

# EasyECR: A Library for Easy Implementation and Evaluation of Event Coreference Resolution Models

Yuncong Li<sup>♣</sup>, Tianhua Xu<sup>♣\*</sup>, Sheng-hua Zhong<sup>♢</sup>, Haiqin Yang<sup>♣†</sup>

<sup>♣</sup>International Digital Economy Academy (IDEA), China

<sup>♢</sup>Shenzhen University

hqyang@ieee.org

## Abstract

Event Coreference Resolution (ECR) is the task of clustering event mentions that refer to the same real-world event. Despite significant advancements, ECR research faces two main challenges: limited generalizability across domains due to narrow dataset evaluations, and difficulties in comparing models within diverse ECR pipelines. To address these issues, we develop EasyECR, the first open-source library designed to standardize data structures and abstract ECR pipelines for easy implementation and fair evaluation. More specifically, EasyECR integrates seven representative pipelines and ten popular benchmark datasets, enabling model evaluations on various datasets and promoting the development of robust ECR pipelines. By conducting extensive evaluation via our EasyECR, we find that, i) the representative ECR pipelines cannot generalize across multiple datasets, hence evaluating ECR pipelines on multiple datasets is necessary, ii) all models in ECR pipelines have a great effect on pipeline performance, therefore, when one model in ECR pipelines are compared, it is essential to ensure that the other models remain consistent. Additionally, reproducing ECR results is not trivial, and the developed library can help reduce this discrepancy. The experimental results provide valuable baselines for future research.

## 1 Introduction

Event coreference resolution (ECR) plays a pivotal role in event analysis by identifying mentions of the same event (Lu and Ng, 2018; Liu et al., 2023). It encompasses two types based on document analysis: within a single document, referred to as “within-document coreference resolution” (WDCR), and across different documents, known as “cross-document coreference resolution” (CDCR). Figure 1 illustrates an example of ECR,




Figure 1: An example of event coreference resolution, which contains three coreferential chains from two documents:  $\{saying, reporting\}$ ,  $\{negotiations, negotiations\}$  and  $\{direct, direct\}$ .

featuring three coreferential chains comprising six event mentions extracted from two documents.

Recently, ECR has witnessed substantial progress, with numerous proposed models shaping its development. Research paradigms for the ECR task can be categorized into four main groups according to technology iterations: rule-based, feature-based, transformer-based, and large language model (LLM)-based approaches. Rule-based approaches rely on a set of predefined rules for prediction. These rules are hand-designed by human experts based on domain-specific knowledge and may include syntactic rules or combinations of specific conditions. Notable contributions in this field include (Araki and Mitamura, 2015; Peng et al., 2016). Feature-based methods focus on utilizing lexical, syntactic, and semantic information in text. Employing established machine learning frameworks such as decision trees and conditional random fields, these methods have been refined by a host of researchers, including (Yang et al., 2015; Lu et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2018; Choubey and Huang, 2018; Tran et al., 2021; Choubey and Huang, 2017; Lee et al., 2017; Hsu and Horwood, 2022). Transformers-based methods provide powerful representations of text that capture both local and long-range dependencies, making them widely adopted in ECR tasks. Representative works in this

\*Work done when Tianhua was interned at IDEA.

†The corresponding author.

Paper	Datasets
Ravi et al. (2023)	ECB+
Ahmed et al. (2023)	ECB+,GVC
Eirew et al. (2022)	WEC
Hsu and Horwood (2022)	ECB+
Bugert and Gurevych (2021)	Hyperlink
Bugert et al. (2021)	ECB+,GVC, FCC
Poumay and Ittoo (2021)	ECB+
Held et al. (2021)	ECB+,GVC, FCC
Caciularu et al. (2021)	ECB+
Cattan et al. (2021)	ECB+
Eirew et al. (2021)	WEC, ECB+
Allaway et al. (2021)	ECB+
Meged et al. (2020)	ECB+
Zeng et al. (2020)	ECB+
Barhom et al. (2019)	ECB+
Choubey and Huang (2017)	ECB+
Upadhyay et al. (2016)	ECB+
Yang et al. (2015)	ECB+

Table 1: Cross-document event coreference resolution papers and the corresponding datasets. Most papers only evaluate one dataset to validate their claims.

category include (Held et al., 2021; Krizan and Ji, 2021; Lu and Ng, 2021b,a; Zeng et al., 2020; Allaway et al., 2021; Caciularu et al., 2021; Barhom et al., 2019; Ahmed et al., 2023). In the most recent wave of innovation, LLMs have emerged as a formidable force in ECR research. Pioneering studies by (Xu et al., 2023a; Ravi et al., 2023) have set the stage for a new era of exploration and discovery.

