

TERMinator: A system for scientific texts processing

Elena Bruches

A.P. Ershov Institute of Informatics Systems / Russia
Novosibirsk State University / Russia
bruches@bk.ru

Yana Dementyeva

Novosibirsk State University / Russia
y.dementeva@g.nsu.ru

Olga Tikhobaeva

Novosibirsk State University / Russia
o.tikhobaeva@g.nsu.ru

Tatiana Batura

A.P. Ershov Institute of Informatics Systems / Russia
tbatura@iis.nsk.su

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the extraction of entities and semantic relations between them from scientific texts, where we consider scientific terms as entities. In this paper, we present a dataset that includes annotations for two tasks and develop a system called TERMinator for the study of the influence of language models on term recognition and comparison of different approaches for relation extraction. Experiments show that language models pre-trained on the target language are not always show the best performance. Also adding some heuristic approaches may improve the overall quality of the particular task. The developed tool and the annotated corpus are publicly available at <https://github.com/iis-research-team/terminator> and may be useful for other researchers.

1 Introduction

Nowadays the amount of scientific publications is constantly growing. In this regard, the processing of scientific texts becomes especially relevant in relation to rapidly developing scientific fields, for example, computer science. Information extraction from scientific texts can be useful in domain-specific areas, for completion of knowledge graphs, in search and question-answering systems. This paper describes the study on entity recognition and relation extraction from scientific texts on computer science in Russian.

Currently, there are a number of datasets with annotations of entities and relations in a general domain (Doddingon et al., 2004; Roth and Yih, 2004; Loukachevitch et al., 2021), biomedical domain (Kim et al., 2003; Gurulingappa et al., 2012; Li et al., 2016), or even multi-domains (Terryn et al., 2020). Still it is more difficult to find a publicly available dataset such as SciERC (Luan et al., 2018) for scientific fields other than biomedical, and especially in languages other than English.

Despite that the named entity recognition task is well studied, it still faces multiple challenges (Li et al., 2022a), namely, NER in domain-specific areas (Weber et al., 2021), NER from noisy data (Derczynski et al., 2017), code-mixed data (Fetahu et al., 2021), and detection of fine-grained and nested named entities (Kim and Kim, 2021; Ringland et al., 2019; Loukachevitch et al., 2021). This is caused by several issues: defining boundaries of compound terms; recognition of whether a lexical unit is part of a compound term; identification of a lexical unit as a term depending on the context and topic of the text in which this lexical unit is used etc. The relation extraction task also remains an unsolved problem, as it often requires the use of knowledge outside the text (for example, from knowledge bases or obtained in another way), and also due to the lack of a large amount of labeled data in different languages.

Selection of the most appropriate language model, which is able to provide the best quality for extraction of terms and relations from scientific texts is one of the relevant issues. Our experimental results not only show the usefulness of the proposed dataset, but also provide baselines for further research.

We make the following contributions:

- Provide a new dataset for both tasks (term recognition and relation extraction) for Russian scientific texts and develop a TERMinator tool for further research experiments.
- Study of influence of language models (without additional information, with heuristics and dictionaries) on term extraction.
- Compare three approaches for relation extraction (based on lexical patterns, classification with a CLS-vector, and combination of them).

2 Related Work

Entity recognition and relation extraction are the main tasks in information extraction. There are various approaches to solve them.

A traditional approach includes two stages: extracting n-grams which potentially may be terms, and then classification whether this n-gram is a term or not. In (Stanković et al., 2016) authors proposed to use dictionaries and morphological and syntax information. There are some works which use pre-defined ontologies for terms extraction (Ivanisenko et al., 2020). Another idea is to solve this task as a sequence labeling (Kucza et al., 2018). It allows to implement terms extraction in one stage and take into account syntax and semantic information from the context. For terms extraction the main challenge is to identify the exact term boundaries. In (Zhu and Li, 2022) authors proposed to use boundary smoothing as a regularization technique to overcome this problem.

Relation extraction is usually considered as a classification problem: for two given terms one needs to determine whether there is a semantic relation between them or not, and if they are related then to define its type. Some works describe the use of knowledge bases for relation extraction (Li et al., 2019; Baldini Soares et al., 2019). With the spread of transformers-based architectures, different pre-trained language models are used to solve this task (Shi and Lin, 2019). Some researchers try to make use of incorporating external data sources in the model, for example the list of hand-written syntax patterns (Tao et al., 2019), information about sentence syntax tree (Ningthoujam et al., 2019; Nayak and Ng, 2019).

