

# CoAM: Corpus of All-Type Multiword Expressions

Yusuke Ide<sup>1</sup> Joshua Tanner<sup>2</sup> Adam Nohejl<sup>1</sup> Jacob Hoffman<sup>2</sup> Justin Vasselli<sup>1</sup>  
Hidetaka Kamigaito<sup>1</sup> Taro Watanabe<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nara Institute of Science and Technology <sup>2</sup>Resolve Research

{ide.yusuke.ja6, nohejl.adam.mt3, vasselli.justin\_ray.vk4, kamigaito.h, taro}  
@is.naist.jp, {josh, jake}@rslv.dev

## Abstract

Multiword expressions (MWEs) refer to idiomatic sequences of multiple words. MWE identification, i.e., detecting MWEs in text, can play a key role in downstream tasks such as machine translation. Existing datasets for MWE identification are inconsistently annotated, limited to a single type of MWE, or limited in size. To enable reliable and comprehensive evaluation, we created CoAM: **Corpus of All-Type Multiword Expressions**, a dataset of 1.3K sentences constructed through a multi-step process to enhance data quality consisting of human annotation, human review, and automated consistency checking. MWEs in CoAM are tagged with MWE types, such as NOUN and VERB, to enable fine-grained error analysis. Annotations for CoAM were collected using a new interface created with our interface generator, which allows easy and flexible annotation of MWEs in any form, including discontinuous ones.<sup>1</sup> Through experiments using CoAM, we find that a fine-tuned large language model outperforms the current state-of-the-art approach for MWE identification. Furthermore, analysis using our MWE type tagged data reveals that VERB MWEs are easier than NOUN MWEs to identify across approaches.

## 1 Introduction

Vocabulary plays a critical role in the comprehension of natural language. Vocabulary is often thought of as consisting of single words, but multiword expressions (MWEs) also form an important part (Jackendoff, 1995). MWEs are defined as idiomatic sequences of multiple words (Baldwin and Kim, 2010). We focus specifically on those whose meaning or grammatical structure cannot be derived from their constituent words, as they can impede text analysis or comprehension. In other words, we exclude transparent collocations.

For example, the bold sequences below constitute MWEs.

(a) *ACL **stands for** Association for Computational Linguistics.*

(b) *He has been **under the weather** lately.*

MWE identification (MWEI), the process of automatically tagging MWEs in text, has been the object of much research (Constant et al., 2017). MWEI can play a key role in a wide range of downstream tasks, including, but not limited to, machine translation (Briakou et al., 2024) and lexical complexity assessment (Kochmar et al., 2020). However, as described in Section 2, existing datasets for MWE identification are inconsistently annotated, limited to a single type of MWE, or limited in size. This hinders reliable and comprehensive evaluations of MWEI systems.

In this paper, we introduce the **Corpus of All-type Multiword expressions (CoAM)**, a dataset of 1.3K sentences for MWEI. “Types” refer to MWE categories assigned based on the part of speech of the MWE, with “all-type” signifying the inclusion of all such categories of MWE. To ensure annotation quality, we assigned two annotators and a reviewer to each sentence and checked all annotations for consistency. Additionally, MWEs in the CoAM test set are tagged with their types, such as NOUN and VERB, facilitating fine-grained error analysis of MWEI systems. This enables us to address questions such as: “Are verbal MWEs—the focus of the long-running PARSEME project (Savary et al., 2017)—more difficult to identify compared to other categories of MWEs?”

Annotations for CoAM were collected using a checkbox-based annotation interface created using our new interface generator, CAIGen: **C**heckbox-based **A**nnotation **I**nterface **G**enerator. It allows easy and flexible annotation of MWEs in any form, including discontinuous MWEs such as *pick . . . up* in *pick me up at the station*, which are common in English and have historically been a challenge for

<sup>1</sup>The CoAM dataset and source code of the interface generator will be publicly accessible upon acceptance.

MWEI systems (Rohanian et al., 2019).

Using CoAM, we evaluate two distinct MWEI approaches. The first approach, MWEasWSD (MaW, Tanner and Hoffman, 2023), combines a rule-based pipeline and a trainable bi-encoder model, achieving state-of-the-art performance on the DiMSUM dataset (Schneider et al., 2016). The second is LLM fine-tuning for MWEI, inspired by the effectiveness of similar approaches in tasks such as named entity recognition (NER, Zhou et al., 2024). We use CoAM to train and evaluate LLMs from the Llama (Dubey et al., 2024) and Qwen (Qwen Team, 2024) model families.

The results reveal that a fine-tuned Qwen model with 72B parameters greatly outperforms MaW, suggesting the effectiveness of LLM fine-tuning. On the other hand, all approaches suffer from low recall (e.g., 50.7% for Qwen-72B). Further analysis shows that fine-tuned LLMs struggle more to detect NOUN and CLAUSE MWEs than to detect VERB MWEs. MWEs not contained in WordNet (Miller, 1995), e.g., *real estate*, were found particularly difficult to identify, presumably because they are less widely recognized as MWEs.

## 2 Related Work

**Datasets** Previous studies have presented several datasets for MWEI and idiom<sup>2</sup> identification. The DiMSUM (Schneider et al., 2016) dataset consists of 5,799 sentences annotated with MWEs, including, but not limited to, verbal MWEs, noun MWEs, phatics, and multi-word (MW) proper nouns. Although DiMSUM has been used in multiple MWEI studies, e.g., Kirilin et al. (2016) and Liu et al. (2021), there exist inconsistencies in the annotation, which hinders proper evaluation. Tanner and Hoffman (2023) found that over 80% of the false positives of their system were actually caused by DiMSUM’s inconsistent annotation. Next, the PARSEME corpus (Savary et al., 2017; Walsh et al., 2018) is a high-quality dataset for the identification of verbal MWEs. It has been continuously updated, and the latest version (1.3) contains over 455,000 sentences across 26 languages. However, their focus is limited to verbal MWEs. Lastly, ID10M (Tedeschi et al., 2022) is an idiom detection dataset consisting of automatically created training data in 10 languages and a manually curated evaluation benchmark of four languages. Their evaluation

<sup>2</sup>According to Tedeschi et al. (2022), idioms are a subset of MWEs.

dataset was created with the help of professional annotators, but it contains only 200 sentences per language. They used Wiktionary as the source of idioms, and MWEs not in Wiktionary were skipped in the annotation. Additionally, they did not annotate discontinuous idioms.

**Tagging Schemes** ID10M used the **BIO** scheme. DiMSUM employed the more flexible **6-tag** scheme, which allows discontinuous MWEs, but cannot handle overlapping MWEs (see Appendix A.4 for an example of an overlapping MWE). In contrast, the **parseme-tsv** format (Savary et al., 2017) accepts MWEs in any form, which leads us to adopt an equivalent data format.

**Other Tasks** Whereas these studies addressed MWE/idiom identification as a sequence tagging task, others worked on a related but different task, idiom usage recognition. It is a binary classification of word sequences in context as idiomatic/figurative or literal. The detection task in Muzny and Zettlemoyer (2013), SemEval-2013 Task 5b (Korkontzelos et al., 2013), SemEval-2022 Task 2 Subtask A (Tayyar Madabushi et al., 2022), and the MAGPIE corpus (Haagsma et al., 2020) are set up for this task. Our task setting is more realistic and challenging than these, requiring systems to identify all MWEs within a given sentence.

## 3 Task Formulation

We formulate the MWEI task as token-level sequence tagging, where each token can belong to multiple MWEs. The systems are provided with tokenized sentences. Given the sequence of tokens in each sentence,  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , the task is to output a list of MWEs where each MWE is represented as a list of word indices. The  $i$ -th MWE in the sentence is represented with  $[\text{idx}(t_{1,1}), \text{idx}(t_{1,2}), \dots]$  where  $t_{i,j}$  is the  $j$ -th token of the MWE and  $\text{idx}(t)$  is  $t$ ’s identifier, i.e., 1-based index. Our annotation interface allows annotations in this scheme, as illustrated in Figure 1.

## 4 Construction of CoAM

### 4.1 Data Selection and Preprocessing

In selecting the sources of our dataset, we prioritized sources aimed at general audiences so that they are in standard English and mostly free of grammatical errors. We also included both written and transcribed spoken texts. Consequently, we constructed CoAM from the following four data

sources (see Appendix A.1 for their details). **News** is news text written by professional writers sourced from EMM NewsBrief, which was introduced by Glavaš and Štajner (2013).<sup>3</sup> **Commentary** is commentaries on news from the WMT23 Shared Task monolingual training data (Kocmi et al., 2023). **TED** is a collection of TED talk transcriptions from two sources. (1) **NAIST** is the dataset by Neubig et al. (2014); (2) **IWSLT** is the subset of IWSLT 2017 Shared Task (Cettolo et al., 2017). **UD** is a collection of single sentences sourced from weblogs, reviews, question-answers, newsgroups, and emails in the English Web Treebank. It is part of the Universal Dependencies (Zeman et al., 2018) and the English PARSEME corpus (Walsh et al., 2018). We included the UD section of the PARSEME corpus in our dataset to enable better comparison between the annotations. We did not, however, include any sentences from UD in the test set, because UD contains user-generated content with frequent grammatical errors. All the other sources were used both for training and test splits.