Despite progress in ECR, two key challenges persist. Firstly, the evaluation of ECR study is often limited to a small number of datasets, hindering the assessment of the generalizability. To shed light on this issue, we deliver a thorough analysis of 39 papers from reputable NLP conferences (ACL, EMNLP, NAACL, EACL, and COLING) and journals (TACL and CL) published between 2015 and 2023. Among these papers, 18 focused on CDCR, while 21 focused on WDCR. In Table 1, we present the findings related to CDCR papers. Notably, although there are 5 publicly available CDCR datasets, namely ECB+ (Cybulska and Vossen, 2014), GVC (Vossen et al., 2018), FCC (Bugert et al., 2020), Hyperlink (Bugert and Gurevych, 2021), and WEC (Eirew et al., 2022),

14 out of 18 CDCR-related papers only utilize a single dataset to validate their claims. Similar observations can be made for WDCR papers and their respective datasets, which are detailed in Table 11 (Appendix A). While the need for multi-dataset evaluation has been acknowledged by Bugert et al. (2021), the complexity of reproducing state-of-the-art models across datasets remains a barrier.

Secondly, ECR typically employs a multi-stage pipeline as depicted in Figure 2. The reason for utilizing a pipeline approach in ECR is that it necessitates the computation of distances between all pairs of event mentions. Employing a complex model to predict distances for such an enormous number of mention pairs (which is proportional to the square of the number of event mentions) is infeasible. Therefore, similar to recommender systems (Covington et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2022), an ECR pipeline comprises multiple stages. Initially, documents are grouped into clusters using straightforward strategies, such as document pre-clustering or topic priors. Only event mentions within the same cluster are considered potentially coreferential. Then, advanced models are employed to estimate the distances between event mention pairs within the same cluster, thereby substantially narrowing down the pool of pairs that require evaluation. In the progressively smaller and more specific clusters described above, event mentions are considered to be coreferential. However, variations in the number and type of models used across pipelines make it difficult to determine their comparative effectiveness. For instance, the CDCR pipeline LH+D<sub>small</sub> consists of three stages (Ahmed et al., 2023) while the pipeline proposed by Held et al. (2021) comprises only two stages, corresponding to the second and third stages in LH+D<sub>small</sub>. Moreover, the models used for these phases are different. Additionally, due to its nature as a system rather than a single model, reproducing an ECR pipeline is more challenging.

To address these issues, we conduct a comprehensive investigation by reproducing 7 representative ECR pipelines, including 2 WDCR and 5 CDCR pipelines. Additionally, we rigorously evaluate these pipelines on 10 popular datasets, providing valuable baselines for future research and development. We ensure fair comparisons by evaluating the models used in different stages under consistent settings. To further facilitate the implementation and evaluation of new pipelines and




Figure 2: The ECR task is accomplished through a pipeline comprising multiple models. Here is a concise breakdown: (a) ECR pipeline: The pipeline consists of multiple stages, each comprising two steps: computing mention pair distances and clustering mentions. Each step involves a specific model. (b) Illustration of a two-stage ECR pipeline: In the first stage, mentions are divided into clusters, where co-referential event mentions are likely. The second stage further divides these clusters into smaller ones, indicating coreferential event mentions. (c) Finding coreferential mentions: This process resembles item recommendation in recommender systems (Covington et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2022). It involves identifying coreferential mentions for a given mention by progressing through the pipeline stages.

assess their models on diverse datasets, we have developed and made available an open-source library called EasyECR. This library not only provides a unified data structure for ECR datasets but also offers a clear and intuitive abstraction of the ECR modeling process. Furthermore, the reproduced pipelines and utilized datasets are seamlessly integrated into the EasyECR, enabling researchers to readily explore and extend the field of ECR.

To summarize, our contributions are two-fold: (I) To make it easy to evaluate ECR pipelines on multiple datasets and compare models in ECR pipelines fairly, we develop EasyECR, the first unified library for implementing and evaluating ECR pipelines, incorporating seven representative pipelines and ten popular datasets. (II) Extensive experiments are conducted on multiple datasets using EasyECR. The experimental results provide valuable baselines for future research and models in different ECR pipelines are compared fairly.

## 2 Related Work

ECR is the task of clustering event mentions that refer to the same real-world event (Lu and Ng, 2018; Liu et al., 2023), which includes two sub-tasks: WDCR and CDCR. Numerous studies have been conducted on both WDCR and CDCR. In the following sections, we will provide an overview of these studies.

**WDCR** focuses on clustering event mentions within the same document (Xu et al., 2022, 2023a). In recent studies, two noteworthy WDCR models have been reproduced. GLT (Xu et al., 2022)

goes beyond previous methods by incorporating a Longformer-based encoder to capture document-level embeddings. It also introduces an event topic generator to infer latent topic-level representations. By combining sentence-level embeddings, document-level embeddings, and topic-level representations, GLT enhances coreference prediction. CorefPrompt (Xu et al., 2023a) addresses the issue of coreference judgment reliance on event mention encoding. It transforms ECR into a cloze-style masked language model (MLM) task, enabling simultaneous event modeling and coreference discrimination within a single template, leveraging a fully shared context. Since the datasets used by GLT and CorefPrompt (KBP 2015, KBP 2016, and KBP 2017) contain short documents with a limited number of event mention pairs, both models consist of a single stage. However, it is important to note that GLT and CorefPrompt are evaluated on only one dataset (KBP 2017), and their generalization performance on other datasets remains unknown.

