

Named Entity Analysis and Extraction with Uncommon Words

Xiaoshi Zhong, Erik Cambria, and Jagath C. Rajapakse

School of Computer Science and Engineering
Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
{xszhong, cambria, asjagath}@ntu.edu.sg

Abstract

Most previous research treats named entity extraction and classification as an end-to-end task. We argue that the two sub-tasks should be addressed separately. Entity extraction lies at the level of syntactic analysis while entity classification lies at the level of semantic analysis. According to Noam Chomsky’s “Syntactic Structures,” pp. 93-94 (Chomsky 1957), syntax does not appeal to semantics and semantics does not affect syntax. We analyze two benchmark datasets for the characteristics of named entities, finding that *uncommon words* can distinguish named entities from common text; where uncommon words are the words that hardly appear in common text and they are mainly the proper nouns. Experiments validate that lexical and syntactic features achieve state-of-the-art performance on entity extraction and that semantic features do not further improve the extraction performance, in both of our model and the state-of-the-art baselines. With Chomsky’s view, we also explain the failure of joint syntactic and semantic parsings in other works.

1 Introduction

Named entity recognition (NER) is formally defined by (Grishman and Sundheim 1996; Chinchor 1997; Sang and Meulder 2003), aiming to extract named entities from free text and classify the extracted named entities into certain categories. NER includes two sub-tasks: entity extraction and entity classification.¹ While most previous research treats the two sub-tasks as an end-to-end task (i.e., NER), the definitions of the two sub-tasks actually point to different central questions. The central question that entity extraction points to is what distinguishes named entities from common text; while the central question of entity classification is what distinguishes different types of named entities from each other.

Besides different central questions, entity extraction and entity classification lie at different levels of linguistic analysis. Entity extraction lies at the level of syntactic analysis while entity classification at the level of semantic analysis.²

¹Term clarification: ‘entity extraction’ denotes the task of extracting named entities from free text; ‘entity classification’ denotes the task of classifying named entities into certain categories; and ‘named entity recognition’ denotes the task of treating entity extraction and classification as an end-to-end task.

²Although entity extraction does not require to explicitly outline the sentences’

According to Noam Chomsky’s “Syntactic Structures,” pp. 93-94 (Chomsky 1957), syntax does not appeal to semantics and semantics does not affect syntax. In this paper we focus on entity extraction, specifically, on the question **Q1**: *what can distinguish named entities from common text?* We also investigate the question **Q2**: *whether do semantic features further improve the entity extraction performance?*

To answer the question **Q1** we analyze the named entities from two benchmark datasets and find two common characteristics. First, more than 92.2% of named entities contain *uncommon words*, which hardly appear in common text. Second, named entities are mainly made up of proper nouns; in the whole text, more than 84.8% of proper nouns appear in named entities, and within named entities, more than 80.1% of words are proper nouns.

The characteristics motivate us to design a conditional random fields (CRFs) (Lafferty, McCallum, and Pereira 2001) based learning method named UGTO to extract named entities from free text. Specifically, UGTO defines a constituent-based tagging scheme named UGTO scheme³ that consists of four tags: U, G, T, and O. U encodes the Uncommon words, such as ‘Boston.’ G encodes the Generic modifiers and T encodes the Trigger words. Generic modifiers (e.g., ‘of’ and ‘and’) can appear in several types of named entities while trigger words appear in a specific type of named entities; for example, the trigger word ‘University’ appears in ‘Boston University.’ O encodes the words Outside named entity. In modeling, UGTO assigns one word with one UGTO tag under a CRFs framework, with lexical features and syntactic features.

syntactic structure, we still need to learn their structure to determine the entities’ boundaries. Our analysis (Section 3) shows that uncommon words/proper nouns can distinguish named entities from common text and they are lexical/syntactic features; and experiments (Section 5) validate that lexical and syntactic features achieve state-of-the-art performance on entity extraction and that semantic features do not further improve entity extraction performance, in both of our model and the state-of-the-art baselines. This demonstrates that entity extraction lies at the syntactic level and does not lie at the semantic level. On the other hand, classifying named entities into different categories requires to learn the entities’ meanings; and a thread of research report that semantic information is much more effective than syntactic information for entity classification (as also known as entity typing) (Giuliano 2009; Ling and Weld 2012; Nakashole, Tylenda, and Weikum 2013). This demonstrates that entity classification lies at the semantic level.

³We use ‘UGTO’ to denote our method and use ‘UGTO scheme’ to denote the tagging scheme that UGTO defines.

UGTO is inspired by TOMN (which defines a constituent-based tagging scheme to model time expressions) (Zhong and Cambria 2018) and like TOMN, UGTO overcomes the problem of inconsistent tag assignment that is caused by the position-based tagging schemes (e.g., IOBES scheme); UGTO therefore can fully leverage the information of the uncommon words and the information that depends on words, such as part-of-speech (POS). The difference between UGTO and TOMN lies in the differences between general named entities and time expressions. First, time expressions consist of only a small group of time-related words and those words can be collected wholly (e.g., only 350 distinct words in time expressions across four datasets) (Zhong, Sun, and Cambria 2017; Zhong and Cambria 2018). General named entities instead contain countless words that it is difficult to collect all of them (e.g., 23,698 distinct words in named entities across CoNLL03 and OntoNotes* datasets). Second, POS tags cannot distinguish time expressions from common text (Zhong, Sun, and Cambria 2017; Zhong and Cambria 2018) and TOMN does not use the POS tags nor other syntactic features; however, the uncommon words, which can distinguish named entities from common text, are mainly proper nouns, a kind of POS tags. (To our knowledge, we are the first to combine uncommon words and proper nouns into a kind of features; see Section 4.) In practice, UGTO derives uncommon words based on the idea that words that hardly appear in training set’s common text are likely to predict named entities. This process addresses the difficulty of collecting the whole entity-related words.