For all sources, we took the first 10 (or all, when there are less than 10) sentences from the article or talk and presented them in original order. Each sentence was tokenized using SpaCy’s en\_core\_web\_lg (3.7.1), with the exception of the UD sentences, which were already tokenized. Note that what we call *words* are tokens given in this manner.

## 4.2 Annotation Guidelines

The construction of a reliable dataset requires clear guidelines for annotators in order to minimize mis-annotation. However, we found no such guidelines for all-type MWE annotation, which led us to create new guidelines based on the MWE definition by Baldwin and Kim (2010) and the PARSEME annotation guidelines.<sup>4</sup>

We define MWEs as idiomatic sequences that satisfy the following three conditions.

(a) **It consists of at least two words that are always realized by the same lexemes.** This condition means that *his* in *put yourself in his shoes* is not part of the MWE, as other words like *Michael’s* can replace *his*.

(b) **It displays semantic, lexical, or syntactic idiomaticity.** Semantic idiomaticity occurs when

<sup>3</sup>The dataset also contains data from WikiNews and Wikipedia, but we preferred EMM NewsBrief, which contains more MWEs according to our preliminary analysis based on the annotation by Kochmar et al. (2020).

<sup>4</sup><https://parsemefr.lis-lab.fr/parseme-st-guidelines/1.3/>

| Tool | Flexible annotation | Simple interface | Easy collaboration | Customizable interface |
|------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| brat | ✗                   | ✓                | ✗                  | ✗                      |
| FLAT | ✓                   | ✗                | ✗                  | ✗                      |
| Ours | ✓                   | ✓                | ✓                  | ✓                      |

Table 1: Comparison of annotation tools.

the meaning of an expression cannot be derived from its constituent words. It is the most important among idiomaticity types because the majority of MWEs are defined as MWEs due to this type of idiomaticity. See more description on the semantic idiomaticity in relation to non-compositionality in Appendix A.3. Note that transparent collocations such as *stuck at* are not an MWE in our definition because they are not semantically, lexically, or syntactically idiomatic. In other words, we did not take statistical idiomaticity as a qualification for an MWE, unlike Baldwin and Kim (2010), for the following reasons. First, our primary aim is to identify sequences that lead to difficulties in reading, and transparent collocations are understandable if the reader knows the constituent words. Second, statistical idiomaticity is difficult for human annotators to judge, and it would bring considerable ambiguity to the definition of MWEs.

(c) **It is not a proper noun, i.e., a specific name of a person, facility, and so on.** Although some previous studies include MW proper nouns in MWEs (Schneider et al., 2016; Baldwin and Kim, 2010), we exclude them because the identification of MW proper nouns has already been actively studied in the field of NER. Delegating MW proper noun identification to NER researchers will enable a more focused investigation on our part.

The full MWE definition is in Appendix A.2. The guidelines were updated whenever an issue was found, such as an ambiguous description.

## 4.3 Annotation Interface

For flexible and efficient annotation, we developed a novel annotation interface generator, CAIGen. CAIGen builds a checkbox-based interface in Google Sheets<sup>5</sup>, allowing annotators to perform annotations of MWEs and other kinds of spans simply by checking checkboxes as shown in Figure 1.

Its main advantages over other comparable annotation tools are summarized in Table 1. The first

<sup>5</sup><https://developers.google.com/sheets>

| ted.naist.000-SheaHembrey.003 |         |  |                                     |                                     |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------|---------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| MWE                           | Indices | Sentence   |                                     |                                     |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |
| grew up                       | 2 3     | I grew up in the middle of nowhere on a dirt road in rural Arkansas , an hour from the nearest movie theater . |                                     |                                     |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |
| the middle of nowhere         | 5 6 7 8 |  |                                     |                                     |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |                                     |                          |                          |
|                               |         | 1  | 2                                   | 3                                   | 4                        | 5                                   | 6                                   | 7                                   | 8                                   | 9                        | 10                       |
| MWE                           |         | I  | grew                                | up                                  | in                       | the                                 | middle                              | of                                  | nowhere                             | on                       | a                        |
| grew up                       |         | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| the middle of nowhere         |         | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|                               |         | <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Figure 1: An example sentence presented in our checkbox-based interface. Checks in the checkboxes are instantly reflected in the bordered zone at the upper right, showing which MWEs are currently marked.

tool, **brat**<sup>6</sup> (Stenetorp et al., 2012), has been used for annotation of a wide range of tasks such as sentiment analysis (Pontiki et al., 2016) and NER (Tabassum et al., 2020). **FLAT**<sup>7</sup> was used for the annotation of the PARSEME corpus (Savary et al., 2017). The advantages of CAIGen are as follows. First, the generated interface accepts annotations of spans of any form, including discontinuous or overlapping spans (see Appendix A.4 for examples), making it more flexible than the previous tools. Second, CAIGen provides a simple spreadsheet-based interface, which is familiar and accessible for technical and non-technical annotators alike. Third, CAIGen alleviates researchers’ overhead of managing servers and annotator accounts by delegating to Google, while the other tools require either (1) distributing data slices to each annotator and having them run applications locally or (2) running and managing the application on a remote server. Lastly, our interface is highly customizable because CAIGen builds it using Google Apps Script, a widely used programming language based on JavaScript; for example, simple customization could allow you to collect annotations about additional information, such as span types.

#### 4.4 Annotation

The annotation was done by (1) two annotators hired through a company and (2) five authors. The hired annotators comprise one native and one non-native English speaker, both with at least six years of experience as translators. They received feedback from the authors after annotating the first 50 or so sentences to correct misunderstandings about the annotation guidelines. We paid roughly 1 USD per sentence as a reward. Meanwhile, the author annotators consist of three native and two non-native speakers, all with a language-related degree and sufficient English proficiency to perform the task.

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/nlplab/brat>

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/proycon/flat>

For reliable annotation, we assigned each sentence to two annotators (one hired annotator and one author), ensuring that at least one was a native English speaker, as the task requires a rich English vocabulary.

All annotators were instructed to carefully read the guidelines and perform annotation using the checkbox-based interface. In the authors’ annotation, we marked unclear sentences to remove them later because it is hard to determine whether a span is an MWE in such sentences.

#### 4.5 Inter-Annotator Agreement

With two annotators being assigned to each sentence, we measured the inter-annotator agreement (IAA) by the MWE-based (exact-match) F1 score. The IAA was found to be only 37.3%, which could be attributed to annotators failing to annotate valid MWEs or to subjectivity in idiomaticity judgments despite the carefully written guidelines. We thus suggest that MWE datasets should be constructed with at least two independent annotators.

#### 4.6 Review

To solve the disagreement between the two annotators and correct any other problematic annotations, two authors—both native English speakers—reviewed all the annotations. We presented them with the annotations in a special interface for reviewing, where the tags given by only one annotator were highlighted, and we asked them to mark inappropriate tags to be deleted and newly found MWEs to be added. When the review was complete, we updated our dataset according to the marks added by reviewers.

#### 4.7 Consistency Check

One of the primary issues with the annotations in the DiMSUM dataset is their inconsistency—that is, a number of MWEs are annotated in one location and not another, despite equivalent constituents

| Type     | PoS of Head                 | Description   | Example  |
|----------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| NOUN     | NOUN, PRON, PROP            | Noun MWEs or compounds.   | <i>the <u>middle</u> of nowhere, red <u>tape</u></i>                                       |
| VERB     | VERB                        | Verbal MWEs.  | <i><u>stand for</u>, <u>pick up</u>, <u>break a leg</u></i>                                |
| MOD/CONN | ADJ, ADV, ADP, CCONJ, SCONJ | Adjectival, adverbial, or connective MWEs.  | <i><u>under the weather</u>, <u>of course</u>, <u>in spite of</u></i>                      |
| CLAUSE   | VERB, AUX                   | MWEs containing (1) a verb or auxiliary verb and (2) its nominal subject, e.g., proverbs, phatic expressions. | <i><u>you're welcome</u>, <u>the early bird gets the worm</u>, <u>when it comes to</u></i> |
| OTHER    | Any                         | MWEs whose head is not contained in them or whose PoS is none of the PoS above.                               | <i>and so on</i>   |

Table 2: MWE types in CoAM. The PoS are denoted with UPOS tags. Underlines denote the head of an MWE.

| Sentence  | Marked |
|---|--------|
| Having never booked train tickets online before thought I would <b>give</b> it a <b>try</b> and was very surprised at how much I saved. | ✓      |
| Would recomend <b>giving</b> this a <b>try</b> .  | ✗      |

Table 3: Inconsistent annotation of `give_try`. Note that the second sentence is reproduced as in DiMSUM, including apparent typos.

and semantics being present in both places. For example, see how `give_try` is labeled in only one of the sentences in Table 3.