**CDCR** involves clustering event mentions that may originate from the same document or different documents (Lu and Ng, 2018). Due to the vast number of event mention pairs in the CDCR task, it is typically addressed through multi-stage pipelines. One example is the pipeline proposed by Held et al. (2021), which comprises two stages. The first stage utilizes a simple model to generate representations for event trigger and arguments, identifying potential coreferential mentions using these representations. The second stage utilizes a complex model to predict whether mentions and their top-k

neighbors are coreferential. Another pipeline proposed by [Hsu and Horwood \(2022\)](#) also consists of two stages. In the first stage, mentions are separated by clustering documents, while the second stage employs contrastive representation learning to generate event mention representations, which are then used for clustering.  $LH+D_{small}$  ([Ahmed et al., 2023](#)) is a three-stage CDCR pipeline. However, the different CDCR pipelines employ multiple models, making it unclear which model performs best in similar roles.

### 3 EasyECR

EasyECR, as depicted in [Figure 3](#), consists of three key components: ECRData, ECRTagger, and Evaluator. ECRData serves as a standardized data structure for ECR datasets within the EasyECR library. ECRTagger assigns unique tags to individual event mentions in ECRData, with event mentions sharing the same cluster tag considered coreferential. Evaluator measures the performance of an ECR pipeline by comparing the event mention tags. In the subsequent sections, we will provide a comprehensive description of each of these components.

#### 3.1 ECRData

EasyECR incorporates three fundamental entities: document, mention, and ECRData, which collectively facilitate event coreference resolution. A document corresponds to a textual passage, while a mention represents an event-related expression within a document. Typically, a mention comprises an event trigger, which is the most explicit word or phrase indicating the occurrence of an event. Additionally, a mention may contain supplementary event details, such as event type and arguments. For example, as illustrated in [Figure 1](#), “saying”, “negotiations”, and “direct” are event triggers in the mentions of “THR is saying”, “director Gary Ross is still in negotiations”, and “to direct the sequel”, respectively.

ECRData encompasses a collection of documents and event mentions, with each entity possessing a unique identifier. Each mention is associated with a document via a document ID and linked to a corresponding event through an event ID. Mentions with the same event ID are considered to be coreferential. The flexible ECRData structure accommodates various existing ECR datasets, facilitating comprehensive coverage and compatibility.

#### 3.2 ECRTagger

In our EasyECR, an ECRTagger is a crucial component of the ECR pipeline that assigns tags to event mentions. Up to now, we have implemented three types of taggers.

- **ReprTagger**: This tagger generates representations for event mentions based on the event trigger, context, and other event information. A model proposed by [Hsu and Horwood \(2022\)](#) falls under this category.
- **DistanceTagger**: This tagger predicts the distances (the distance here can commonly be defined as the difference between 1 and the probability that the two mentions refer to the same event) between event mention pairs using the event trigger, context, other event information, and mention representations generated by the ReprTagger. Based on these distances, each event mention is assigned a tag containing its distances from other mentions. Both the lemma distance model and the discriminator used by [Ahmed et al. \(2023\)](#) can be classified as DistanceTaggers.
- **ClusterTagger**: This tagger clusters event mentions either based on their representations or the distances between mention pairs. Each event mention is assigned a cluster ID, and mentions with the same cluster ID are considered coreferential. Two ClusterTaggers have been implemented: ConnectedComponent, as used by [Ahmed et al. \(2023\)](#), and the agglomerative clustering algorithm employed by [Ravi et al. \(2023\)](#).

There is no limitation on the number of taggers that can be applied to ECRData. A stage in an ECR pipeline can consist of either two taggers (ReprTagger and ClusterTagger) or three taggers (ReprTagger, DistanceTagger, and ClusterTagger). Importantly, the subsequent DistanceTagger only needs to predict distances for event mention pairs formed by mentions within the same clusters generated by the preceding ClusterTagger. This flexibility enables EasyECR to easily implement multi-stage ECR pipelines.

#### 3.3 Evaluator

EasyECR incorporates the widely used coreference evaluation package, *coval* ([Moosavi and Strube, 2016](#)), for evaluating ECR performance. The code has been slightly modified to support direct evaluation of ECR pipeline performance using the ECRData. This package has provided support for common evaluation metrics, including MUC ([Vilain](#)




Figure 3: The framework of EasyECR. The Part 2 includes a loop corresponding to Figure 2 (a).

et al., 1995), B-cubed (Bagga and Baldwin, 1998), CEAF<sub>e</sub> (Luo, 2005), LEA (Moosavi and Strube, 2016), and CoNLL F1. CoNLL F1, which is the average of MUC F1, B-cubed F1, and CEAF<sub>e</sub> F1, offers a comprehensive assessment of ECR. Therefore, we report only the CoNLL F1 score in the experiments, as done by Ahmed et al. (2023).

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Datasets

We collect 10 commonly used datasets for our evaluation, which include: (1) Five datasets specifically designed for WDCR: ACE 2005 (English only) (Walker et al., 2006), KBP 2015 (Mitamura et al., 2015), KBP 2016 (Mitamura et al., 2016), KBP 2017 (Mitamura et al., 2017) and MAVEN-ERE (Wang et al., 2022); (2) Five datasets for CDCR: ECB+ (Cybulska and Vossen, 2014), GVC (Vossen et al., 2018), FCC (Bugert et al., 2020), FCCT (Bugert et al., 2021) and WEC (Eirew et al., 2022). The statistics of these datasets are reported in Table 2 and split statistics are shown in Table 12 (Appendix B).