We evaluate UGTO against two representative state-of-the-art methods. Experiment results demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of UGTO compared with the state-of-the-art baselines. Moreover, experiments demonstrate that lexical and syntactic features achieve state-of-the-art performance on entity extraction and that, with answering the question **Q2**, semantic features do not further improve the entity extraction performance, in both of our model and the state-of-the-art baselines. This provides empirical evidence in terms of entity extraction supporting Chomsky’s view that syntax does not appeal to semantics and semantics does not affect syntax (Chomsky 1957). In addition, with Chomsky’s view, we explain the failure of the joint syntactic and semantic parsings as a tradeoff between the two parsings (see Section 6 for details).

To summarize, we have the following contributions.

- We recognize from two benchmark datasets the capability of the uncommon words and proper nouns to distinguish named entities from common text.
- We design a CRFs-based learning method with a constituent-based tagging scheme to extract named entities from free text. Our method fully leverages the information of the uncommon words and addresses the difficulty of collecting the whole entity-related words. Experimental results validate the effectiveness and efficiency of our method and together Chomsky’s syntactic theory (Chomsky 1957) suggest us to address the entity extraction and classification separately.
- We use Chomsky’s syntactic theory to explain the failure of joint syntactic and semantic parsings in other works.

2 Related Work

We mainly concern the problem of named entity extraction, and the problem is related to named entity recognition.

Named Entity Recognition

Named entity recognition has a long history. Nadeau and Sekine review the development of early years (from 1991 to 2006) (Nadeau and Sekine 2007) in terms of languages (e.g., English, German, and Chinese) (Wang, Li, and Chang 1992; Chen and Lee 1996; Grishman and Sundheim 1996; Chinchor 1997; Sang and Meulder 2003), text genres (e.g., scientific and journalistic) and domains (e.g., sports and business) (Maynard et al. 2001; Poibeau and Kosseim 2001; Minkov, Wang, and Cohen 2005), statistical learning techniques (e.g., hidden Markov models, maximum entropy models, and conditional random fields) (Bikel et al. 1997; Sekine 1998; Borthwick et al. 1998; Asahara and Matsumoto 2003; McCallum and Li 2003), engineering features (e.g., word-level features and dictionary features) (Bikel et al. 1997; Ravin and Wacholder 1997; Yu, Bai, and Wu 1998; Collins and Singer 1999; Collins 2002; Silva, Kozareva, and Lopes 2004), and shared task evaluations (e.g., ACE, MUC, and CoNLL) (Grishman and Sundheim 1996; Chinchor 1997; Sang and Meulder 2003; Doddington et al. 2004).

Before deep learning era, there are also works that concern several aspects of NER, like leveraging unlabeled data for NER (Liang 2005), leveraging external knowledge for NER (Kazama and Torisawa 2007; Ratinov and Roth 2009; Chiu and Nichols 2016), nested NER (Alex, Haddow, and Grover 2007; Finkel and Manning 2009b), and NER in informal text (Liu et al. 2011; Ritter et al. 2011).

In deep learning era, researchers use neural networks and word embeddings to develop variants of models on CoNLL03 dataset (Collobert et al. 2011; Passos, Kumar, and McCallum 2014; Huang, Xu, and Yu 2015; Ling et al. 2015; Luo et al. 2015; Santos and Guimaraes 2015; Chiu and Nichols 2016; Lample et al. 2016; Ma and Hovy 2016; Peters et al. 2017; Strubell et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2018).

UGTO benefits some features from the traditional methods, and refines the significant features according to an in-depth analysis for the characteristics of named entities. Unlike the neural network based methods that mainly compute the semantic similarities among words, UGTO focuses on the distinction between named entities and common text. And unlike most NER methods that treat the entity extraction and classification as an end-to-end task, UGTO together with Chomsky’s syntactic theory (Chomsky 1957) suggests to address the entity extraction and classification separately. Specifically, our analysis and experiments demonstrate that entity extraction lies at the syntactic level and the thread of research on entity typing/classification demonstrate that entity classification lies at the semantic level.

UGTO focuses on the entity extraction and leaves the entity classification to the existing methods for entity typing/classification (Ling and Weld 2012; Nakashole, Tylenda, and Weikum 2013; Giuliano 2009) or to the future work.

Table 1: Dataset statistics. ‘Entire’ denotes entire dataset.

Dataset		#Docs	#Words	#Entities	#Type
CoNLL03	Train	946	203,621	23,499	4
	Dev.	216	51,362	5,942	
	Test	231	46,435	5,648	
	Entire	1,393	301,418	35,089	
OntoNotes*	Train	2,729	1,578,195	81,222	11
	Dev.	406	246,009	12,721	
	Test	235	155,330	7,537	
	Entire	3,370	1,979,534	101,480	

3 Named Entity Analysis

Datasets

We use two benchmark datasets for named entity analysis: CoNLL03 and OntoNotes*.⁴

CoNLL03 is a benchmark dataset derived from Reuters RCV1 corpus, with 1,393 news articles between August 1996 and August 1997; it contains 4 entity types: PER, LOC, ORG, and MISC (Sang and Meulder 2003).

OntoNotes* is a dataset derived from OntoNotes5 dataset (Pradhan et al. 2013). OntoNotes5 is a portion of OnteNotes 5.0 corpus for named entity analysis and consists of 3,370 articles collected from different sources (e.g., newswire and web data) over a long period of time; it contains 18 entity types.⁵ Although OntoNotes5 is a benchmark dataset, we find that its annotation is far from perfect. For example, ‘‘OntoNotes Named Entity Guidelines (Version 14.0)’’ states that the ORDINAL includes all the ordinal numbers and the CARDINAL includes the whole numbers, fractions, and decimals, but we find in common text 3,588 numeral words, 7.1% of the total numeral words. Besides, some sequences are annotated inconsistently; for the ‘the Cold War,’ for example, in some cases the whole sequence is annotated as an entity (i.e., ‘<ENAMEX>the Cold War</ENAMEX>’; where ‘ENAMEX’ is the annotation mark) while in some cases only the ‘Cold War’ is an entity (i.e., ‘the <ENAMEX>Cold War</ENAMEX>’).

