

**Round 2 results — Run BBGhelani3 submitted from BBGhelani**




**Run Description**

The run is generated using a human in the loop active learning approach. HiCAL[2] is used for the task. It uses Continuous active learning[1] and a solr+bm25 search interface. The active learning model for each topic was seeded using judgments made by us in Round 1 and NIST qrel. For topics 1-30, at most 5 minutes were spent per topic. For topic 31-35, at most 15 minutes were spent per topic. [1] Gordon V. Cormack and Maura R. Grossman. Evaluation of machine-learning proto-cols for technology-assisted review in electronic discovery. In Proceedings of the 37th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pages 153–162. ACM, 2014. [2] <https://github.com/hical/HiCAL>


Summary Statistics	
Run ID	BBGhelani3
Topic type	manual
Contributed to judgment sets?	no

Overall measures	
Number of topics	35
Total number retrieved	35000
Total relevant	3002
Total relevant retrieved	1982
MAP	0.2386
Mean Bpref	0.5027
Mean NDCG@10	0.5868
Mean RBP(p=0.5)	0.6376 +0.0036

Document Level Averages	
	Precision
At 5 docs	0.7543
At 10 docs	0.6657
At 15 docs	0.5771
At 20 docs	0.5300
At 30 docs	0.4514
R-Precision	
Exact	0.2843




Per-topic difference from median bpref for all Round 2 runs




Per-topic difference from median NDCG@10 for all Round 2 runs

## Round 2 results — Run BBGhelani3 submitted from BBGhelani

---



Per-topic difference from median P@5 for all Round 2 runs



Per-topic difference from median RBP(p=0.5) for all Round 2 runs