All of these datasets have been seamlessly integrated into EasyECR. By providing a directory as input, EasyECR generates an ECRData object that contains the dataset. The directory structure and file formats remain the same as when the dataset is downloaded from a public source, requiring no modifications. This approach offers the advantage that even for non-free datasets like ACE 2005 that cannot be directly released, users can still effortlessly load and utilize them through EasyECR.

Dataset	#D	#M	#E	C/W
ACE 2005	535	4277	3341	W
KBP	984	25058	16450	W
MAVEN-ERE	4480	133205	84285	W
ECB+	976	6833	2741	C
FCC	451	2618	217	C
FCCT	451	3223	514	C
GVC	510	7298	1413	C
WEC	37129	43672	7597	C

Table 2: Statistics of datasets incorporated into EasyECR. #D, #M, and #E represents the number of documents, mentions, and events, respectively. C and W stand for CDCR and WDCR, respectively. KBP includes KBP 2015, 2016 and 2017.

### 4.2 Reproduced Pipelines

We have replicated seven notable representative pipelines in our comparison, encompassing two WDCR pipelines: GLT (Xu et al., 2022) and Coref-Prompt (Xu et al., 2023b), as well as five CDCR pipelines: DCT Held et al. (2021) CDCR-E2E (Cattan et al., 2021) CRL (Hsu and Horwood, 2022), Lemma (Bugert et al., 2021; Eirew et al., 2022; Ahmed et al., 2023) and LemmaECR (Ahmed et al., 2023). Lemma serves as a commonly used baseline and is also employed in the initial stage of LemmaECR (Ahmed et al., 2023). For all pipelines, we follow the settings in original papers.

Different models utilize distinct types of event information for event coreference prediction. The inclusion of a dataset in model experiments depends on whether the dataset satisfies the specific event information requirements of the model.

Method	Source	CoNLL F1
GLT	Original	<b>54.20</b>
	EasyECR	52.31
CorefPrompt	Original	54.23
	EasyECR	<b>56.01</b>

Table 3: Comparison between the results of reproduced WDCR pipelines and the results reported in original papers. All experiments are conducted on KBP 2017.

Method	Source	CoNLL F1
DCT	Original	<b>85.70</b>
	EasyECR	73.07
CDCR-E2E	Original	<b>81.00</b>
	EasyECR	78.40
CRL	Original	<b>81.80</b>
	EasyECR	72.08
Lemma	Original	76.40
	EasyECR	<b>77.33</b>
LemmaECR	Original	<b>80.30</b>
	EasyECR	78.31

Table 4: Comparison between the results of reproduced CDCR pipelines and the results reported in original papers. All experiments are conducted on ECB+.

### 4.3 Reproduced Results

Table 3 presents a comparison of the performance of the reproduced WDCR pipelines with the results reported in the original papers. Both GLT and CorefPrompt models are trained on the KBP 2015 and KBP 2016 datasets, and their evaluation is conducted on the KBP 2017 dataset. It is observed that the performance of GLT is slightly lower than the results reported in the original paper, while the opposite is true for CorefPrompt. The differences in performance for both models are approximately 2%. We are confident in the replication of these models, and a 2% performance difference is considered reasonable.

Table 4 compares the performance of reproduced CDCR pipelines with the results reported in the original papers. While Lemma, CDCR-E2E, and LemmaECR have been successfully reproduced, other models demonstrate lower performance. Multi-stage pipelines, such as DCT and CRL, face additional complexities, making their reproduction more challenging. For example, DCT utilizes a deep cluster model in its first stage, which generates representations and identifies potential coreferential mentions. Reproducing the performance of this unsupervised and complex

ID	Clustering	Subtopic	Keep Singleton	CoNLL F1
1		✓	✓	<b>77.3</b>
2	✓			65.5
3		✓		66.3
4			✓	71.7
5				59.6

Table 5: Experimental results of Lemma on ECB+ with various evaluation settings: The term ‘‘Clustering’’ refers to whether document clustering is utilized as a stage in the pipeline. ‘‘Subtopic’’ indicates whether the subtopics provided by the dataset are used as the output of document clustering. ‘‘KeepSingleton’’ denotes whether the singletons of event mentions are retained during pipeline evaluation.

Method	ACE 2005	KBP2017	MAVEN-ERE
GLT	<b>64.64</b>	52.31	<b>64.34</b>
CorefPrompt	56.50	<b>56.01</b>	64.28

Table 6: Our experimental results of WDCR pipelines on multiple datasets in terms of CoNLL F1.

model is more difficult compared to simpler models like Lemma. Additionally, unclear descriptions of CRL’s sample generation strategy may have led to the omission of crucial details during reproduction. Further analysis will be conducted to investigate the reasons behind the lower performance of the implemented DCT model.

## 5 Analysis

**Impact of Evaluation Settings.** To investigate the impact of different evaluation settings on the performance of CDCR pipelines, we conduct experiments specifically focusing on Lemma using the ECB+ dataset. Table 5 displays the results obtained under various evaluation settings. From the table, two conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, both the Clustering and KeepSingleton settings significantly improve the CoNLL F1 score. Secondly, the Clustering and Subtopic settings demonstrate similar effects. These conclusions align with previous studies (Cattan et al., 2021; Bugert et al., 2021), which recommend the use of the ID 5 setting. However, this recommendation has not been widely adopted. In our comparison, we follow their suggestion and employ the ID 5 setting in Table 5 for evaluation, which may result in lower reported results in the subsequent analyses.