To get a high quality dataset for named entity analysis, we derive a dataset named OntoNotes* from OntoNotes5 by removing the entity types⁶ whose entities are mainly composed of numbers and ordinals and moving all the ‘the’ at the beginning of entities and all the ‘s’ at the end of entities outside their entities (e.g., all the ‘<ENAMEX>the Cold War’s</ENAMEX>’ are changed to ‘the <ENAMEX>Cold War</ENAMEX>’s’’).

In setting the training, development, and test sets, we follow the setting by (Sang and Meulder 2003) for CoNLL03 and follow the setting⁷ by OntoNotes5’s author for OntoNotes*. Table 1 summarizes the dataset statistics.

⁴The original CoNLL03 and OntoNotes5 datasets include data in English and other languages, here we focus on the English data.

⁵OntoNotes5’s 18 entity types are CARDINAL, DATE, EVENT, FAC, GPE, LANGUAGE, LAW, LOC, MONEY, NORP, ORDINAL, ORG, PERCENT, PERSON, PRODUCT, QUANTITY, TIME, and WORK_OF_ART.

⁶The removed entity types include CARDINAL, DATE, MONEY, ORDINAL, PERCENT, QUANTITY, and TIME.

⁷<https://github.com/ontonotes/conll-formatted-ontonotes-5.0>

Table 2: Percentage of named entities each has at least one word that hardly appears in common text

	Entire	Train	Dev.	Test
CoNLL03	97.77	98.77	99.19	98.62
OntoNotes*	92.91	92.20	95.22	95.61

Table 3: Top 4 POS tags in named entities and their percentage over the whole tags within named entities (P_{entity}) and over the corresponding tags in the whole text (P_{text})

POS	CoNLL03		POS	OntoNotes*	
	P_{entity}	P_{text}		P_{entity}	P_{text}
NNP	83.81	84.82	NNP	77.67	85.88
JJ	5.82	17.57	JJ	4.60	6.77
NN	4.89	6.46	NN	4.57	2.91
NNPS	1.55	94.12	NNPS	2.50	93.04

Characteristics

Although the two datasets vary in source, corpus size, text genre, and concern different entity types, we find that their named entities demonstrate some similar characteristics.

Characteristic 1 *Named entity contains uncommon word(s); more than 92.2% of named entities each has at least one word that hardly appears in the common text.*

Table 2 reports the percentage of named entities that have words hardly appearing in common text (case sensitive); ‘common text’ here means the whole text with named entities excluded. The percentage is computed within a set that contains named entities and common text; and the set can be an entire dataset (e.g., CoNLL03 dataset) or only a splitting set (e.g., CoNLL03’s training set). Within a set, for a word w , the rate of its occurrences in named entities over the ones in the whole text is defined by Equation (1):

$$r(w) = \frac{f_{entity}(w)}{f_{entity}(w) + f_{common}(w)} \quad (1)$$

where $f_{entity}(w)$ denotes w ’s occurrences in named entities while $f_{common}(w)$ denotes its occurrences in common text. If $r(w)$ reaches a threshold t , then the word w is treated as hardly appearing in common text. For CoNLL03 and its splitting sets, t is set by 1; which means the word does not appear in common text. For OntoNotes* and its splitting sets, t is set by 0.95; because its annotation is imperfect: its common text contains some words that should be treated as named entities, such as ‘American.’⁸ We call such kind of words that hardly appear in common text *uncommon words*.

We can see that for a set, more than 92.2% of its named entities contain at least one uncommon word; and the phenomenon of uncommon words widely exists in CoNLL03 and OntoNotes* datasets as well as their training, development, and test sets. A corollary of this phenomenon is that for a dataset, the uncommon words of its development and test sets also hardly appear in the common text of its training set. This suggests that test set’s words that hardly appear in training set’s common text tend to predict named entities.

⁸The threshold $t = 0.95$ for OntoNotes* dataset is set by referring to a typical p -value threshold (i.e., 0.05) in statistical hypothesis testing. We think that the imperfect annotation should be controlled to an acceptable degree.

Characteristic 2 *Named entities are mainly made up of proper nouns. In the whole text, more than 84.8% of proper nouns appear in named entities; and within named entities, more than 80.1% of the words are proper nouns.*

We find that named entities are mainly made up of proper nouns. Table 3 lists the top 4 POS tags in named entities and their percentage over the whole tags in named entities (P_{entity}) and over the corresponding tags in the whole text (P_{text}). We can see that the top 4 POS tags in both of CoNLL03 and OntoNotes* are the same and they are NNP, JJ, NN, and NNPS. The P_{entity} of proper nouns (including NNP and NNPS) reaches more than 80.1%, and this indicates that named entities are mainly made up of proper nouns. The P_{text} of proper nouns reaches more than 84.8%, and this indicates that in the whole text, the proper nouns mainly appear in named entities.⁹ Within named entities, the JJ words are mainly the nationality words (e.g., ‘American’).

Explanation

The phenomena of the uncommon words and proper nouns in named entities can be explained by the process of annotation. An annotator annotates a sequence of word(s) as a named entity primarily because the annotator encounters in the sequence certain word(s) (e.g., ‘Boston’) that should be treated as (part of) a named entity, after that determines the sequence’s boundaries to get the named entity; and those words are mainly proper nouns. In perfect annotation, those words (e.g., ‘Boston’) would not appear in the common text of the dataset, including the training set and the test set.

