

Errata for poster:

Golub, K., Ardö, A., Mladenic, D., Grobelnik, M. 2006. Comparing and Combining Two Approaches to Automated Subject Classification of Text. In J. Gonzalo et al. (Eds.): ECDL 2006, LNCS 4172, Spain. P. 467-470.

1)

P. 470. Table 2. The name of the row “SVM – original (complete)” should be the name of the first three columns with results for Rec., Prec. and F1.

2)

P. 470. Table 2. The results for “SM” expressed in Rec., Prec. and F1 have been mistyped and should read as follows in the table below:

	SVM – original (complete)			SVM – controlled		
	Rec.	Prec.	F1	Rec.	Prec.	F1
Macroavg.	0.76	0.81	0.78	0.55	0.57	0.55
	SVM – descriptive			SVM – distinctive		
	Rec.	Prec.	F1	Rec.	Prec.	F1
Macroavg.	0.72	0.79	0.75	0.75	0.64	0.69
	SM – original (controlled)			SM – distinctive + controlled		
	Rec.	Prec.	F1	Rec.	Prec.	F1
Macroavg.	0.34	0.51	0.38	0.92	0.28	0.43
	SM – descriptive			SM – distinctive		
	Rec.	Prec.	F1	Rec.	Prec.	F1
Macroavg.	0.99	0.19	0.32	0.91	0.29	0.43

3)

P. 469. Last paragraph. Based on the previous error, the sentence “This hypothesis was not confirmed: both approaches have the best performance in the original setting (see Table 2)” should be replaced with the following: “This hypothesis was not confirmed: SVM performs best using the original set of terms, and string-matching approach also has best precision when using the original set of terms. Best recall for string-matching is achieved when using descriptive terms.”