Recently, special attention has been paid to systems which solve terms recognition and relation extraction jointly. The authors propose an architecture that sequentially extracts entities and relationships between them, but in end-to-end settings (Eberts and Ulges, 2020; Ji et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2019; Miwa and Bansal, 2016). Another idea is to train a model with two outputs: one output is for term extraction, and the other is for relation extraction (Xue et al., 2019). However such approaches require quite a lot of annotated data to find hidden regularities.

3 Data Preparation

For the experiments we create an annotated dataset, which consists of abstracts of scientific papers on

Information Technology in Russian.

As entities we consider nouns or noun groups, which are terms in this particular domain. Terms that we recognize as entities may consist of one or several tokens (“*software*”, “*non-preemptive multi-tasking*”), abbreviations (“*CPU*”, “*DLL*”), names of programming languages (“*Python*”, “*C++*”) and libraries (“*Pytorch*”, “*SpaCy*”), hyphenated concepts containing Latin characters (“*n-gram*”, “*web-service*”). Thereby we consider all possible chains of tokens that can be terms, except for those that are recursive or overlap. The entities are marked in the BIO format: each token is assigned a B-TERM tag if it is the initial tag for an entity, I-TERM if it is inside a term, or O if it is outside any entity.

Statistics for our dataset is presented in Table 1.

Unit	train	test
texts	136	80
tokens	12 809	11 157
terms	2 028	2 027
relations	356	620

Table 1: Dataset statistics

The list of relations is selected based on the following criteria. At first, a relation should be monosemantic (for example, we don’t consider a semantic relation $\langle \textit{Entity-Destination} \rangle$ because it has indirect meaning as well). Secondly, a relation should link scientific terms (for example, in relation $\langle \textit{Communication-Topic} \rangle$ (an act of communication is about topic) the actants are not scientific terms). Thus, six semantic relations were selected. Types of relations in a corpus, their meanings and distribution by train and test sets are presented in Table 2.

Relation type	Meaning	train	test
CAUSE	x is the cause of y	19	19
ISA	x is y	96	93
PART_OF	x is part of y	23	87
SYNONYMS	x is the same as y	35	22
TOOL	x allows to create/etc. y	54	38
USAGE	x is used for/in y	126	330

Table 2: Types of relations

Here is a sample sentence where two terms and the relation between them are highlighted: *Pokazany preimushchestva primeneniya* $\langle e1 \rangle$ *mul’timedijnyh tekhnologij* $\langle /e1 \rangle$ $\langle e2 \rangle$ *uchebnom processe* $\langle /e2 \rangle$ *i effektivnost’ ih ispol’zovaniya vo vremya lekcij i seminarov*. (The advantages of using multimedia technologies in the educational process and the effectiveness of

their use during lectures and seminars are shown.). The relation between $e1$ and $e2$ is *USAGE*.

The dataset is available for other researchers¹.

4 Influence of language models on term extraction

4.1 Models without additional information

The experimental methodology is as follows: texts are fed as input; during the vectorization procedure, each text is divided into spans (in our case these are BPE tokens), each of which is assigned to a vector. Initially, the model learns to match tokens with labels by using the training data; then based on the revealed regularities the model makes predictions on the validation data. In this way, the metrics are fixed after each training epoch. The output is a set of labels associated by the system with each word from the input text.

We experimented with two models: multilingual BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and BERT pre-trained on Russian texts (Kuratov and Arkhipov, 2019).

In the first stage of the experiment each pre-trained language model was fine-tuned on the train set described above. The optimal learning rate was chosen as 10^{-6} , and the batch size was 12. Such values prevent overfitting and obtain the best results. At this stage, the metrics show that on partial match both models give the same performance, while in exact match the model pre-trained on Russian-language texts gives better scores.

Then we extended a train set by adding 212 texts with a pseudo labeling method. We collected a dictionary (list of scientific terms) in a semi-automatic way:

- We extracted 2-, 3- and 4-grams from the scientific papers and manually filtered phrases, which potentially can be terms.
- We extracted all titles of articles from Wikipedia, which are included in a subgraph of category “Science”, and then manually selected words and phrases, which potentially can be terms.