4 UGTO: Named Entity Extraction with Uncommon Words

Characteristics 1 and 2 suggest that for a dataset, words of its development and test sets that hardly appear in the common text of training set tend to predict named entities; and they are mainly the proper nouns. This is our main idea for named entity extraction. Figure 1 visualizes the idea with a simple example: in the test set, words like ‘Boston’ and ‘Reuters’ that hardly appear in training set’s common text are likely to predict named entities. In practice, such words are also called *uncommon words* and they include two kinds: the first kind appear in training set’s named entities (e.g., ‘Boston’) while the second kind do not (e.g., ‘Reuters’). Following we illustrate how we develop the idea in UGTO.

UGTO models named entities under a CRFs framework and follows the CRFs procedure. UGTO includes four components: (1) uncommon word induction, (2) word lexicon, (3) UGTO scheme, and (4) named entity modeling.

Uncommon Word Induction¹⁰

For each dataset, the first kind of uncommon words are induced from the annotated training set. At the beginning,

⁹ P_{text} of proper nouns does not reach 100% mainly because individual dataset concerns certain types of named entities and partly because some NNP* words (e.g., ‘SURPRISE/NNP DEFEAT/NNP’) are POS tagging error.

¹⁰In analysis (Section 3), we analyze the phenomenon of the uncommon words using each of the annotated sets; but in experiments (Section 4 and 5), we induce the uncommon words from the annotated training set and unannotated test set.




Figure 1: Main idea: words (red font) of test set that hardly appear in training set’s common text (bottom-left) are likely to predict named entities. Such words include two kinds: the first kind (e.g., ‘Boston’) appear in training set’s named entities (top-left) while the second kind (e.g., ‘Reuters’) do not. Solid arrow denotes appearing while dashed arrow denotes hardly appearing.

Table 4: Number of entity tokens and trigger words

Category	#Entity Tokens	#Trigger Words
PER	8,474	31
LOC	831	18
ORG	-	69
MISC	353	29

there is an empty list L . For each word w in training set’s named entities, we compute its rate ($r(w)$) of hardly appearing in common text by Equation (1). If $r(w)$ reaches a threshold t , then we add w to L . Like the setting in Section 3, t is set by 1 for CoNLL03 and 0.95 for OntoNotes*.

The second kind of uncommon words are induced from the unannotated test set. They include the words (excluding those in L) that appear in the unannotated test set and do not appear in training set’s common text. Inducing them is to extract out-of-vocabulary named entities. Note that they can be only used in the test phase, because the unannotated test set is not available in the training phase.

Word Lexicon

Word lexicon includes two kinds of entity-related words: entity token and modifier. Entity tokens are collected from external sources. We collect from the entity list provided by CoNLL03 shared task (Sang and Meulder 2003) some PER and LOC entity tokens and from Wikipedia¹¹ some LOC and MISC entity tokens. Modifiers are collected from training set according to the dataset’s annotation guideline and include two kinds: generic modifier and trigger word. Generic modifiers can modify several types of entity tokens, such as ‘of’ and ‘and’; while trigger words modify a specific type of entity tokens, such as ‘Inc’ modifies ORG entity tokens. Unlike previous works (Kazama and Torisawa 2007; Ratnoff and Roth 2009) that use lexicon in word sequences,

¹¹https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lists_of_cities_by_country for LOC entity tokens. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lists_of_people_by_nationality for MISC entity tokens.

we use lexicon in words. For example, we do not use ‘Boston University’ but use ‘Boston’ and ‘University.’ Table 4 summarizes the number of entity tokens and trigger words; the generic modifiers include 17 words. We collect word lexicon for only CoNLL03’s entity types and use them for CoNLL03 and OntoNotes* datasets. Note that the word lexicon is collected with only a little effort and the size of nationality words (i.e., MISC entity tokens) and modifiers is far smaller than the one of words in named entities (517 vs. 23,698).

UGTO Scheme

The constituent-based UGTO scheme consists of four tags: U, G, T, and O; they indicate the constituents of named entity: Uncommon word, Generic modifier, Trigger word, and the words Outside named entity. U encodes the uncommon words and entity tokens. G encodes the generic modifiers while T encodes the trigger words.

Named Entity Modeling

Named entity modeling includes two parts: feature extraction and model learning and tagging.

Feature Extraction We extract three kinds of features: UGTO pre-tag features, word cluster features, and lexical & POS features. The i th word in text is denoted by w_i .

UGTO Pre-tag Features. UGTO pre-tag features are designed to encode the information of the uncommon words and word lexicon under UGTO scheme. Specifically, a word is pre-tagged by U if it satisfies two conditions: (1) it appears in the list L induced in Section 4 (the first kind of uncommon words) or does not appear in the common text of training set (the second kind of uncommon words); (2) it has a POS tag of NNP* or is matched by the entity tokens or is hyphenized by at least one entity token (e.g., ‘U.S.-based’ and ‘England-oriented’). A word is pre-tagged by G if it is matched by the generic modifiers. A word is pre-tagged by T if it is matched by the LOC, ORG, and MISC trigger words; the word that is matched by the PER trigger words is pre-tagged by a separate tag of TP. Other words are pre-tagged by O.

Besides, we use two features to indicate whether a word is matched by entity tokens and whether a word is matched by nationality words or hyphenized by entity tokens.

Word Cluster Features. We follow previous works (Miller, Guinness, and Zamanian 2004; Liang 2005) to derive the prefix paths of 4, 8, and 12 bits from a hierarchical word clusters as features for a word. In experiments, we use the publicly available word clusters; specifically, we use bllip-clusters¹² for CoNLL03 and use the one¹³ trained by OntoNotes 5.0 corpus (Pradhan et al. 2013) for OntoNotes*.