In order to quantify this issue in both DiMSUM and CoAM—and to eliminate it from CoAM—we used a partially automated approach to find inconsistencies in both the entirety of CoAM and 1.3K sentences (the size of CoAM) randomly sampled from DiMSUM. We started by initializing an empty set  $M$ , then iterated through all given sentences and added all labeled MWEs from them to  $M$ . Next, we used a simple rule-based MWEI pipeline, repurposed from [Tanner and Hoffman \(2023\)](#), to find constituent groups in other sentences that could correspond to an MWE in  $M$  but were not already labeled. Finally, an author and native speaker of English reviewed each of these candidate constituent groups to see if they are semantically equivalent to already labeled instances of this MWE—that is, to see if they represent an inconsistency.

We found 118 instances of inconsistencies like this in the random sample of DiMSUM and 147 in CoAM,<sup>8</sup> reaffirming the difficulty involved in producing consistent MWE annotations. However, we then added the missing labels to all MWEs found in this way, eliminating these inconsistencies from the final CoAM data.

<sup>8</sup>When counting inconsistencies, we always consider positive labels correct, and negative labels inconsistent.

## 4.8 MWE Type Tagging

To enable fine-grained error analysis using CoAM, we automatically tagged all test-set MWEs, and training-set MWEs except those from UD with MWE types. Inspired by the classification by [Schneider et al. \(2014\)](#), we group MWEs into five types: NOUN, VERB, MODIFIER/CONNECTIVE (MOD/CONN), CLAUSE, and OTHER. The details are described in Table 2. We tag MWEs in each sentence  $s$  through the following automatic operations after dependency parsing using SpaCy. For each MWE  $m$  in  $s$ , we look for the head word, namely, try to find  $w$  that has all the other words in  $m$  as its descendants. If  $m$  has such  $w$ , we determine its type based on the PoS of  $w$ ; for example, we tag  $m$  as NOUN when  $w$  is a noun. If  $m$  does not have such  $w$ , we tag  $m$  as OTHER. We did not tag the sentences in UD because none of them are contained in the test set.

## 4.9 Statistics

Table 4 shows dataset statistics. CoAM has more than 1.3K sentences. The MWE density is 6–7% in both training and test sets. This proportion is much lower than that of DiMSUM ([Schneider et al., 2016](#))—13% in the grand total—most likely because they included proper noun phrases in MWEs. The right five columns show that VERB and NOUN are the two most frequent MWE types across data sources. They also demonstrate that our type tagging approach successfully assigned a specific (non-OTHER) MWE type to almost 95% of the MWEs in CoAM.

We also report the ratio of unseen MWEs, because they are of interest to the MWE research community, with their identification being a major challenge ([Ramisch et al., 2020](#)). An MWE in the test set is considered unseen if the multi-set of

|            | Sentences | Words  | MWEs | MWE<br>Density (%) | MWE Type Proportion (%) |      |          |        |       |
|------------|-----------|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------------|------|----------|--------|-------|
|            |           |        |      |                    | NOUN                    | VERB | MOD/CONN | CLAUSE | OTHER |
| News       | 360       | 9,328  | 230  | 5.5                | 33.5                    | 47.8 | 16.5     | 0.0    | 2.2   |
| Commentary | 357       | 9,310  | 272  | 7.0                | 29.8                    | 30.5 | 29.4     | 1.1    | 9.2   |
| TED        | 299       | 6,592  | 212  | 7.2                | 33.0                    | 37.3 | 21.2     | 3.8    | 4.7   |
| UD         | 285       | 5,001  | 160  | 7.2                | -                       | -    | -        | -      | -     |
| Train      | 780       | 16,817 | 489  | 6.7                | 33.4                    | 35.9 | 22.8     | 1.5    | 6.4   |
| Test       | 521       | 13,414 | 385  | 6.5                | 30.6                    | 40.0 | 22.9     | 1.6    | 4.9   |
| Total      | 1,301     | 30,231 | 874  | 6.6                | 31.9                    | 38.1 | 22.8     | 1.5    | 5.6   |

Table 4: Statistics of CoAM. MWE density is the percentage of words in MWEs. The test set comprises part of News, Commentary, and TED, while the training set comprises the rest of the data.

lemmas of its constituents was never annotated in the training set. Among 385 MWEs in our test set, 64.2% are unseen.

## 5 MWEI Approaches

We use CoAM to evaluate the following MWEI approaches.

### 5.1 MWEasWSD

MWEasWSD (MaW) is a system that uses (1) an MWE lexicon—WordNet (Miller, 1995)—and a rule-based pipeline to identify MWE candidates and (2) a trainable model to filter MWE candidates (Tanner and Hoffman, 2023). It achieved state-of-the-art performance on the DiMSUM dataset. They published four of their filtering models, among which we use the bi-encoder (BiEnc) and DCA poly-encoder (DCA). Both models are based on BERT (Devlin et al., 2019), specifically bert-base-uncased. They have been trained with SemCor (Miller et al., 1993), and we further fine-tune each model with the CoAM training set. We also run MaW with the rule-based pipeline only, i.e., without a filtering model.

### 5.2 LLM Fine-Tuning

Recent studies have shown the effectiveness of LLM fine-tuning for a wide range of tasks, such as NER (Zhou et al., 2024) and grammatical error correction (Kaneko and Okazaki, 2023). These works achieved high performance by providing LLMs with prompts that included instructions on the task.

Inspired by their success, we perform LLM fine-tuning, where the inputs to LLMs are instructions for MWEI (a summary of the annotation guidelines) followed by formatted tokens in a sentence.

## 6 Experiments

### 6.1 Setup

**LLM Fine-Tuning** We use four instruction-tuned LLMs that are available on Hugging Face Hub: Llama-3.1-8B-Instruct, Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct (Dubey et al., 2024), Qwen-2.5-7B-Instruct, and Qwen-2.5-72B-Instruct (Qwen Team, 2024). We hereafter abbreviate them, e.g., to Llama-8B, omitting the versions. For efficient training and inference, we use QLoRA (Detmers et al., 2023), performing 4-bit NormalFloat quantization and double quantization. Other hyperparameters are described in Appendix B.1. The computational budgets are in Appendix C.

To find a performant input-output format, we conduct preliminary experiments with three formats, adjusting the prompt for each format. These experiments are detailed in Appendix B.1. We find tsv\_to\_tsv (see Table 6) is the only format the models can comply with.

All prompts contain a placeholder for a definition of MWEs to clarify what sequences should be marked. We report scores using what we refer to as the *long definition* in Table 5; for scores using a shorter definition, see the ablation study in Appendix B.1.

**Evaluation Metrics** We use MWE-based precision, recall, and F1 score (Savary et al., 2023). See Appendix B.2 for their exact definitions.

### 6.2 Results and Analysis

In Table 5a, the left three columns show the overall scores. Fine-tuned Qwen-72B achieves the best F1, surpassing the highest F1 by Rule+DCA of MaW. Moreover, fine-tuned Qwen-72B outperforms all MaW systems in precision and recall. This indicates the effectiveness of fine-tuning LLMs for

|     |            | Recall by MWE Type    |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|-----|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|     |            | F1                    | P                     | R                     | NOUN<br>(118)         | VERB<br>(154)         | MOD/CONN<br>(88)      | CLAUSE<br>(6)         |
| FT  | Llama-8B   | 29.4 $\pm$ 2.1        | <b>82.6</b> $\pm$ 1.2 | 17.9 $\pm$ 1.6        | 5.9 $\pm$ 0.8         | 26.4 $\pm$ 1.5        | 24.2 $\pm$ 3.5        | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |
|     | Llama-70B  | 38.4 $\pm$ 4.8        | 74.5 $\pm$ 2.6        | 26.1 $\pm$ 4.6        | 19.2 $\pm$ 4.2        | 35.7 $\pm$ 5.7        | 25.4 $\pm$ 5.6        | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |
|     | Qwen-7B    | 45.2 $\pm$ 0.6        | 63.2 $\pm$ 0.9        | 35.2 $\pm$ 0.8        | 26.0 $\pm$ 2.0        | 47.2 $\pm$ 1.0        | 31.8 $\pm$ 2.0        | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |
|     | Qwen-72B   | <b>55.5</b> $\pm$ 0.5 | 61.5 $\pm$ 2.6        | <b>50.7</b> $\pm$ 2.5 | <b>44.4</b> $\pm$ 3.2 | <b>60.6</b> $\pm$ 1.0 | <b>50.4</b> $\pm$ 5.1 | <b>22.2</b> $\pm$ 9.6 |
| MaW | Rule       | 32.7                  | 28.3                  | 38.7                  | 37.3                  | 40.9                  | 47.7                  | 0.0                   |
|     | Rule+BiEnc | 41.6 $\pm$ 0.1        | 48.6 $\pm$ 0.3        | 36.5 $\pm$ 0.3        | 32.2 $\pm$ 0.0        | 41.1 $\pm$ 0.7        | 44.3 $\pm$ 0.0        | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |
|     | Rule+DCA   | 42.0 $\pm$ 0.1        | 48.4 $\pm$ 0.6        | 37.1 $\pm$ 0.3        | 33.3 $\pm$ 0.5        | 40.9 $\pm$ 0.0        | 45.8 $\pm$ 0.7        | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |

(a)

|     |            | Recall by Seen/Unseen |                       | Recall by In WN or Not |                       |
|-----|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
|     |            | Seen<br>(138)         | Unseen<br>(247)       | True<br>(163)          | False<br>(222)        |
| FT  | Llama-8B   | 37.2 $\pm$ 3.4        | 7.2 $\pm$ 0.6         | 29.2 $\pm$ 1.9         | 9.6 $\pm$ 1.7         |
|     | Llama-70B  | 35.0 $\pm$ 7.3        | 21.1 $\pm$ 3.2        | 46.8 $\pm$ 6.5         | 10.8 $\pm$ 3.2        |
|     | Qwen-7B    | 44.4 $\pm$ 0.8        | 30.0 $\pm$ 0.8        | 50.1 $\pm$ 1.4         | 24.2 $\pm$ 0.5        |
|     | Qwen-72B   | <b>58.2</b> $\pm$ 5.8 | <b>46.6</b> $\pm$ 0.7 | 63.6 $\pm$ 3.4         | <b>41.3</b> $\pm$ 1.9 |
| MaW | Rule       | 47.8                  | 33.6                  | <b>91.4</b>            | 0.0                   |
|     | Rule+BiEnc | 44.2 $\pm$ 0.0        | 32.1 $\pm$ 0.5        | 86.1 $\pm$ 0.7         | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |
|     | Rule+DCA   | 45.4 $\pm$ 0.8        | 32.4 $\pm$ 0.0        | 87.5 $\pm$ 0.7         | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0         |

(b)

Table 5: Results by MWEI system and metric/MWE category, as mean percentage scores of three runs with random training seeds. The numbers in parentheses are the MWE counts.  $\pm$  denotes standard deviation. The bold font denotes the highest score. *Rule* stands for the rule-based baseline, and *WN* for WordNet.

| Role   | Message   |
|--------|---|
| System | You are a helpful system to identify multiple-word expressions (MWEs).  |
| User   | Identify all the MWEs in the given sentence, and output their surface forms and the indices of their components.\n\n [MWE_DEFINITION]\n\n Each sentence is given as a string of words delimited by '\n'. Respond in TSV format, where the first and second columns contain words and MWE tags, respectively. The MWE tag should be a string of MWE identifiers. When a word belongs to multiple MWEs, the tag should be a concatenation of their numbers delimited by semicolons.\n\n Sentence:\n ACL\n stands\n\n \n |

Table 6: Example prompt for fine-tuning, based on the tsv\_to\_tsv format. In our main experiments, [MWE\_DEFINITION] will be filled with the long MWE definition described in Appendix B.1.

MWEI—particularly LLMs with a large number of parameters. One explanation for this could be that knowledge about MWEs was acquired by LLMs through pre-training, and we can harness this knowledge for MWEI by fine-tuning.

Meanwhile, all systems except for the rule-based pipeline suffer from low recall. Even the best system, fine-tuned Qwen-72B, achieves a recall of only 50.7%, failing to identify almost half of the gold MWEs. This leads us to conduct further analysis.

**Analysis of Recall** The right columns in Table 5a compare recall by MWE type, showing that CLAUSE and NOUN MWEs are more difficult to identify than MOD/CONN or VERB MWEs across models. In Table 5b, the left columns show that seen MWEs are easier to identify than unseen ones across models/systems. This result resembles that of the PARSEME shared task 1.2 (Ramisch et al., 2020), demonstrating that unseen MWEs remain challenging in MWEI.

The right columns in Table 5b reveal that MWEs not contained in WordNet are much more difficult to identify than those in WordNet. It is natural that MaW systems cannot identify the MWEs not in

| Result | MWE                | Context   | Note                      |
|--------|--------------------|---|---------------------------|
| TP     | <i>fire up</i>     | <i>The allegations have <b>fired up</b> the opposition, ...</i> | VERB MWE in WordNet       |
| TP     | <i>at least</i>    | <i>... since <b>at least</b> the 1950s.</i>                     | MOD/CONN MWE in WordNet   |
| FN     | <i>real estate</i> | <i>... park their toxic <b>real estate</b> assets ...</i>       | NOUN MWE not in WordNet   |
| FN     | <i>you know</i>    | <i><b>You know</b>, it's very old ...</i>                       | CLAUSE MWE not in WordNet |

Table 7: Examples of true positives (TPs) and false negatives (FNs), i.e., MWEs identified/missed in all three runs, of fine-tuned Qwen-72B.

WordNet, as their rule-based pipeline cannot detect these candidates, but interestingly we find that fine-tuned LLMs also struggle to identify MWEs not in WordNet. For Qwen-72B, the F1 score gap between MWEs contained and not contained in WordNet is about 22 points, much larger than the gap between seen/unseen MWEs, about 12 points. We hypothesize that this is caused by MWEs in WordNet being more widely recognized as idioms and that this recognition is reflected in the training data of the LLMs, enhancing their ability to identify these MWEs.

Table 7 shows examples of correctly identified MWEs and missed MWEs by fine-tuned Qwen-72B. 79.0% of VERB MWEs in WordNet like *fire up* are correctly identified by the model. Meanwhile, the NOUN MWE *real estate* was not identified. The aforementioned hypothesis could explain this, as *real estate* is not in WordNet. Accurately identifying such multi-word entities or multi-word terms (Savary et al., 2019) could be a challenge for future studies.

**Ablation Study on LLM Fine-Tuning** Given the high performance of fine-tuned Qwen-72B, we investigate how much fine-tuning (FT) contributes to the performance by comparing FT to zero-shot learning (ZSL) and few-shot learning (FSL). In ZSL, we provide the models with the same prompt as FT. In FSL, we sample 5 pairs of input (sentence) and output (gold MWE set) from the training set, convert them into the `tsv_to_tsv` format, and include them in the prompt as examples. In the sampling process, we repeat random sampling until at least two of the example sentences contain one or more MWEs so that the models have a sufficient number of examples to learn the task and format.

Table 8 shows the results. FT greatly outperforms ZSL and FSL, demonstrating the effectiveness of FT on the CoAM training set.

### Relative Strengths of LLMs vs MWEasWSD

As shown in Table 5a, fine-tuned Qwen-72B outperforms the best MaW system, Rule+DCA, in

|     | Llama-70B      | Qwen-72B       |
|-----|----------------|----------------|
| FT  | 38.4 $\pm$ 4.8 | 55.5 $\pm$ 0.5 |
| FSL | 4.3 $\pm$ 0.9  | 14.1 $\pm$ 0.3 |
| ZSL | 6.9            | 2.8            |

Table 8: Ablation results by MWEI method and model, as mean percentage F1 scores of three runs (for FT the randomness arises in training, and for FSL in exemplar selection).  $\pm$  denotes standard deviation.

all of F1, precision, and recall, by over 10 points. However, it does not mean fine-tuning should always be preferred. First, MaW’s encoder model (bert-base-uncased) has only 110M parameters, taking approximately  $2 \times 110M \times 4 = 880M$  bytes in total (2 is the number of encoders). 4-bit quantized Qwen-72B takes  $72,000M \times 0.5 = 36,000M$  bytes, taking roughly 40 times more space than MaW. On the other hand, the performance of 4-bit quantized Qwen-7B, which takes roughly 4 times more space, is comparable with Rule+DCA, suggesting that MaW is more memory-efficient.

Furthermore, the bottleneck of MaW is identified to be the size of the lexicon (Tanner and Hoffman, 2023). Future work could significantly improve the system’s performance simply by using a lexicon containing more MWEs than WordNet.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper, we constructed CoAM, a high-quality dataset of 1.3K sentences for MWEI covering all types of MWEs. Using a combination of human review and automated consistency checking, we addressed consistency issues that have been a problem for previous MWE datasets, enabling more accurate evaluation results for future work in MWEI. We used CoAM to evaluate two MWEI approaches: MaW and LLM fine-tuning. Our largest fine-tuned LLM performed the best, outperforming the current state-of-the-art, but all systems suffered from low recall. Consequently, we argue that MWEI overall remains a challenging task.