Thus we obtained a list of 17 252 terms, which we used for pseudo labeling. This technique is useful for rapidly changing areas of knowledge, when it is difficult to have dictionaries of terms and keep them up to date.

¹<https://github.com/iis-research-team/ruserrc-dataset>

Due to the less detailed checking of the markup of the corpus, even with its comparatively large size, the metrics received with the models trained on it turned out to be lower than those of the same models trained on the manual annotated texts.

4.2 Models with heuristics

Experimentally we found out that in order to improve the quality of term extraction, we need to improve the definition of term boundaries. The task of defining terms’ boundaries is more challenging than classifying a token as a “term” type. To improve the recognition of term boundaries, we apply some heuristics to handle such cases as removing a preposition as a first token of a term and some others. From the results shown in Table 3, it can be seen that the heuristics improve the quality of term extraction on the exact match.

4.3 Models with heuristics and dictionaries

In the third stage, the system extracts terms not only with the trained model, but also with the use of the dictionary described above. Heuristics are also applied.

Table 3 shows that the ruBERT model fine-tuned on the manually annotated train set extracts the terms in half of the cases, which is the best result of a exact match. On the pseudo-labeled train set, this combined method gives good results for the multilingual BERT both for exact and partial matches.

Both models solve the task of term recognition with a high quality, which can be seen from the good results on a partial match. The best result on an exact match pertains to the RuBERT model supported by a dictionary and heuristics. The results of the models on the exact match are expectedly lower than the results on a partial match, which again draws our attention to the task of defining terms’ boundaries in texts.

The markup quality significantly affects the quality, as we can note from a comparison of the results of the first and second stages of the experiment (see Sections 4.1, 4.2). Fine-tuning on the manually-annotated training set gives better performance than fine-tuning on the pseudo-labeled training set, even though its size is larger than the size of the manually-annotated one. It is hard to compare results with other researchers as this is the first corpora for scientific texts in Russian as far as we know. But for the similar dataset in English

Train set	Model	F-M P	F-M R	F-M F1	P-M P	P-M R	P-M F1
Manually labeled	mBERT	0.40	0.46	0.43	0.89	0.88	0.88
	mBERT + h	0.49	0.45	0.47	0.86	0.86	0.86
	mBERT + d + h	0.47	0.50	0.48	0.86	0.87	0.87
	ruBERT	0.48	0.50	0.49	0.89	0.88	0.88
	ruBERT + h	0.52	0.47	0.49	0.89	0.88	0.88
Pseudo labeled	ruBERT + d + h	0.49	0.51	0.50	0.86	0.87	0.87
	mBERT	0.33	0.34	0.34	0.80	0.75	0.75
	mBERT + h	0.42	0.38	0.40	0.80	0.79	0.79
	mBERT + d + h	0.41	0.39	0.40	0.80	0.80	0.80
	ruBERT	0.32	0.32	0.33	0.78	0.76	0.75
ruBERT + h	0.40	0.37	0.38	0.79	0.79	0.79	
ruBERT + h + d	0.38	0.39	0.38	0.79	0.74	0.76	

Table 3: Metrics for full match (F-M) and partial match (P-M) terms extraction; *d* is for dictionary, *h* is for heuristics.

SciERC (Luan et al., 2018) the authors (Eberts and Ulges, 2020) reported F1-measure to be 0.70.

We observed that for the term extraction task the model mistakes in recognizing the exact term boundaries. Another problem arises when a term is divided by other words or signs in the sentence, for example, "*Morphological and syntax analysis*". Probably, it should be solved at a post-processing stage.

5 Comparison of approaches for relation extraction

5.1 Using lexical patterns

At first, we applied an approach for relation identification based on lexical patterns. It consists in the following: for texts with tagged terms, we extract a context between each pair of terms, lemmatize it, and compare it with the lexical patterns. If they match, these two terms are connected by this relation. The length of the context should not exceed six words. This value was obtained experimentally by changing it and comparing the quality of the model. The obtained metrics for this approach are shown in Table 4. We used 111 patterns; examples of patters and their distribution by relations are presented in Table 5.