Lexical & POS Features. The lexical & POS features are widely used for NER and we extract three kinds of such features for w_i : (1) the word w_i itself, its lowercase, and its lemma; (2) whether its first letter is capitalized and whether it is the beginning of a sentence; and (3) its POS tag.

Table 5: Examples of named entity extraction. Color background indicates named entities.

Model with entity types in labeling tags	
(1)	Japan/U-LOC began/O its/O Asian/U-MISC Cup/T-MISC title/O with/O a/O lucky/O 2-1/O win/O against/O ...
(2)	UK/U-ORG Department/T-ORG of/G-ORG Transport/T-ORG on/O Friday/O said/O that/O ...
(3)	Australian/U-MISC Tom/U-PER Moody/U-PER took/O six/O for/O 82/O but/O ...
Model without entity types in labeling tags	
(4)	Japan/U began/O its/O Asian/U Cup/T title/O with/O a/O lucky/O 2-1/O win/O against/O ...
(5)	UK/U Department/T of/G Transport/T on/O Friday/O said/O that/O ...
(6)	Australian/U Tom/U Moody/U took/O six/O for/O 82/O but/O ...

For the UGTO pre-tag features and lexical & POS features, we extract them for w_i in a 5-word window, namely the features of w_{i-2} , w_{i-1} , w_i , w_{i+1} , and w_{i+2} . For the word cluster features we consider them for only the w_i .

Labeling Tag Assignment. We use UGTO scheme as our labeling tags. The words outside named entity are assigned with O. Within named entities, a word is assigned with U if it appears in the list L or has a POS of NNP* or is matched by entity tokens (including those with hyphens); a word is assigned with T if it is matched by the LOC, ORG, and MISC trigger words; otherwise it is assigned with G. (Note that the UGTO scheme is used as a kind of features in feature extraction and as the labeling tags in sequence tagging.)

Model Learning and Tagging UGTO uses Stanford Tagger¹⁴ to obtain word lemma and POS tags and uses CRF-Suite¹⁵ with its default parameters for modeling.

Although UGTO focuses on named entity extraction, the baselines concern the end-to-end NER task and use the entity types. To keep the comparisons fair, we incorporate the entity types into the labeling tags during model learning and tagging but remove the entity types during the evaluation so as to report the results of entity extraction. (The model without incorporating entity types is left to the factor analysis.) For the baselines, we try to preserve their performance by keeping their settings but also remove the entity types during the evaluation.

Named Entity Extraction. After sequence tagging, we extract named entities from the tagged sequences. For the model that incorporates entity types in labeling tags, those words that appear together and are tagged with same entity type form a named entity. See Example (1) ~ (3) in Table 5. For the model without incorporating entity types, the U, G, and T words (i.e., non-O words) that appear together form a named entity. See Example (4) ~ (6) in Table 5.

¹²<http://people.csail.mit.edu/maestro/papers/bllip-clusters.gz>

¹³<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B2ke42d0kYfN1ZSVExLN1YwX1E/view>

¹⁴<http://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tagger.shtml>

¹⁵<http://www.chokkan.org/software/crfsuite/>

Table 6: Entity extraction performance of UGTO and baselines on CoNLL03 and OntoNotes*

Dataset	Method	Dev.			Test		
		<i>Pr.</i>	<i>Re.</i>	F_1	<i>Pr.</i>	<i>Re.</i>	F_1
CoNLL03	StanfordNER	96.03	95.27	95.65	93.57	93.11	93.34
	LSTM-CRF	95.60	94.80	95.20	92.19	91.57	91.88
	UGTO	96.11	95.34	95.72	94.50	93.66	94.08
OntoNotes*	StanfordNER	93.19	91.57	92.38	93.58	91.45	92.50
	LSTM-CRF	92.19	92.63	92.41	93.03	92.60	92.81
	UGTO	93.25	91.96	92.60	93.47	92.79	93.13

5 Experiments

Setting

We evaluate UGTO on CoNLL03 and OntoNotes* datasets (detailed in Section 3) against two representative state-of-the-art baselines: StanfordNER and LSTM-CRF.

Baselines. Our baselines include StanfordNER (Finkel, Grenager, and Manning 2005) and LSTM-CRF (Lample et al. 2016). StanfordNER derives handcrafted features under CRFs with IO scheme (Inside-Outside). LSTM-CRF derives automatic features learned by long short-term memory networks (LSTMs) under CRFs with IOBES scheme (Beginning-Inside-End-Single-Outside). We use StanfordNER as the representative of the traditional methods and use LSTM-CRF as the representative of the neural network based methods. For the two baselines, we use their source codes to report their performance on the datasets.¹⁶

Evaluation Metrics. We use the CoNLL03 shared task’s evaluation toolkit¹⁷ to report the performance under the three standard metrics: *Precision*, *Recall*, and F_1 .

Overall Performance

Table 6 reports the overall performance of UGTO and baselines on the datasets.¹⁸ On CoNLL03, UGTO outperforms the baselines in all the measures. On OntoNotes*, UGTO achieves the best F_1 . In terms of error reduction, UGTO reduces up to 11.11% of errors in F_1 . Compared with StanfordNER which mainly treats the training set’s named entities as a kind of dictionary, UGTO explicitly takes into account the training set’s named entities and common text. Specifically, we induce two kinds of uncommon words and the second kind of uncommon words can help extract more out-of-vocabulary named entities.

Consider the LSTM-CRF. According to literature, LSTM-CRF significantly outperforms StanfordNER in NER task on CoNLL03; LSTM-CRF achieves 90.94% of F_1 on CoNLL03’s test set (Lample et al. 2016) while StanfordNER achieves only 86.86% (Finkel, Grenager, and Manning

¹⁶For StanfordNER, we use its 3.8.0 version with default setting except disuse the features of ‘useSequences’ and ‘usePrevSequences’ for saving memory; this setting training on CoNLL03 gets similar results compared with its provided model. For LSTM-CRF, we use its default parameters and its source code can be found at <https://github.com/glample/tagger>.