**Generalization.** We evaluate the implemented




Figure 4: An illustration showing how four CDCR pipelines are constructed using ECRTaggers.

Method	ECB+	WEC	GVC	FCCT
DCT	37.4	-	29.7	34.3
CDCR-E2E	59.6	56.0	32.5	<b>44.4</b>
CRL	<b>67.7</b>	-	31.3	42.9
Lemma	59.6	40.7	30.5	37.8
LemmaECR	65.9	-	<b>55.1</b>	29.4

Table 7: Our experimental results of CDCR pipelines on multiple datasets in terms of CoNLL F1.

ECR pipelines on multiple datasets to showcase their generalization. The experimental results of WDCR pipelines are presented in Table 6, while the experimental results of CDCR pipelines are shown in Table 7. From the WDCR experimental results, we observe that CorefPrompt outperforms GLT on the KBP 2017 dataset, which aligns with the findings reported in (Xu et al., 2023b). However, on the ACE 2005 dataset and the MAVEN-ERE dataset, the situation is reversed. This indicates that the conclusions drawn from the KBP 2017 dataset may not directly apply to other datasets, highlighting the importance of evaluating WDCR pipelines across multiple datasets. Similar conclusions can be drawn from Table 7. In addition, in Table 7, except for CDCR-E2E and Lemma, results from other pipelines on the WEC dataset are not available, due to the enormous number of mentions in the WEC dataset. These pipelines could not complete their experiments on the WEC dataset within an acceptable timeframe.

**Comparison of Recall Models and Rank Models.** Among the implemented pipelines, four CDCR pipelines consist of multiple stages, as illustrated in Figure 4.

- DCT (Held et al., 2021) consists of two stages. The first stage utilizes a deep cluster model

(ReprTagger) to generate representations for event mentions and identify potential coreferential mentions. The second stage trains a cross-encoder model (DistanceTagger) to directly predict the distances between event-mention pairs.

- CDCR-E2E (Cattan et al., 2021) also includes two stages. The first stage employs a DistanceTagger to compute distances between document pairs and a ClusterTagger to cluster the documents, with event mentions from the same document belonging to the same cluster. The second stage trains a cross-encoder model (DistanceTagger) to predict distances between mention pairs.
- CRL (Hsu and Horwood, 2022) comprises three stages. The first stage involves computing distances between document pairs using a DistanceTagger and clustering the documents using a ClusterTagger. The second stage employs a ReprTagger to generate event mention representations and a DistanceTagger to compute distances between event mention pairs based on these representations. The distances are then used to identify the most similar and least similar event mentions, generating positive and negative training samples for the third stage. The third stage trains a more effective ReprTagger.
- LemmaECR (Ahmed et al., 2023) also consists of three stages. The first stage computes distances between document pairs using a DistanceTagger and clusters the documents using a ClusterTagger. The second stage uses a simple DistanceTagger to compute distances between event-mention pairs and clusters the event mentions accordingly, considering only the lemma of the event-mention trigger. The second stage then trains a cross-encoder model (DistanceTagger) to predict distances between event-mention pairs.

For convenience, similar to recommender sys-

Method	CoNLL F1
Cluster	27.42
Lemma	59.60
CRL	<b>67.68</b>

Table 8: The performance of recall models on ECB+.

Recall Model	Rank Model	CoNLL F1
Lemma	DCT	60.09
Lemma	CDCR-E2E	<b>61.62</b>
Lemma	LemmaECR	60.01

Table 9: The performance of rank models on ECB+.

tems (Covington et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2022), we categorize the models used in earlier stages of the ECR pipeline as recall models, while those used in later stages are referred to as rank models. In DCT, the ReprTagger (Cluster) in the first stage, the ReprTagger (CRL) in the third stage of CRL, and the DistanceTagger (Lemma) in the second stage of LemmaECR are recall models. The DistanceTagger (DCT) in the second stage of DCT, the DistanceTagger (CDCR-E2E) in the second stage of CDCR-E2E, and the DistanceTagger (LemmaECR) in the third stage of LemmaECR are rank models.

Table 8 presents the performance of three recall models, yielding three key observations: (1) There are notable performance differences among the models, highlighting the critical role of the recall model in overall pipeline performance. DCT’s poor reproduction performance can be attributed to limitations in its recall model. (2) While CRL demonstrates subpar reproduction performance under the commonly used evaluation setting, it surpasses state-of-the-art models in a more reasonable setting (67.68 vs. 62.67). (3) The recall model significantly impacts the overall effectiveness of the ECR pipeline by generating training samples for the rank model and defining the clustering scope in the subsequent stage. Our experiments reveal an interdependence between these factors. For example, in the Lemma experiment, optimizing hyperparameters improves results but reduces the number of training samples for the rank model (from nearly 30,000 to less than 10,000). Hence, further exploration is necessary to comprehend the influence of the recall model on the overall performance of the ECR pipeline.