## 8 Limitations

Despite our best efforts to craft clear and unambiguous annotation guidelines, our initial annotations on CoAM suffered from very low inter-annotator agreement, suggesting possible inconsistencies. We have done our best to address this problem through the combination of human review (Section 4.6) and consistency checking (Section 4.7), but we acknowledge that in an ideal world initial inter-annotator agreement would have been higher.

Additionally, our annotation interface generator, CAIGen suffers from a few drawbacks. For example, it requires annotators to change rows when they have marked some MWEs and are marking more. Because annotators can forget to change rows, which happened in the construction of CoAM, researchers should urge them to confirm their annotations are as intended after finishing each sentence. Taking this into consideration, we release CAIGen’s source codes so that potential users can judge for themselves if its benefits outweigh its drawbacks.

## 9 Ethical Considerations

All sources of CoAM are permitted at minimum for use in research, as described in Appendix A.1. CoAM itself will be released under the condition that the users do not publish the data on the open web to prevent its leakage to the training data of future models. All annotators of CoAM consented that their annotations be made publicly accessible. Throughout the dataset construction processes involving authors, we found no contents harmful to the environment, specific groups of people, privacy, and so on.

## 10 Acknowledgments

To paraphrase or polish authors’ original content, we used an AI writing assistant tool, ChatGPT.<sup>9</sup> Financially, this work was supported by JST SPRING Grant Number JPMJSP2140.

## References

Timothy Baldwin and Su Nam Kim. 2010. Multiword expressions. In *Handbook of Natural Language Processing*.

Ann Bies, Justin Mott, Colin Warner, and Seth Kulick. 2012. English web treebank. LDC2012T13.

<sup>9</sup><https://chatgpt.com>

Eleftheria Briakou, Jiaming Luo, Colin Cherry, and Markus Freitag. 2024. *Translating step-by-step: Decomposing the translation process for improved translation quality of long-form texts*. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 1301–1317, Miami, Florida, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Mauro Cettolo, Marcello Federico, Luisa Bentivogli, Jan Niehues, Sebastian Stüker, Katsuhito Sudoh, Koichiro Yoshino, and Christian Federmann. 2017. *Overview of the IWSLT 2017 evaluation campaign*. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Spoken Language Translation*, pages 2–14, Tokyo, Japan. International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation.

Mauro Cettolo, Christian Girardi, and Marcello Federico. 2012. *Wit3: Web inventory of transcribed and translated talks*. In *EAMT*, pages 261–268.

Mathieu Constant, Gülşen Eryiğit, Johanna Monti, Lonneke Van Der Plas, Carlos Ramisch, Michael Rosner, and Amalia Todirascu. 2017. Multiword expression processing: A survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 43(4):837–892.

Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2023. *Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms*. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 10088–10115. Curran Associates, Inc.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. *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 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, Anirudh Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Aobo Yang, Archi Mitra, Archie Sravankumar, Artem Korenev, Arthur Hinsvark, Arun Rao, Aston Zhang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Austen Gregerson, Ava Spataru, Baptiste Roziere, Bethany Biron, Binh Tang, Bobbie Chern, Charlotte Caucheteux, Chaya Nayak, Chloe Bi, Chris Marra, Chris McConnell, Christian Keller, Christophe Touret, Chunyang Wu, Corinne Wong, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Cyrus Nikolaidis, Damien Alonsius, Daniel Song, Danielle Pintz, Danny Livshits, David Esiobu, Dhruv Choudhary, Dhruv Mahajan, Diego Garcia-Olano, Diego Perino, Dieuwke Hupkes, Egor Lakomkin, Ehab AlBadawy, Elina Lobanova, Emily Dinan, Eric Michael Smith, Filip Radenovic, Frank Zhang, Gabriel Synnaeve, Gabrielle Lee, Georgia Lewis Anderson, Graeme Nail, Gregoire Mialon, Guan Pang, Guillem Cucurell, Hailey Nguyen, Hannah Korevaar, Hu Xu, Hugo Touvron, Iliyan Zarov, Imanol Arrieta Ibarra, Isabel Kloumann, Ishan

Misra, Ivan Evtimov, Jade Copet, Jaewon Lee, Jan Geffert, Jana Vranes, Jason Park, Jay Mahadeokar, Jeet Shah, Jelmer van der Linde, Jennifer Billock, Jenny Hong, Jenya Lee, Jeremy Fu, Jianfeng Chi, Jianyu Huang, Jiawen Liu, Jie Wang, Jiecao Yu, Joanna Bitton, Joe Spisak, Jongsoo Park, Joseph Rocca, Joshua Johnstun, Joshua Saxe, Junteng Jia, Kalyan Vasuden Alwala, Kartikeya Upasani, Kate Plawiak, Ke Li, Kenneth Heafield, Kevin Stone, Khalid El-Arini, Krithika Iyer, Kshitiz Malik, Kuenley Chiu, Kunal Bhalla, Lauren Rantala-Yearly, Laurens van der Maaten, Lawrence Chen, Liang Tan, Liz Jenkins, Louis Martin, Lovish Madaan, Lubo Malo, Lukas Blecher, Lukas Landzaat, Luke de Oliveira, Madeline Muzzi, Mahesh Pasupuleti, Mannat Singh, Manohar Paluri, Marcin Kardas, Mathew Oldham, Mathieu Rita, Maya Pavlova, Melanie Kambadur, Mike Lewis, Min Si, Mitesh Kumar Singh, Mona Hassan, Naman Goyal, Narjes Torabi, Nikolay Bashlykov, Nikolay Bogoychev, Niladri Chatterji, Olivier Duchenne, Onur Çelebi, Patrick Alrassy, Pengchuan Zhang, Pengwei Li, Petar Vasic, Peter Weng, Prajjwal Bhargava, Pratik Dubal, Praveen Krishnan, Punit Singh Koura, Puxin Xu, Qing He, Qingxiao Dong, Ragavan Srinivasan, Raj Ganapathy, Ramon Calderer, Ricardo Silveira Cabral, Robert Stojnic, Roberta Raileanu, Rohit Girdhar, Rohit Patel, Romain Sauvestre, Ronnie Polidoro, Roshan Sumbaly, Ross Taylor, Ruan Silva, Rui Hou, Rui Wang, Saghar Hosseini, Sahana Chennabasappa, Sanjay Singh, Sean Bell, Seohyun Sonia Kim, Sergey Edunov, Shaoliang Nie, Sharan Narang, Sharath Rapparth, Sheng Shen, Shengye Wan, Shruti Bhosale, Shun Zhang, Simon Vandenhende, Soumya Batra, Spencer Whitman, Sten Sootla, Stephane Collot, Suchin Gururangan, Sydney Borodinsky, Tamar Herman, Tara Fowler, Tarek Sheasha, Thomas Georgiou, Thomas Scialom, Tobias Speckbacher, Todor Mihaylov, Tong Xiao, Ujjwal Karn, Vedanuj Goswami, Vibhor Gupta, Vignesh Ramanathan, Viktor Kerkez, Vincent Gouget, Virginie Do, Vish Vogeti, Vladan Petrovic, Weiwei Chu, Wenhan Xiong, Wenyin Fu, Whitney Meers, Xavier Martinet, Xiaodong Wang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Xinfeng Xie, Xuchao Jia, Xuewei Wang, Yaelle Goldschlag, Yashesh Gaur, Yasmine Babaei, Yi Wen, Yiwen Song, Yuchen Zhang, Yue Li, Yuning Mao, Zacharie Delpierre Coudert, Zheng Yan, Zhengxing Chen, Zoe Papanikolaou, Aaditya Singh, Aaron Grattafiori, Abha Jain, Adam Kelsey, Adam Shajnfeld, Adithya Gangidi, Adolfo Victoria, Ahuva Goldstand, Ajay Menon, Ajay Sharma, Alex Boesenberg, Alex Vaughan, Alexei Baevski, Allie Feinstein, Amanda Kallet, Amit Sangani, Anam Yunus, Andrei Lupu, Andres Alvarado, Andrew Caples, Andrew Gu, Andrew Ho, Andrew Poulton, Andrew Ryan, Ankit Ramchandani, Annie Franco, Aparajita Saraf, Arkabandhu Chowdhury, Ashley Gabriel, Ashwin Bharambe, Assaf Eisenman, Azadeh Yazdan, Beau James, Ben Maurer, Benjamin Leonhardi, Bernie Huang, Beth Loyd, Beto De Paola, Bhargavi Paranjape, Bing Liu, Bo Wu, Boyu Ni, Braden Hancock, Bram Wasti, Brandon Spence, Brani Stojkovic, Brian Gamido, Britt Montalvo, Carl Parker, Carly Burton, Catalina Mejia, Changhan Wang, Changkyu