¹⁷Official version (Perl): <http://www.cnts.ua.ac.be/conll2000/chunking/conllev1.txt>; an alternative (Python): <https://github.com/spyysalo/conllev1.py>

¹⁸Note that Table 6 and 7 report only the performance of entity extraction.

2005). However, LSTM-CRF performs comparably with StanfordNER (and worse than UGTO) in entity extraction (see Table 6). That means the features learned by LSTM-CRF for entity classification do not improve the entity extraction performance. This gives ‘no’ answer to the question **Q2** and supports Chomsky’s view that semantics does not affect syntax (Chomsky 1957).

Factor Analysis

We conduct controlled experiments to further investigate the question **Q2** and analyze the impact of the main factors that are used in UGTO. Because of limited space, we report the results on only the test sets in Table 7.

To further investigate the question **Q2** we add to UGTO the GloVe embeddings, which are trained on Wikipedia 2014 and Gigaword 5 corpora to compute semantic vectors for words (Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014). We try all the 50, 100, 200, and 300 dimensional embeddings and the 50 dimensional version achieves the best result and we report that result. Table 7 shows that the embedding features do not further improve the extraction performance. This further confirms that the semantic features do not improve the syntactic extraction and supports Chomsky’s view (Chomsky 1957) that semantics does not affect syntax.

To analyze the impact of the UGTO pre-tag features we remove them from UGTO. From Table 7 we can see that the UGTO pre-tag features significantly improve the performance, with about absolute 2.0% improvements. This confirms the predictive power of the uncommon words.

To analyze the effect of addressing the difficulty of collecting the whole entity-related words, we remove the PER and LOC entity tokens from UGTO but keep the UGTO pre-tag features and other word lexicon; because the nationality words and modifiers are in a small size and they can be collected with little effort (see Section 4). We can see that the PER and LOC entity tokens improve the performance but their impact is far less significant than the impact of the UGTO pre-tag features. That means UGTO addresses that difficulty at the cost of only a little accuracy.

Entity types improve the performance, due to their function of separating some consecutive entities (compare Example (3) and (6) in Table 5). CoNLL03 dataset contains 304 pairs of consecutive entities, 1.73% of the total named entities; OntoNotes* contains 905 pairs, 1.78% of total. A post-processing should be helpful but we do not conduct in UGTO so as to keep the comparisons fair.

Table 7: Impact of factors. ‘+’ indicates adding the kind of factors to UGTO while ‘-’ indicates removing. ‘PER&LOC’ denotes the PER and LOC entity tokens.

Dataset	Method	Test		
		<i>Pr.</i>	<i>Re.</i>	<i>F₁</i>
CoNLL03	UGTO	94.50	93.66	94.08
	+Embeddings	93.54	92.58	93.06
	-UGTO Pre-tags	93.35	90.42	91.86
	-PER&LOC	94.20	92.25	93.21
	-Entity Types	93.37	93.54	93.45
	-Word Clusters	94.19	92.76	93.47
OntoNotes*	UGTO	93.47	92.79	93.13
	+Embeddings	93.25	92.84	93.04
	-UGTO Pre-tags	93.09	89.70	91.36
	-PER&LOC	93.41	92.71	92.06
	-Entity Types	92.71	92.90	92.80
	-Word Clusters	93.32	92.31	92.81

Table 8: Running time that UGTO and baselines cost to complete a whole training and test process

Method	CoNLL03	OntoNotes*
StanfordNER	5 minutes	101 minutes
LSTM-CRF	54 hours	984 hours
UGTO	4 minutes	53 minutes

Word clusters are helpful in UGTO (about 0.4% improvement) but not significant as their impact in some other works (Miller, Guinness, and Zamanian 2004; Liang 2005; Ratnoff and Roth 2009; Owoputi et al. 2013). Such little help is also reported by (Liu et al. 2011). The reason is that the uncommon words and UGTO pre-tag features already play a similar role as word clusters in connecting words at the abstraction level and improving the coverage.

Efficiency

Table 8 reports the runtime that UGTO and baselines cost to complete a whole training and test process on a Mac laptop (1.4GHz CPU and 8GB memory). LSTM-CRF is implemented by Python2.7; StanfordNER is by Java; and UGTO is by java with CRFSuite (which uses C). If ignoring the impact of the programming language, UGTO is more efficient than the two baselines, especially on the large-scale OntoNotes* dataset.

6 Discussion

Failure of Joint Syntactic and Semantic Parsings

If you accept Chomsky’s view that syntax does not appeal to semantics and semantics does not affect syntax (Chomsky 1957), you will immediately understand why most works for joint syntactic and semantic parsings fail to further improve the performance compared with the best separate models. Sutton and McCallum report that their approach for joint syntactic parsing and semantic role labeling gets negative results (Sutton and McCallum 2005). In the CoNLL08 shared task on joint syntactic and semantic parsings (Surdeanu et al. 2008), the system developed by Johansson and Nugues achieves the best results, but

they train separate syntactic and semantic submodels; they also report that their joint model fails to improve the performance compared with their submodels (Johansson and Nugues 2008). In the CoNLL09 shared task for joint syntactic and semantic parsings in multiple languages, the systems that perform the best are the ones that consider only the semantic parsing (Hajič et al. 2009). Recently, several researchers try a series of techniques to develop joint models for syntactic and semantic parsings on CoNLL08 and CoNLL09 datasets, but none of them can further improve the performance compared with the best separate models (Lluís, Carreras, and Màrquez 2013; Henderson et al. 2013; Swayamdipta et al. 2016; Shi and Zhang 2017). (The only successful joint model for syntactic and semantic parsings we could find in literature is the one developed by Li et al.; their joint model improves the performance on the Chinese datasets over their own pipeline model, without compared with the best separate models (Li, Zhou, and Ng 2010).) The reason of these failure is that in theory, syntax and semantics lie at different levels of linguistic analysis (Chomsky 1957; Katz and Fodor 1963); in practice, joint modeling of the syntactic and semantic parsings requires a tradeoff between the two parsings, and in that tradeoff the two parsings would affect each other.