Table 9 presents the performance of three rank models for the Lemma recall model. The results show that the difference between the three rank

ClusterTagger	CoNLL F1
ConnectedComponent	<b>59.60</b>
Agglomerative	27.42

Table 10: The experimental results of Lemma pipeline using different ClusterTaggers on the ECB+ dataset.

models is small.

**Comparison of ClusterTaggers.** Different pipelines employ different ClusterTaggers. For instance, Held et al. (2021); Ahmed et al. (2023) utilize the ConnectedComponent algorithm and Catan et al. (2021); Hsu and Horwood (2022) employ the agglomerative clustering algorithm. In this section, we conduct experiments to assess the impact of ClusterTaggers. The experimental results of the Lemma pipeline using different ClusterTaggers are presented in Table 10. Notably, significant performance discrepancies exist among the different ClusterTaggers. Therefore, for fair comparisons of other components within the ECR pipeline, it is essential to ensure that the ClusterTagger remains consistent.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we develop EasyECR, an open-source ECR library designed to establish standardized data structures and enable fair comparisons among ECR pipelines. Extensive experiments are conducted using EasyECR and the results provide valuable baselines for future research. From the results, we draw two conclusions. First, the representative state-of-the-art ECR pipelines cannot generalize across multiple datasets, hence evaluating ECR pipelines on multiple datasets is necessary. Second, all models in ECR pipelines have a great effect on pipeline performance, therefore, when models corresponding to one step in ECR pipelines are compared, the other models need to remain identical.

## 7 Limitations

In ECR pipelines, preceding stages usually generate representations for event mentions and then find potential coreferential event mentions for target mentions based on the representations. Compared to predicting distances of event mention pairs using cross-encoder models (Held et al., 2021; Ahmed et al., 2023), computing the cosine or other distances between two mention representations is much faster. However, when the number of event mentions is larger, such as the WEC (Eirew et al.,



2022) dataset, this step is still very time-consuming in EasyECR due to the simple vector search implementation. To mitigate this issue, FAISS (Douze et al., 2024; Johnson et al., 2019) or other efficient vector search tools can be incorporated into EasyECR in the future. Additionally, our EasyECR has room for enhancement, with upcoming developments including an error-analysis module. This module will analyze instances where the model has incorrectly predicted event mentions as coreferential.