Kim, Chao Zhou, Chester Hu, Ching-Hsiang Chu, Chris Cai, Chris Tindal, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Damon Civin, Dana Beaty, Daniel Kreymer, Daniel Li, Danny Wyatt, David Adkins, David Xu, Davide Testuggine, Delia David, Devi Parikh, Diana Liskovich, Didem Foss, DingKang Wang, Duc Le, Dustin Holland, Edward Dowling, Eissa Jamil, Elaine Montgomery, Eleonora Presani, Emily Hahn, Emily Wood, Erik Brinkman, Esteban Arcaute, Evan Dunbar, Evan Smothers, Fei Sun, Felix Kreuk, Feng Tian, Firat Ozgenel, Francesco Caggioni, Francisco Guzmán, Frank Kanayet, Frank Seide, Gabriela Medina Florez, Gabriella Schwarz, Gada Badeer, Georgia Swee, Gil Halpern, Govind Thattai, Grant Herman, Grigory Sizov, Guangyi, Zhang, Guna Lakshminarayanan, Hamid Shojanazeri, Han Zou, Hannah Wang, Hanwen Zha, Haroun Habeeb, Harrison Rudolph, Helen Suk, Henry Aspegren, Hunter Goldman, Ibrahim Damlaj, Igor Molybog, Igor Tufanov, Irina-Elena Veliche, Itai Gat, Jake Weissman, James Geboski, James Kohli, Japhet Asher, Jean-Baptiste Gaya, Jeff Marcus, Jeff Tang, Jennifer Chan, Jenny Zhen, Jeremy Reizenstein, Jeremy Teboul, Jessica Zhong, Jian Jin, Jingyi Yang, Joe Cummings, Jon Carvill, Jon Shepard, Jonathan McPhie, Jonathan Torres, Josh Ginsburg, Junjie Wang, Kai Wu, Kam Hou U, Karan Saxena, Karthik Prasad, Kartikay Khandelwal, Katayoun Zand, Kathy Matosich, Kaushik Veeraraghavan, Kelly Michelena, Keqian Li, Kun Huang, Kunal Chawla, Kushal Lakhota, Kyle Huang, Lailin Chen, Lakshya Garg, Lavender A, Leandro Silva, Lee Bell, Lei Zhang, Liangpeng Guo, Licheng Yu, Liron Moshkovich, Luca Wehrstedt, Madian Khabsa, Manav Avalani, Manish Bhatt, Maria Tsim-poukelli, Martynas Mankus, Matan Hasson, Matthew Lennie, Matthias Reso, Maxim Groshev, Maxim Naumov, Maya Lathi, Meghan Keneally, Michael L. Seltzer, Michal Valko, Michelle Restrepo, Mihir Patel, Mik Vyatskov, Mikayel Samvelyan, Mike Clark, Mike Macey, Mike Wang, Miquel Jubert Hermoso, Mo Metanat, Mohammad Rastegari, Munish Bansal, Nandhini Santhanam, Natascha Parks, Natasha White, Navyata Bawa, Nayan Singhal, Nick Egebo, Nicolas Usumier, Nikolay Pavlovich Laptev, Ning Dong, Ning Zhang, Norman Cheng, Oleg Chernoguz, Olivia Hart, Omkar Salpekar, Ozlem Kalinli, Parkin Kent, Parth Parekh, Paul Saab, Pavan Balaji, Pedro Rittner, Philip Bontrager, Pierre Roux, Piotr Dollar, Polina Zvyagina, Prashant Ratan-chandani, Pritish Yuvraj, Qian Liang, Rachad Alao, Rachel Rodriguez, Rafi Ayub, Raghotham Murthy, Raghu Nayani, Rahul Mitra, Raymond Li, Rebekkah Hogan, Robin Battey, Rocky Wang, Rohan Maheswari, Russ Howes, Ruty Rinott, Sai Jayesh Bondu, Samyak Datta, Sara Chugh, Sara Hunt, Sargun Dhillon, Sasha Sidorov, Satadru Pan, Saurabh Verma, Seiji Yamamoto, Sharadh Ramaswamy, Shaun Lindsay, Shaun Lindsay, Sheng Feng, Shenghao Lin, Shengxin Cindy Zha, Shiva Shankar, Shuqiang Zhang, Shuqiang Zhang, Sinong Wang, Sneha Agarwal, Soji Sajuyigbe, Soumith Chintala, Stephanie Max, Stephen Chen, Steve Kehoe, Steve Satterfield, Sudarshan Govindaprasad, Sumit Gupta, Sungmin Cho, Sunny Virk, Suraj Subramanian, Sy Choudhury,

- Sydney Goldman, Tal Remez, Tamar Glaser, Tamara Best, Thilo Kohler, Thomas Robinson, Tianhe Li, Tianjun Zhang, Tim Matthews, Timothy Chou, Tzook Shaked, Varun Vontimitta, Victoria Ajayi, Victoria Montanez, Vijai Mohan, Vinay Satish Kumar, Vishal Mangla, Vitor Albiero, Vlad Ionescu, Vlad Poenaru, Vlad Tiberiu Mihailescu, Vladimir Ivanov, Wei Li, Wenchen Wang, Wenwen Jiang, Wes Bouaziz, Will Constable, Xiaocheng Tang, Xiaofang Wang, Xiaojian Wu, Xiaolan Wang, Xide Xia, Xilun Wu, Xinbo Gao, Yanjun Chen, Ye Hu, Ye Jia, Ye Qi, Yenda Li, Yilin Zhang, Ying Zhang, Yossi Adi, Youngjin Nam, Yu, Wang, Yuchen Hao, Yundi Qian, Yuzi He, Zach Rait, Zachary DeVito, Zef Rosnbrick, Zhaoduo Wen, Zhenyu Yang, and Zhiwei Zhao. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Goran Glavaš and Sanja Štajner. 2013. [Event-centered simplification of news stories](#). In *Proceedings of the Student Research Workshop associated with RANLP 2013*, pages 71–78, Hissar, Bulgaria. INCOMA Ltd. Shoumen, BULGARIA.
- Hessel Haagsma, Johan Bos, and Malvina Nissim. 2020. [MAGPIE: A large corpus of potentially idiomatic expressions](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 279–287, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Ray Jackendoff. 1995. [The Boundaries of Lexicon](#). In M. Everaert, E.J. van der Linden, A. Schenk, R. Schreuder, and R. Schreuder, editors, *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*, pages 133–166. Erlbaum, NJ.
- Masahiro Kaneko and Naoaki Okazaki. 2023. [Reducing sequence length by predicting edit spans with large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10017–10029, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Angelika Kirilin, Felix Krauss, and Yannick Versley. 2016. [ICL-HD at SemEval-2016 task 10: Improving the detection of minimal semantic units and their meanings with an ontology and word embeddings](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2016)*, pages 937–945, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ekaterina Kochmar, Sian Gooding, and Matthew Shardlow. 2020. [Detecting multiword expression type helps lexical complexity assessment](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 4426–4435, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Tom Kocmi, Eleftherios Avramidis, Rachel Bawden, Ondřej Bojar, Anton Dvorkovich, Christian Federmann, Mark Fishel, Markus Freitag, Thamma Gowda, Roman Grundkiewicz, Barry Haddow, Philipp Koehn, Benjamin Marie, Christof Monz, Makoto Morishita, Kenton Murray, Makoto Nagata, Toshiaki Nakazawa, Martin Popel, Maja Popović, and Mariya Shmatova. 2023. [Findings of the 2023 conference on machine translation \(WMT23\): LLMs are here but not quite there yet](#). In *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*, pages 1–42, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ioannis Korkontzelos, Torsten Zesch, Fabio Massimo Zanzotto, and Chris Biemann. 2013. [SemEval-2013 task 5: Evaluating phrasal semantics](#). In *Second Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics (\*SEM), Volume 2: Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval 2013)*, pages 39–47, Atlanta, Georgia, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nelson F. Liu, Daniel Hershcovich, Michael Kranzlein, and Nathan Schneider. 2021. [Lexical semantic recognition](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2021)*, pages 49–56, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- George A. Miller. 1995. [Wordnet: A lexical database for english](#). *Communications of the ACM*, 38(1):39–41.
- George A. Miller, Claudia Leacock, Randee Teng, and Ross T. Bunker. 1993. [A semantic concordance](#). In *Human Language Technology: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Plainsboro, New Jersey, March 21-24, 1993*.
- Grace Muzny and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2013. [Automatic idiom identification in Wiktionary](#). In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1417–1421, Seattle, Washington, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Graham Neubig, Katsuhiko Sudoh, Yusuke Oda, Kevin Duh, Hajime Tsukuda, and Masaaki Nagata. 2014. [The NAIST-NTT TED talk treebank](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation: Papers*, pages 265–270, Lake Tahoe, California.
- Maria Pontiki, Dimitris Galanis, Haris Papageorgiou, Suresh Manandhar, Ion Androutsopoulos, Núria Bel, and Gülşen Eryiğit. 2016. [Semeval-2016 task 5: Aspect based sentiment analysis](#). In *International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation*.
- Qwen Team. 2024. [Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models](#).
- Carlos Ramisch, Agata Savary, Bruno Guillaume, Jakub Waszczuk, Marie Candito, Ashwini Vaidya, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Archana Bhatia, Uxoia Iñurrieta, Voula Giouli, Tunga Güngör, Menghan Jiang, Timm Lichte, Chaya Liebeskind, Johanna Monti, Renata Ramisch, Sara Stymne, Abigail Walsh, and Hongzhi Xu. 2020. [Edition 1.2 of the PARSEME shared task on semi-supervised identification of verbal multiword expressions](#). In *Proceedings of the*