Success of Joint Tasks at Same Level

Although it is discouraging to jointly model multiple tasks across the syntactic and semantic levels, it is promising to jointly model multiple tasks at the same level. Zhang and Clark jointly model Chinese word segmentation and POS tagging (Zhang and Clark 2008); Toutanova and Cherry jointly model lemmatization and POS tagging (Toutanova and Cherry 2009); Finkel and Manning jointly model NER and syntactic parsing (Finkel and Manning 2009a; 2010). These joint models successfully further improve the performance over the individual tasks. (The improvement in NER should be attributed to the improvement in entity extraction.) The reason of these success is that both of the individual tasks lie at the syntactic level and philosophically follow the same syntactic system and therefore can enhance each other.

7 Conclusion

We find from two benchmark datasets that uncommon words and proper nouns can distinguish named entities from common text and they are lexical and syntactic features. Experiments validate that lexical and syntactic features achieve state-of-the-art performance on entity extraction and that semantic features do not further improve the entity extraction performance, in both of our model and representative state-of-the-art baselines. This provides empirical evidence in terms of entity extraction supporting Chomsky’s view that syntax does not appeal to semantics and semantics does not affect syntax (Chomsky 1957). With Chomsky’s view, we also explain the failure of the joint syntactic and semantic parsings in other works. More generally, Chomsky’s syntactic theory together with the empirical results of our work and those works of joint syntactic and semantic parsings suggests us not to jointly model multiple tasks across the syntactic and semantic levels.

References

- Alex, B.; Haddow, B.; and Grover, C. 2007. Recognising nested named entities in biomedical text. In *BioNLP*.
- Asahara, M., and Matsumoto, Y. 2003. Japanese named entity extraction with redundant morphological analysis. In *NAACL*.
- Bikel, D. M.; Miller, S. L.; Schwartz, R. M.; and Weischedel, R. M. 1997. Nymble: A high-performance learning name-finder. In *ANLP*.
- Borthwick, A.; Sterling, J.; Agichtein, E.; and Grishman, R. 1998. Nyu: Description of the mene named entity system as used in muc-7. In *MUC-7*.
- Chen, H.-H., and Lee, J.-C. 1996. Identification and classification of proper nouns in chinese texts. In *COLING*.
- Chinchor, N. A. 1997. Muc-7 named entity task definition. In *MUC-7*.
- Chiu, J. P., and Nichols, E. 2016. Named entity recognition with bidirectional lstm-cnns. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 4:357–370.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton Publishers.
- Collins, M., and Singer, Y. 1999. Unsupervised models for named entity classification. In *EMNLP*.
- Collins, M. 2002. Ranking algorithms for named-entity extraction: Boosting and the voted perceptron. In *ACL*.
- Collobert, R.; Weston, J.; Bottou, L.; Karlen, M.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; and Kuksa, P. P. 2011. Natural language processing (almost) from scratch. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12:2493–2537.
- Doddington, G.; Mitchell, A.; Przybocki, M.; Ramshaw, L.; Strassel, S.; and Weischedel, R. 2004. The automatic content extraction (ace) program tasks, data, and evaluation. In *LREC*.
- Finkel, J. R., and Manning, C. 2009a. Joint parsing and named entity recognition. In *NAACL*.
- Finkel, J. R., and Manning, C. 2009b. Nested named entity recognition. In *EMNLP*.
- Finkel, J. R., and Manning, C. 2010. Hierarchical joint learning: Improving joint parsing and named entity recognition with non-jointly labeled data. In *ACL*.
- Finkel, J. R.; Grenager, T.; and Manning, C. 2005. Incorporating non-local information into information extraction systems by gibbs sampling. In *ACL*.
- Giuliano, C. 2009. Fine-grained classification of named entities exploiting latent semantic kernels. In *CoNLL*.
- Grishman, R., and Sundheim, B. 1996. Message understanding conference - 6: A brief history. In *MUC-6*.
- Hajič, J.; Ciaramita, M.; Johansson, R.; Kawahara, D.; Martí, M. A.; Màrquez, L.; Meyers, A.; Nivre, J.; Padó, S.; Štěpánek, P.; Surdeanu, M.; Xue, N.; and Zhang, Y. 2009. The conll-2009 shared task: Syntactic and semantic dependencies in multiple languages. In *CoNLL*.
- Henderson, J.; Merlo, P.; Titov, I.; and Musillo, G. 2013. Multilingual joint parsing of syntactic and semantic dependencies with a latent variable model. *Computational Linguistics* 39(4):949–998.
- Huang, Z.; Xu, W.; and Yu, K. 2015. Bidirectional lstm-crf models for sequence tagging. In *arXiv*.
- Johansson, R., and Nugues, P. 2008. Dependency-based syntactic-semantic analysis with propbank and nombank. In *CoNLL*.
- Katz, J. J., and Fodor, J. A. 1963. The structure of a semantic theory. *Language* 39(2):170–210.
- Kazama, J., and Torisawa, K. 2007. Exploiting wikipedia as external knowledge for named entity recognition. In *EMNLP/CoNLL*.
- Lafferty, J.; McCallum, A.; and Pereira, F. 2001. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. In *ICML*.
- Lample, G.; Ballesteros, M.; Subramanian, S.; Kawakami, K.; and Dyer, C. 2016. Neural architecture for named entity recognition. In *NAACL*.
- Li, J.; Zhou, G.; and Ng, H. T. 2010. Joint syntactic and semantic parsing of chinese. In *ACL*.
- Liang, P. 2005. Semi-supervised learning for natural language. Master’s thesis, MIT.
- Ling, X., and Weld, D. S. 2012. Fine-grained entity recognition. In *AAAI*.
- Ling, W.; Dyer, C.; Black, A. W.; Trancoso, I.; Fernandez, R.; Amir, S.; Marujo, L.; and Luis, T. 2015. Finding function in form: Compositional character models for open vocabulary word representation. In *EMNLP*.
- Liu, X.; Zhang, S.; Wei, F.; and Zhou, M. 2011. Recognizing named entities in tweets. In *ACL*.
- Liu, L.; Shang, J.; Ren, X.; Xu, F. F.; Gui, H.; Peng, J.; and Han, J. 2018. Empower sequence labeling with task-aware neural language model. In *AAAI*.
- Lluís, X.; Carreras, X.; and Màrquez, L. 2013. Joint arc-factored parsing of syntactic and semantic dependencies. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 1:219–230.
- Luo, G.; Huang, X.; Lin, C.-Y.; and Nie, Z. 2015. Joint named entity recognition and disambiguation. In *EMNLP*.
- Ma, X., and Hovy, E. 2016. End-to-end sequence labeling via bi-directional lstm-cnns-crf. In *ACL*.
- Maynard, D.; Tablan, V.; Ursu, C.; Cunningham, H.; and Wilks, Y. 2001. Named entity recognition from diverse text types. In *RANLP*.
- McCallum, A., and Li, W. 2003. Early results for named entity recognition with conditional random fields, feature induction and web-enhanced lexicons. In *CoNLL*.
- Miller, S.; Guinness, J.; and Zamanian, A. 2004. Name tagging with word clusters and discriminative training. In *NAACL*.
- Minkov, E.; Wang, R. C.; and Cohen, W. W. 2005. Extracting personal names from email: Applying named entity recognition to informal text. In *EMNLP*.