## References

- Shafiuddin Rehan Ahmed, Abhijnan Nath, James H. Martin, and Nikhil Krishnaswamy. 2023. *2 \* n is better than n<sup>2</sup>: Decomposing event coreference resolution into two tractable problems*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1569–1583, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Emily Allaway, Shuai Wang, and Miguel Ballesteros. 2021. *Sequential cross-document coreference resolution*. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4659–4671, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jun Araki and Teruko Mitamura. 2015. *Joint event trigger identification and event coreference resolution with structured perceptron*. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2074–2080, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amit Bagga and Breck Baldwin. 1998. Algorithms for scoring coreference chains. In *The first international conference on language resources and evaluation workshop on linguistics coreference*, volume 1, pages 563–566. Citeseer.
- Shany Barhom, Vered Shwartz, Alon Eirew, Michael Bugert, Nils Reimers, and Ido Dagan. 2019. *Revisiting joint modeling of cross-document entity and event coreference resolution*. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4179–4189, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Bugert and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. *Event coreference data (almost) for free: Mining hyperlinks from online news*. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 471–491, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Michael Bugert, Nils Reimers, Shany Barhom, Ido Dagan, and Iryna Gurevych. 2020. Breaking the subtopic barrier in cross-document event coreference resolution. In *Text2story@ ecir*, pages 23–29.
- Michael Bugert, Nils Reimers, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. *Generalizing cross-document event coreference resolution across multiple corpora*. *Computational Linguistics*, 47(3):575–614.
- Avi Caciularu, Arman Cohan, Iz Beltagy, Matthew Peters, Arie Cattan, and Ido Dagan. 2021. *CDLM: Cross-document language modeling*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2648–2662, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arie Cattan, Alon Eirew, Gabriel Stanovsky, Mandar Joshi, and Ido Dagan. 2021. *Cross-document coreference resolution over predicted mentions*. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 5100–5107.
- Chen Chen and Vincent Ng. 2015. *Chinese event coreference resolution: An unsupervised probabilistic model rivaling supervised resolvers*. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 1097–1107, Denver, Colorado. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prafulla Kumar Choubey and Ruihong Huang. 2017. *Event coreference resolution by iteratively unfolding inter-dependencies among events*. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2124–2133, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prafulla Kumar Choubey and Ruihong Huang. 2018. *Improving event coreference resolution by modeling correlations between event coreference chains and document topic structures*. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 485–495, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prafulla Kumar Choubey and Ruihong Huang. 2021. *Automatic data acquisition for event coreference resolution*. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 1185–1196, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Prafulla Kumar Choubey, Kaushik Raju, and Ruihong Huang. 2018. *Identifying the most dominant event in a news article by mining event coreference relations*. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 340–345, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Paul Covington, Jay Adams, and Emre Sargin. 2016. [Deep neural networks for youtube recommendations](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '16*, page 191–198, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Agata Cybulska and Piek Vossen. 2014. [Using a sledgehammer to crack a nut? lexical diversity and event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)*, pages 4545–4552, Reykjavik, Iceland. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Matthijs Douze, Alexandr Guzhva, Chengqi Deng, Jeff Johnson, Gergely Szilvasy, Pierre-Emmanuel Mazaré, Maria Lomeli, Lucas Hosseini, and Hervé Jégou. 2024. [The faiss library](#).
- Alon Eirew, Avi Caciularu, and Ido Dagan. 2022. [Cross-document event coreference search: Task, dataset and modeling](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 900–913, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Alon Eirew, Arie Cattan, and Ido Dagan. 2021. [WEC: Deriving a large-scale cross-document event coreference dataset from Wikipedia](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2498–2510, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- William Held, Dan Iter, and Dan Jurafsky. 2021. [Focus on what matters: Applying discourse coherence theory to cross document coreference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1406–1417, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Benjamin Hsu and Graham Horwood. 2022. [Contrastive representation learning for cross-document coreference resolution of events and entities](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3644–3655, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yin Jou Huang, Jing Lu, Sadao Kurohashi, and Vincent Ng. 2019. [Improving event coreference resolution by learning argument compatibility from unlabeled data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 785–795, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou. 2019. Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, 7(3):535–547.
- Mandar Joshi, Omer Levy, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Daniel Weld. 2019. [BERT for coreference resolution: Baselines and analysis](#). 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 5803–5808, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Samuel Kriman and Heng Ji. 2021. [Joint detection and coreference resolution of entities and events with document-level context aggregation](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing: Student Research Workshop*, pages 174–179, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tuan Lai, Heng Ji, Trung Bui, Quan Hung Tran, Franck Dernoncourt, and Walter Chang. 2021. [A context-dependent gated module for incorporating symbolic semantics into event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 3491–3499, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenton Lee, Luheng He, Mike Lewis, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. [End-to-end neural coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 188–197, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kenton Lee, Luheng He, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2018. [Higher-order coreference resolution with coarse-to-fine inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 687–692, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ruicheng Liu, Rui Mao, Anh Tuan Luu, and Erik Cambria. 2023. A brief survey on recent advances in coreference resolution. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, pages 1–43.
- Weiwen Liu, Yunjia Xi, Jiarui Qin, Fei Sun, Bo Chen, Weinan Zhang, Rui Zhang, and Ruiming Tang. 2022. [Neural re-ranking in multi-stage recommender systems: A review](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-22*, pages 5512–5520. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization. Survey Track.
- Zhengzhong Liu, Teruko Mitamura, and Eduard Hovy. 2018. [Graph based decoding for event sequencing and coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3645–3657, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jing Lu and Vincent Ng. 2017. [Joint learning for event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 90–101, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jing Lu and Vincent Ng. 2018. Event coreference resolution: A survey of two decades of research. In *IJCAI*, pages 5479–5486.
- Jing Lu and Vincent Ng. 2021a. [Constrained multi-task learning for event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 4504–4514, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jing Lu and Vincent Ng. 2021b. [Conundrums in event coreference resolution: Making sense of the state of the art](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1368–1380, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jing Lu, Deepak Venugopal, Vibhav Gogate, and Vincent Ng. 2016. [Joint inference for event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 3264–3275, Osaka, Japan. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee.
- Xiaoqiang Luo. 2005. On coreference resolution performance metrics. In *Proceedings of human language technology conference and conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 25–32.
- Yehudit Meged, Avi Caciularu, Vered Shwartz, and Ido Dagan. 2020. [Paraphrasing vs coreferring: Two sides of the same coin](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 4897–4907, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hieu Minh Tran, Duy Phung, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2021. [Exploiting document structures and cluster consistencies for event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4840–4850, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Teruko Mitamura, Zhengzhong Liu, and Eduard H Hovy. 2015. Overview of tac kbp 2015 event nugget track. In *TAC*.
- Teruko Mitamura, Zhengzhong Liu, and Eduard H. Hovy. 2016. [Overview of TAC-KBP 2016 event nugget track](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Text Analysis Conference, TAC 2016, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA, November 14-15, 2016*. NIST.
- Teruko Mitamura, Zhengzhong Liu, and Eduard H. Hovy. 2017. [Events detection, coreference and sequencing: What’s next? overview of the tac kbp 2017 event track](#). *Theory and Applications of Categories*.
- Nafise Sadat Moosavi and Michael Strube. 2016. [Which coreference evaluation metric do you trust? a proposal for a link-based entity aware metric](#). In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 632–642, Berlin, Germany. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haoruo Peng, Yangqiu Song, and Dan Roth. 2016. [Event detection and co-reference with minimal supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 392–402, Austin, Texas. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Judicael Poumay and Ashwin Ittoo. 2021. [A Comprehensive Comparison of Word Embeddings in Event & Entity Coreference Resolution](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2755–2764, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sahithya Ravi, Chris Tanner, Raymond Ng, and Vered Shwartz. 2023. [What happens before and after: Multi-event commonsense in event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1708–1724, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hieu Minh Tran, Duy Phung, and Thien Huu Nguyen. 2021. [Exploiting document structures and cluster consistencies for event coreference resolution](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4840–4850.
- Shyam Upadhyay, Nitish Gupta, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Dan Roth. 2016. [Revisiting the evaluation for cross document event coreference](#). In *Proceedings of COLING 2016, the 26th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: Technical Papers*, pages 1949–1958, Osaka, Japan. The COLING 2016 Organizing Committee.
- Marc Vilain, John D Burger, John Aberdeen, Dennis Connolly, and Lynette Hirschman. 1995. A model-theoretic coreference scoring scheme. In *Sixth Message Understanding Conference (MUC-6): Proceedings of a Conference Held in Columbia, Maryland, November 6-8, 1995*.
- Piek Vossen, Filip Ilievski, Marten Postma, and Roxane Segers. 2018. [Don’t annotate, but validate: a data-to-text method for capturing event data](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*,