Relation type	Precision	Recall	F1
CAUSE	0.07	0.05	0.06
ISA	0.18	0.19	0.19
PART_OF	0.17	0.14	0.15
SYNONYMS	0.23	0.82	0.35
TOOL	0.06	0.08	0.07
USAGE	0.21	0.39	0.27
NO-RELATION	0.96	0.92	0.94
macro-average	0.27	0.37	0.29

Table 4: Metrics for lexical pattern’s approach

5.2 Classification task with a CLS-vector

The second approach we used for the relation extraction is similar to R-BERT, and is used by other authors (Hosseini et al., 2022; Aldahdooh et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022b). We consider the task of relation extraction as a classification task (with 7 classes of relations: CAUSE, ISA, PART-OF, SYNONYMS, TOOL, USAGE, NO-RELATION). We take the vector of a special token CLS (it is considered as a vector of the input text) and the vector of two terms (connected by the relation). These three vectors are concatenated and the resulting vector is fed to the classifier (Wu and He, 2019). We tried to use three different language models: mBERT, ruBERT (Kuratov and Arhipov, 2019) and cointegrated/rubert-tiny2.

In addition, some features of the training are noteworthy. Firstly, to train the models, we used the corpus of Russian texts without dividing it into training and validation sets, and the most appropriate number of epochs was selected experimentally, because there are very few examples for some relations, and therefore the validation set would be unrepresentative to determine the quality of the model. Secondly, to reduce the imbalance between the number of examples in the classes, we added only 50% of the randomly selected pairs of terms to the training set, excluding those with the distance between tokens more than 10.

Finally, we implemented an ensemble which includes both approaches: model and lexical patterns. All metrics are presented in Table 6. F1-score for all types of relations for combined approach are presented in Table 7. For comparison, the state-of-the-art result achieved on SciERC with the SpERT (using SciBERT) method is 50.84% for relation extraction (Eberts and Ulges, 2020). Our results

Relation type	Examples of patterns (transliteration)	Examples of patterns (translation)	N
CAUSE	<i>Uvelichivsheesya potreblenie rafinirovannyh produktov pitaniya yavlyaetsya prichinoy mnozhestva takih zabolevanij.</i>	Increased consumption of refined foods is the cause of many diseases.	23
ISA	<i>Odnim iz samyh tochnyh i effektivnyh sposobov upravleniya zhestami yavlyaetsya upravlenie aktivnost'yu myshc.</i>	One of the most accurate and effective ways to control gestures is to control muscle activity.	13
PART_OF	<i>Process referirovaniya sostoit iz pyati osnovnyh shagov.</i>	The referencing process consists of five main steps.	5
SYNONYMS	<i>Stat'ya posvyashchena issledovaniyu vertikal'nogo poleta robota s mashushchim krylom, takzhe nazvaemogo ornitopterom.</i>	The article is devoted to the study of the vertical flight of a robot with a flap wing, also called an ornithopter.	5
TOOL	<i>V stat'e predstavlen opyt razrabotki informacionnoj sistemy, avtomatiziruyushchej process raspredeleniya studentov po bazam praktik.</i>	The article presents the experience of development of the information system, which automates the process of distribution of students by the bases of practice.	29
USAGE	<i>V nastoyashchee vremya aktivno razvivaetsya napravlenie, svyazannoe s proektirovaniem neronnyh setej dlya ispol'zovaniya v mobil'nyh ustroystvah.</i>	Currently, the development of neural networks for use on mobile devices is growing rapidly.	36

Table 5: Examples of lexical patterns

may also be related to insufficient data, as Russian is morphologically rich, which additionally complicates the work of the language model. Moreover, error analysis of relation extraction revealed that relations are often present implicitly between terms and one can recognize them if one only knows these particular terms. Quite many terms in IT texts are abstract (for example, "program implementation", "testing", etc.) and it can be difficult to define, whether there is any semantic relation between them or not. We plan to study this aspects in the future.

Model	Precision	Recall	F1
mBERT	0.26	0.32	0.26
ruBERT	0.26	0.34	0.27
rubert-tiny2	0.22	0.23	0.22
mBERT + p	0.26	0.41	0.29
ruBERT + p	0.29	0.35	0.28
rubert-tiny2 + p	0.29	0.24	0.24

Table 6: Metrics for different language models and combined approach; *p* is for patterns

Relation type	mBERT	ruBERT	ruBERT-tiny2
CAUSE	0.06	0.09	0.10
ISA	0.30	0.28	0.14
PART_OF	0.14	0.04	0.00
SYNONYMS	0.32	0.33	0.38
TOOL	0.04	0.07	0.00
USAGE	0.27	0.22	0.11
NO-RELATION	0.93	0.95	0.94
macro-average	0.29	0.28	0.24

Table 7: F1-score for all types of relations for combined approach

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we built a new dataset and study several methods for term recognition and relation extraction from computer science texts in Russian. We conducted several experiments with different pre-trained language models for both tasks. The results of our experiments show that language models pre-trained on the target language are not always show the best performance. Also adding some heuristic approaches may improve the overall quality for the particular task.