- Joint Workshop on Multiword Expressions and Electronic Lexicons*, pages 107–118, online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Omid Rohanian, Shiva Taslimipour, Samaneh Kouchaki, Le An Ha, and Ruslan Mitkov. 2019. [Bridging the gap: Attending to discontinuity in identification of multiword expressions](#). 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 2692–2698, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ivan A. Sag, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond, Ann Copestake, and Dan Flickinger. 2002. [Multiword expressions : a pain in the neck for nlp](#).
- Agata Savary, Cherifa Ben Khelil, Carlos Ramisch, Voula Giouli, Verginica Barbu Mititelu, Najet Hadj Mohamed, Cvetana Krstev, Chaya Liebeskind, Hongzhi Xu, Sara Stymne, Tunga Güngör, Thomas Pickard, Bruno Guillaume, Eduard Bejček, Archana Bhatia, Marie Candito, Polona Gantar, Uxoá Iñurrieta, Albert Gatt, Jolanta Kovalevskaite, Timm Lichte, Nikola Ljubešić, Johanna Monti, Carla Parra Escartín, Mehrnosh Shamsfard, Ivelina Stoyanova, Veronika Vincze, and Abigail Walsh. 2023. [PARSEME corpus release 1.3](#). In *Proceedings of the 19th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2023)*, pages 24–35, Dubrovnik, Croatia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Agata Savary, Silvio Cordeiro, and Carlos Ramisch. 2019. [Without lexicons, multiword expression identification will never fly: A position statement](#). In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Multiword Expressions and WordNet (MWE-WN 2019)*, pages 79–91, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Agata Savary, Carlos Ramisch, Silvio Cordeiro, Federico Sangati, Veronika Vincze, Behrang Qasemizadeh, Marie Candito, Fabienne Cap, Voula Giouli, Ivelina Stoyanova, and Antoine Doucet. 2017. [The PARSEME shared task on automatic identification of verbal multiword expressions](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2017)*, pages 31–47, Valencia, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nathan Schneider, Dirk Hovy, Anders Johannsen, and Marine Carpuat. 2016. [SemEval-2016 task 10: Detecting minimal semantic units and their meanings \(DiMSUM\)](#). In *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2016)*, pages 546–559, San Diego, California. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nathan Schneider, Spencer Onuffer, Nora Kazour, Emily Danchik, Michael T Mordowanec, Henrietta Conrad, and Noah A Smith. 2014. Comprehensive annotation of multiword expressions in a social web corpus. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*, pages 455–461. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Pontus Stenetorp, Sampo Pyysalo, Goran Topić, Tomoko Ohta, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2012. Brat: a web-based tool for nlp-assisted text annotation. In *Proceedings of the Demonstrations at the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 102–107.
- Jeniya Tabassum, Mounica Maddela, Wei Xu, and Alan Ritter. 2020. [Code and named entity recognition in stackoverflow](#). In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Joshua Tanner and Jacob Hoffman. 2023. [MWE as WSD: Solving multiword expression identification with word sense disambiguation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 181–193, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Harish Tayyar Madabushi, Edward Gow-Smith, Marcos Garcia, Carolina Scarton, Marco Idiart, and Aline Villavicencio. 2022. [SemEval-2022 task 2: Multilingual idiomaticity detection and sentence embedding](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation (SemEval-2022)*, pages 107–121, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simone Tedeschi, Federico Martelli, and Roberto Navigli. 2022. [ID10M: Idiom identification in 10 languages](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2022*, pages 2715–2726, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abigail Walsh, Claire Bonial, Kristina Geeraert, John P. McCrae, Nathan Schneider, and Clarissa Somers. 2018. [Constructing an annotated corpus of verbal MWEs for English](#). In *Proceedings of the Joint Workshop on Linguistic Annotation, Multiword Expressions and Constructions (LAW-MWE-CxG-2018)*, pages 193–200, Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ralph Weischedel, Martha Palmer, Mitchell Marcus, Eduard Hovy, Sameer Pradhan, Lance Ramshaw, Nianwen Xue, Ann Taylor, Jeff Kaufman, Michelle Franchini, Mohammed El-Bachouti, Robert Belvin, and Ann Houston. 2013. Ontonotes release 5.0. LDC2013T19.
- Seid Muhie Yimam, Chris Biemann, Shervin Malmasi, Gustavo Paetzold, Lucia Specia, Sanja Štajner, Anaïs Tack, and Marcos Zampieri. 2018. [A report on the complex word identification shared task 2018](#). In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 66–78, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Daniel Zeman, Jan Hajič, Martin Popel, Martin Potthast, Milan Straka, Filip Ginter, Joakim Nivre, and Slav

Petrov. 2018. [CoNLL 2018 shared task: Multilingual parsing from raw text to Universal Dependencies](#). In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2018 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies*, pages 1–21, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wenxuan Zhou, Sheng Zhang, Yu Gu, Muhao Chen, and Hoifung Poon. 2024. [UniversalNER: Targeted distillation from large language models for open named entity recognition](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

## A Construction of CoAM

### A.1 Data Sources

| Source          | Paper  | URL  | License   | Note   |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|
| News            | Glavaš and Štajner (2013); Yimam et al. (2018) | <a href="https://takelab.fer.hr/data/evsimplify/">https://takelab.fer.hr/data/evsimplify/</a><br><a href="https://sites.google.com/view/cwisharedtask2018/datasets">https://sites.google.com/view/cwisharedtask2018/datasets</a> | Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 | We used the News_Train data from the CWI Shared Task 2018 datasets.  |
| Commentary      | Kocmi et al. (2023)                            | <a href="https://data.statmt.org/news-commentary/v18.1/training-monolingual/">https://data.statmt.org/news-commentary/v18.1/training-monolingual/</a>  | Can be freely used for research purposes.                 | We used the English part of v18.1.                                   |
| TED (NAIST-NTT) | Neubig et al. (2014)                           | <a href="https://ahcweb01.naist.jp/old/resource/tedtreebank/">https://ahcweb01.naist.jp/old/resource/tedtreebank/</a>  | Creative Commons ShareAlike-Attribution-NonCommercial     |  |
| TED (IWSLT)     | Cettolo et al. (2012, 2017)                    | <a href="https://wit3.fbk.eu/2017-01">https://wit3.fbk.eu/2017-01</a><br><a href="https://wit3.fbk.eu/2017-01-b">https://wit3.fbk.eu/2017-01-b</a>   | Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0   |  |
| UD              | Bies et al. (2012); Walsh et al. (2018)        | <a href="https://gitlab.com/parseme/parseme_corpus_en">https://gitlab.com/parseme/parseme_corpus_en</a>  | Creative Commons ShareAlike 4.0                           | We used the portion of PARSEME corpus from the English Web Treebank. |

Table 9: Data sources of CoAM.

### A.2 MWE definition in Annotation Guidelines

In our definition, MWEs are idiomatic sequences that (a) consist of multiple words, (b) display semantic, lexical, or syntactic idiomaticity, and (c) are not proper nouns.

- a. **An MWE consists of at least two words that are always realized by the same lexemes.**<sup>10</sup> For example, the MWE *"break up"* is always realized by (1) *"break"* or its conjugated form such as *"broke"* and (2) *"up"*. Such words cannot be replaced without distorting the meaning of the expression or violating the language conventions.
- b. **An MWE displays semantic, lexical, or syntactic idiomaticity.** The semantically idiomatic MWEs include *"break up"*, the lexically idiomatic include *"to and fro"*, and the syntactically idiomatic include *"long time no see"*.
  - Semantic idiomaticity occurs when **the meaning of an expression cannot be derived from its components**. That is, you cannot necessarily infer the meaning of the expression even if you know all the senses of its components. In other words, a semantically idiomatic takes on a meaning that is unique to that combination of words.  
The inferability differs from one expression to another. The meaning of idiomatic MWEs such as *"kick the bucket"* cannot be inferred from its components at all. The meaning of institutionalized phrases like *"traffic light"* is inferable to some degree. Yet it is an MWE because it does not mean any type of light related to traffic but a specific type of light.
  - Lexical idiomaticity occurs when **one or more components of an expression are not used as stand-alone words in standard English**. Examples include *"bide one's time"*; *"bide"* rarely appears by itself in today's standard English.
  - Syntactic idiomaticity occurs when **the grammatical structure of an expression cannot be derived directly from that of its components**. It constitutes expressions whose grammar seems

<sup>10</sup><https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lexeme>

to go against standard English grammatical conventions. This includes expressions such as "*all of a sudden*," where "*sudden*" appears in its archaic noun form.