Miyazaki, Japan. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

Christopher Walker, Stephanie Strassel, Julie Medero, and Kazuaki Maeda. 2006. [Ace 2005 multilingual training corpus](#).

Xiaozhi Wang, Yulin Chen, Ning Ding, Hao Peng, Zimu Wang, Yankai Lin, Xu Han, Lei Hou, Juanzi Li, Zhiyuan Liu, Peng Li, and Jie Zhou. 2022. [MAVEN-ERE: A unified large-scale dataset for event coreference, temporal, causal, and subevent relation extraction](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 926–941, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sheng Xu, Peifeng Li, and Qiaoming Zhu. 2022. [Improving event coreference resolution using document-level and topic-level information](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6765–6775, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sheng Xu, Peifeng Li, and Qiaoming Zhu. 2023a. [CorefPrompt: Prompt-based event coreference resolution by measuring event type and argument compatibilities](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15440–15452, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Sheng Xu, Peifeng Li, and Qiaoming Zhu. 2023b. [Corefprompt: Prompt-based event coreference resolution by measuring event type and argument compatibilities](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15440–15452.

Bishan Yang, Claire Cardie, and Peter Frazier. 2015. [A hierarchical distance-dependent Bayesian model for event coreference resolution](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3:517–528.

Yao Yao, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. 2023. [Learning event-aware measures for event coreference resolution](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 13542–13556, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Yutao Zeng, Xiaolong Jin, Saiping Guan, Jiafeng Guo, and Xueqi Cheng. 2020. [Event coreference resolution with their paraphrases and argument-aware embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 3084–3094, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.

## A WDCR Papers and The Corresponding Datasets

Tabel 11 lists 21 WDCR papers and their corresponding datasets. It is shown that most papers

only evaluate a dataset to validate their claims.

## B More Dataset Statistics

More dataset statistics are shown in Tabel 12.

Paper	Datasets
(Yao et al., 2023)	ACE2005
(Xu et al., 2023a)	KBP 2017 (trained on KBP 2015 and KBP 2016)
(Wang et al., 2022)	MAVEN-ERE
(Xu et al., 2022)	KBP 2017 (trained on KBP 2015 and KBP 2016)
(Lu and Ng, 2021a)	KBP 2017
(Kriman and Ji, 2021)	ACE05-E+
(Lai et al., 2021)	ACE2005, KBP2016
(Choubey and Huang, 2021)	KBP2017, RED
(Minh Tran et al., 2021)	KBP2016, KBP2017 (trained on KBP 2015)
(Lu and Ng, 2021b)	ACE2005, KBP2017
(Joshi et al., 2019)	OntoNotes, GAP
(Huang et al., 2019)	KBP2017 English
(Lee et al., 2018)	OntoNotes 5.0
(Choubey and Huang, 2018)	KBP2016, 2017
(Liu et al., 2018)	KBP2015
(Choubey et al., 2018)	KBP2016
(Lu and Ng, 2017)	KBP2016 English and Chinese
(Lu et al., 2016)	KBP2015 English, ACE2005 Chinese
(Peng et al., 2016)	ACE2005, KBP2015
(Araki and Mitamura, 2015)	ProcessBank
(Chen and Ng, 2015)	ACE2005

Table 11: Within-document event coreference resolution papers and the corresponding datasets. Most papers only evaluate a dataset to validate their claims.

Dataset	Split	#D	#M	#E	C/W
ACE 2005	Training	428	2887	2237	W
	dev	53	647	514	W
	test	54	743	590	W
KBP	Training	735	18880	12341	W
	dev	82	2182	1402	W
	test	167	3996	2707	W
MAVEN-ERE	Training	2913	73939	67984	W
	dev	710	17780	16301	W
	test	857	41486	-	W
ECB+	Training	574	3808	1527	C
	dev	196	1245	409	C
	test	206	1780	805	C
FCC	Training	207	1195	115	C
	dev	117	535	47	C
	test	127	888	55	C
FCCT	Training	207	1469	236	C
	dev	117	680	111	C
	test	127	1074	167	C
GVC	Training	358	5313	991	C
	dev	78	977	228	C
	test	74	1008	194	C
WEC	Training	34132	40529	7042	C
	dev	1194	1250	233	C
	test	1803	1893	322	C

Table 12: Statistics of datasets incorporated into EasyECR. #D, #M, and #E represent the number of documents, mentions, and events, respectively. C and W stand for CDCR and WDCR, respectively. KBP includes KBP 2015, 2016, and 2017, where KBP 2015 and 2016 are used to train models, while KBP 2017 is used to evaluate models.