References

- Jehad Aldahdooh, Ziaurrehman Tanoli, and Jing Tang. 2021. R-bert-cnn: Drug-target interactions extraction from biomedical literature. In *Proceedings of the BioCreative VII Challenge Evaluation Workshop*, pages 102–106. BioCreative VII challenge and workshop ; Conference date: 08-11-2021 Through 10-11-2021.
- Livio Baldini Soares, Nicholas FitzGerald, Jeffrey Ling, and Tom Kwiatkowski. 2019. [Matching the blanks: Distributional similarity for relation learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2895–2905, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Leon Derczynski, Eric Nichols, Marieke van Erp, and Nut Limsopatham. 2017. Results of the wnut2017 shared task on novel and emerging entity recognition. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text*, pages 140–147.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep

- bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, volume 15, pages 4171–4186. Association for Computational Linguistics Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- George Doddington, Alexis Mitchell, Mark Przybocki, Lance Ramshaw, Stephanie Strassel, and Ralph Weischedel. 2004. [The automatic content extraction \(ACE\) program – tasks, data, and evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'04)*, Lisbon, Portugal. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Markus Eberts and Adrian Ulges. 2020. Span-based joint entity and relation extraction with transformer pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 24th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
- Besnik Fetahu, Anjie Fang, Oleg Rokhlenko, and Shervin Malmasi. 2021. Gazetteer Enhanced Named Entity Recognition for Code-Mixed Web Queries. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1677–1681.
- Harsha Gurulingappa, Abdul Mateen Rajput, Angus Roberts, Juliane Fluck, Martin Hofmann-Apitius, and Luca Toldo. 2012. Development of a benchmark corpus to support the automatic extraction of drug-related adverse effects from medical case reports. *J. of Biomedical Informatics*, 45(5):885–892.
- Pedram Hosseini, David A. Broniatowski, and Mona Diab. 2022. [Knowledge-augmented language models for cause-effect relation classification](#). In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Commonsense Representation and Reasoning (CSRR 2022)*, pages 43–48, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weipeng Huang, Xingyi Cheng, Taifeng Wang, and Wei Chu. 2019. [Bert-based multi-head selection for joint entity-relation extraction](#). In *Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing: 8th CCF International Conference, NLPCC 2019, Dunhuang, China, October 9–14, 2019, Proceedings, Part II*, page 713–723, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Timofey V. Ivanisenko, Olga V. Saik, Pavel S. Demenkov, Nikita V. Ivanisenko, Alexander N. Savostianov, and Vladimir A. Ivanisenko. 2020. [Anddige: a new web-based module of andsystem for the search of knowledge in the scientific literature](#). *BMC Bioinformatics*, 21(Suppl 11):228.
- Bin Ji, Jie Yu, Shasha Li, Jun Ma, Qingbo Wu, Yusong Tan, and Huijun Liu. 2020. [Span-based joint entity and relation extraction with attention-based span-specific and contextual semantic representations](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 88–99, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Hongjin Kim and Harksoo Kim. 2021. Fine-grained named entity recognition using a multi-stacked feature fusion and dual-stacked output in korean. *Applied Sciences*, 11(22):10795.
- Jin-Dong Kim, Tomoko Ohta, Yuka Tateisi, and Jun’ichi Tsujii. 2003. Genia corpus—a semantically annotated corpus for bio-textmining. *Bioinformatics*, 19(suppl_1):i180–i182.
- Maren Kucza, Jan Niehues, Thomas Zenkel, Alex Waibel, and Sebastian Stuker. 2018. Term extraction via neural sequence labeling a comparative evaluation of strategies using recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of Interspeech 2018*, pages 2072–2076, Hyderabad, India.
- Yuri Kuratov and Mikhail Arkhipov. 2019. [Adaptation of deep bidirectional multilingual transformers for russian language](#). In *Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies: Proceedings of the International Conference “Dialogue 2019”*, volume arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07213, pages 333–339.
- Jiao Li, Yueping Sun, Robin J. Johnson, Daniela Sciaky, Chih-Hsuan Wei, Robert Leaman, Allan Peter Davis, Carolyn J. Mattingly, Thomas C. Wieggers, and Zhiyong Lu. 2016. [BioCreative V CDR task corpus: a resource for chemical disease relation extraction](#). *Database*, 2016. Baw068.
- Jing Li, Aixin Sun, Jianglei Han, and Chenliang Li. 2022a. A survey on deep learning for named entity recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 34:50–70.
- Peng-Hsuan Li, Ting-Fu Chen, Jheng-Ying Yu, Shang-Hung Shih, Chan-Hung Su, Yin-Hung Lin, Huai-Kuang Tsai, Hsueh-Fen Juan, Chien-Yu Chen, and Jia-Hsin Huang. 2022b. [pubmedKB: an interactive web server for exploring biomedical entity relations in the biomedical literature](#). *Nucleic Acids Research*, 50(W1):W616–W622.
- Pengfei Li, Kezhi Mao, Xuefeng Yang, and Qi Li. 2019. [Improving relation extraction with knowledge-attention](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 229–239, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Natalia Loukachevitch, Ekaterina Artemova, Tatiana Batura, Pavel Braslavski, Iliia Denisov, Vladimir Ivanov, Suresh Manandhar, Alexander Pugachev, and Elena Tutubalina. 2021. [Nerel: A russian dataset with nested named entities, relations and events](#). In *Proceedings of Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*, page 876–885.