- Nadeau, D., and Sekine, S. 2007. A survey of named entity recognition and classification. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 30(1):3–26.
- Nakashole, N.; Tylenda, T.; and Weikum, G. 2013. Fine-grained semantic typing of emerging entities. In *ACL*.
- Owoputi, O.; O'Connor, B.; Dyer, C.; Gimpel, K.; Schneider, N.; and Smith, N. A. 2013. Improved part-of-speech tagging for online conversational text with word clusters. In *NAACL*.
- Passos, A.; Kumar, V.; and McCallum, A. 2014. Lexicon infused phrase embeddings for named entity resolution. In *CoNLL*.
- Pennington, J.; Socher, R.; and Manning, C. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *EMNLP*.
- Peters, M. E.; Ammar, W.; Bhagavatula, C.; and Power, R. 2017. Semi-supervised sequence tagging with bidirectional language models. In *ACL*.
- Poibeau, T., and Koseim, L. 2001. Proper name extraction from non-journalistic texts. *Language and Computers* 37:144–157.
- Pradhan, S.; Moschitti, A.; Xue, N.; Ng, H. T.; Bjorkelund, A.; Uryupina, O.; Zhang, Y.; and Zhong, Z. 2013. Towards robust linguistic analysis using ontonotes. In *CoNLL*.
- Ratinov, L., and Roth, D. 2009. Design challenges and misconceptions in named entity recognition. In *CoNLL*.
- Ravin, Y., and Wacholder, N. 1997. Extracting names from natural-language text. Technical report.
- Ritter, A.; Clark, S.; Mausam; and Etzioni, O. 2011. Named entity recognition in tweets: An experimental study. In *EMNLP*.
- Sang, E. F. T. K., and Meulder, F. D. 2003. Introduction to the conll-2003 shared task: Language-independent named entity recognition. In *CoNLL*.
- Santos, C. N. D., and Guimaraes, V. 2015. Boosting named entity recognition with neural character embeddings. In *5th Named Entities Workshop*.
- Sekine, S. 1998. Nyu: Description of the japanese ne system used for met-2. In *MUC-7*.
- Shi, P., and Zhang, Y. 2017. Joint bi-affine parsing and semantic role labeling. In *IALP*.
- Silva, J. F. D.; Kozareva, Z.; and Lopes, J. G. P. 2004. Cluster analysis and classification of named entities. In *LREC*.
- Strubell, E.; Verga, P.; Belanger, D.; and McCallum, A. 2017. Fast and accurate entity recognition with iterated dilated convolutions. In *EMNLP*.
- Surdeanu, M.; Johansson, R.; Meyers, A.; Màrquez, L.; and Nivre, J. 2008. The conll-2008 shared task on joint parsing of syntactic and semantic dependencies. In *CoNLL*.
- Sutton, C., and McCallum, A. 2005. Joint parsing and semantic role labeling. In *CoNLL*.
- Swayamdipta, S.; Ballesteros, M.; Dyer, C.; and Smith, N. A. 2016. Greedy, joint syntactic-semantic parsing with stack lstms. In *CoNLL*.
- Toutanova, K., and Cherry, C. 2009. A global model for joint lemmatization and part-of-speech prediction. In *ACL/IJCNLP*.
- Wang, L.-J.; Li, W.-C.; and Chang, C.-H. 1992. Recognizing unregistered names for mandarin word identification. In *COLING*.
- Yu, S.; Bai, S.; and Wu, P. S. 1998. Description of the kent ridge digital labs system used for muc-7. In *MUC-7*.
- Zhang, Y., and Clark, S. 2008. Joint word segmentation and pos tagging using a single perceptron. In *ACL*.
- Zhong, X., and Cambria, E. 2018. Time expression recognition using a constituent-based tagging scheme. In *WWW*.
- Zhong, X.; Sun, A.; and Cambria, E. 2017. Time expression analysis and recognition using syntactic token types and general heuristic rules. In *ACL*.