Page Ranking Algorithm for Search Engines Using Implicit Feedback," Engineering Letters, Advance online publication, Southern Illinois University, USA, 2006.
44. M. Balabanovic, "An adaptive web page recommendation service," in First International Conference on Autonomous Agents, p. 378-85 ACM, 2000.
45. R. Nath and R. Bhushan, "A Study of Web Personalization System: Supporting User Profiling In Web Recommendation System," Amity Global Business Review, vol. 7, 2012.
46. H. Wen, "Development of personalized online systems for web search, recommendations, and e-commerce," Development, vol. 1, pp. 1-2011, 2011.
47. J. Hong, "A Simple Discussion about User-model Technique in Individuation Service of Digital Library [J]," The Journal of the Library Science in Jiangxi, vol. 4, 2006.
48. J. Zheng, S. Guo, L. Gao, D. Xue, N. Zhao, and H. Ma, "Inferring gender of micro-blog users based on multi-classifiers fusion," International Journal of Performability Engineering, vol. 14, p. 349, 2018.
49. S. Meenakshi, G. Agarwal, S. Bakshi, S. Bhatter, and P. Sivakumar, "Cognitive Agents for Web Based Search Engines: A Review," in 2017 Second International Conference on Recent Trends and Challenges in Computational Models (ICRTCCM), 2017, pp. 201-206.
50. K. Fun Li, Y. Wang, and W. Yu, "Chapter 7 Personalised search engine evaluation: Methodologies and metrics," in Web Search Engine Research, ed: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2012, pp. 163-202.
51. T. Ignatova and V. Ivichev, "Technologies for Streaming Processing of News for Personalized Search Engine Results for News Content," Problems of Economic Transition, vol. 57, pp. 39-45, 2015.
52. S. M. Y. Esbitan, "A Personalized Context-Dependent Web Search Engine Using Word Net (Sama Search Engine)," A Personalized Context-Dependent Web Search Engine Using Word Net (Sama Search Engine), 2012.
53. W. Choochaiwattana, "An Architecture of an Academic Search Engine with Personalized Search Result Ranking Mechanism," in Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Network, Communication and Computing, 2016, pp. 161-165.
54. Q. Ai, Y. Zhang, K. Bi, X. Chen, and W. B. Croft, "Learning a hierarchical embedding model for personalized product search," in Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, 2017, pp. 645-654.
55. S. Babekr, K. M. Fouad, and N. Arshad, "Personalized semantic retrieval and summarization of web based documents," Int. J. Adv. Comput. Sci. Appl.(IJACSA), vol. 4, 2013.
56. M. N. Mahdi, A. R. Ahmad, and R. Ismail, "Intelligent metadata web search engines: A brief review of literature on intelligent metadata based search engines," in Information Technology and Multimedia (ICIMU), 2014 International Conference on, 2014, pp. 255-258.