- Yi Luan, Luheng He, Mari Ostendorf, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2018. [Multi-task identification of entities, relations, and coreference for scientific knowledge graph construction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3219–3232, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Makoto Miwa and Mohit Bansal. 2016. [End-to-end relation extraction using LSTMs on sequences and tree structures](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1105–1116, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tapas Nayak and Hwee Tou Ng. 2019. [Effective attention modeling for neural relation extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 603–612, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dhanachandra Ningthoujam, Shweta Yadav, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, and Asif Ekbal. 2019. [Relation extraction between the clinical entities based on the shortest dependency path based lstm](#). *ArXiv*, arXiv:1903.09941. Version 1.
- Nicky Ringland, Xiang Dai, Ben Hachey, Sarvnaz Karimi, Cecile Paris, and James R Curran. 2019. NNE: A dataset for nested named entity recognition in english newswire. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 5176–5181.
- Dan Roth and Wen-tau Yih. 2004. [A linear programming formulation for global inference in natural language tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL-2004) at HLT-NAACL 2004*, pages 1–8, Boston, Massachusetts, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Peng Shi and Jimmy Lin. 2019. [Simple bert models for relation extraction and semantic role labeling](#). *ArXiv*, arXiv:1904.05255. Version 1.
- Ranka Stanković, Cvetana Krstev, Ivan Obradović, Biljana Lazić, and Aleksandra Trtovac. 2016. [Rule-based automatic multi-word term extraction and lemmatization](#). In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'16)*, pages 507–514, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Qiongxing Tao, Xiangfeng Luo, and Hao Wang. 2019. Enhancing relation extraction using syntactic indicators and sentential contexts. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*, pages 574–580, Piscataway, NJ.
- Ayla Rigouts Terry, Veronique Hoste, and Els Lefever. 2020. In no uncertain terms: a dataset for monolingual and multilingual automatic term extraction from comparable corpora. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 54:385–418.
- Leon Weber, Mario Sanger, Jannes Munchmeyer, Maryam Habibi, Ulf Leser, and Alan Akbik. 2021. Hunflair: an easy-to-use tool for state-of-the-art biomedical named entity recognition. *Bioinformatics*, 37(17):2792–2794.
- Shanchan Wu and Yifan He. 2019. [Enriching pre-trained language model with entity information for relation classification](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 2361–2364. ACM.
- Kui Xue, Yangming Zhou, Zhiyuan Ma, Tong Ruan, Huanhuan Zhang, and Ping He. 2019. Fine-tuning bert for joint entity and relation extraction in chinese medical text. In *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 892–897.
- Enwei Zhu and Jinpeng Li. 2022. [Boundary smoothing for named entity recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7096–7108. Association for Computational Linguistics.