**c. An MWE is not a proper noun, such as the name of a specific person, organization, and so forth.**

In this project, do not annotate proper nouns unless they are part of an MWE (like *Pavlov* in "*Pavlov's dog*"). Here is the full list of proper nouns in our definition.<sup>11</sup>

| Type   | Example   |
|--|---|
| People's names                                 | <i>Shohei Ohtani</i>                            |
| Nationalities or religious or political groups | <i>African American, Sunni Muslims</i>          |
| Facilities                                     | <i>Narita International Airport, Taipei 101</i> |
| Organizations                                  | <i>Procter &amp; Gamble, Kyoto University</i>   |
| Geopolitical entities (GPE)                    | <i>Los Angeles, the United Kingdom</i>          |
| Non-GPE locations                              | <i>Mount Fuji, Amazon River</i>                 |
| Products                                       | <i>Toyota Prius, Samsung Galaxy</i>             |
| Named events                                   | <i>World War II, Olympic Games Tokyo 2020</i>   |
| Works of art                                   | <i>Norwegian Wood, Bohemian Rhapsody</i>        |
| Named legal documents                          | <i>The Magna Carta</i>                          |
| Named languages                                | <i>Middle English, American Sign Language</i>   |

Note:

- Proper noun phrases usually start with a capital letter, while exceptions like "*iPhone 15*" exist.

### A.3 Notes on Idiomaticity and (Non-)Compositionality

To judge whether a sequence is an MWE, we focus on (semantic) idiomaticity instead of non-compositionality, although non-compositionality has been considered an inherent property of MWEs in previous studies, such as [Tedeschi et al. \(2022\)](#). To discuss the difference between the two notions, consider the expression *spill the beans*. It is deemed compositional because it can be analyzed as being made up of *spill* in a "reveal" sense and the *beans* in a "secret(s)" sense, resulting in the overall compositional reading of "reveal the secret(s)" ([Sag et al., 2002](#)). Meanwhile, the "secret(s)" sense is unique to the expression and cannot be derived from the word *beans*, making the whole expression semantically idiomatic. We argue that *spill the beans* should be identified as an MWE because the meaning of *beans* depends on the whole expression and that any idiomatic sequences should be identified even if they are compositional.

### A.4 Annotation Interface

|         |                                     |                          |                                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|         |                                     | 1                        | 2                                   | 3                        | 4                        | 5                        | 6                        |
| MWE     | Pick                                | me                       | up                                  | at                       | the                      | station                  |                          |
| Pick up | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|         | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

(a) An example of discontinuous MWE.

|             |                          |                          |                                     |                          |                                     |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
|             |                          | 1                        | 2                                   | 3                        | 4                                   | 5                        | 6                        | 7                                   |
| MWE         | They                     | were                     | letting                             | him                      | in                                  | and                      | out                      |                                     |
| letting in  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| letting out | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

(b) An example of overlapping MWEs.

Figure 2: How to annotate tricky MWEs using our interface.

Our interface generated by CAIGen enables annotators to mark spans in any form, including discontinuous and overlapping ones, only by checking checkboxes. Figure 2 shows the examples.

<sup>11</sup>The 11 types derive from the named entity types of OntoNotes Release 5.0 ([Weischedel et al., 2013](#)).

## B Experimental Setup

### B.1 LLM fine-tuning

|          |                         |  |
|----------|-------------------------|--|
| LoRA     | $r$                     | 64                                     |
|          | $\alpha$                | 16                                     |
|          | Dropout                 | 0.05                                   |
|          | Target modules          | All linear layers                      |
| Training | Epoch                   | 3                                      |
|          | Effective batch size    | 32                                     |
|          | Learning rate           | 2e-4                                   |
|          | Learning rate scheduler | constant                               |
|          | Optimizer               | paged_adamw_8bit ( $\beta_2 = 0.999$ ) |
|          | Max grad norm           | 0.3                                    |

Table 10: Hyperparameters for fine-tuning. The epoch was determined based on preliminary experiments, while other parameters are based on [Dettmers et al. \(2023\)](#).

| Name                                | Example (Input $\rightarrow$ Output)   |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <code>dict_to_dict_list</code>      | <code>{1: 'ACL', 2: 'stands', 3: 'for', ...}</code> $\rightarrow$ <code>[{'surface': 'stands for', 'indices': [2, 3]}]</code>              |
| <code>str_to_str_number_span</code> | ACL stands for Association for Computational Linguistics . $\rightarrow$ ACL <1>stands for</1> Association for Computational Linguistics . |
| <code>tsv_to_tsv</code>             | ACL\nstands\nfor\n $\rightarrow$ ACL\t\nstands\t1\nfor\t1\n  |
|                                     | $\vdots$ $\vdots$  |

Table 11: Input-output formats for fine-tuning. Bold fonts denote the format employed for the main experiments. Suppose the sentence given as the example is *ACL stands for Association for Computational Linguistics*.

**Hyperparameters** Table 10 shows hyperparameters used for training and evaluation. At inference, we perform greedy decoding.

**Input-Output Format** To investigate the optimal input-output format, we perform preliminary experiments. We prepare three input-output formats described in Table 11. All the output formats allow us to represent MWEs in any form, including discontinuous or overlapping MWEs. We train and evaluate Llama-8B and Qwen-7B with CoAM, using each input-output format. We use the hyperparameters described in Table 10 and the long MWE definition (same as the main experiments).

As a result, `tsv_to_tsv` turned out to be the only format the models can comply with. Employing other formats results in the violation of the format despite carefully written instructions. With `dict_to_dict_list`, the models produce wrong indices in the outputs. With `str_to_str_number_span`, the models delete spaces before punctuations.



| Name  | Content  |
|-------|--|
| Long  | <p>Here, an MWE is defined as a sequence that satisfies the following three conditions.\n</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It consists of multiple words that are always realized by the same lexemes. Such words cannot be replaced without distorting the meaning of the expression or violating language conventions.\n</li> <li>2. It displays semantic, lexical, or syntactic idiomaticity. Semantic idiomaticity occurs when the meaning of an expression cannot be explicitly derived from its components. In other words, a semantically idiomatic takes on a meaning that is unique to that combination of words. Lexical idiomaticity occurs when one or more components of an expression are not used as stand-alone words in standard English. Syntactic idiomaticity occurs when the grammar of an expression cannot be derived directly from that of its components. For example, semantically idiomatic MWEs include "break up", the lexically idiomatic include "to and fro", and the syntactically idiomatic include "long time no see".\n</li> <li>3. It is not a multi-word named entity, i.e., a specific name of a person, facility, etc.</li> </ol> |
| Short | <p>Here, an MWE is defined as a sequence that satisfies the following three conditions.\n</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It consists of multiple words that are always realized by the same lexemes.\n</li> <li>2. It is idiomatic, that is, its meaning cannot be explicitly derived from its components.\n</li> <li>3. It is not a multi-word named entity, i.e., a specific name of a person, facility, etc.</li> </ol>  |

Table 12: MWE definitions to be included in prompts for fine-tuning.

|       |          | F1             | P               | R              | R by MWE Type  |                |                |               |
|-------|----------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
|       |          |                |                 |                | Noun (118)     | Verb (154)     | Mod/Conn (88)  | Clause (6)    |
| Long  | Llama-8B | 29.4 $\pm$ 2.1 | 82.6 $\pm$ 1.2  | 17.9 $\pm$ 1.6 | 5.9 $\pm$ 0.8  | 26.4 $\pm$ 1.5 | 24.2 $\pm$ 3.5 | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0 |
|       | Qwen-7B  | 45.2 $\pm$ 0.6 | 63.2 $\pm$ 0.9  | 35.2 $\pm$ 0.8 | 26.0 $\pm$ 2.0 | 47.2 $\pm$ 1.0 | 31.8 $\pm$ 2.0 | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0 |
| Short | Llama-8B | 8.6 $\pm$ 14.8 | 28.9 $\pm$ 50.0 | 5.0 $\pm$ 8.7  | 1.4 $\pm$ 2.4  | 7.1 $\pm$ 12.4 | 7.2 $\pm$ 12.5 | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0 |
|       | Qwen-7B  | 32.8 $\pm$ 0.2 | 70.8 $\pm$ 1.6  | 21.4 $\pm$ 0.1 | 12.1 $\pm$ 0.5 | 30.5 $\pm$ 0.6 | 22.3 $\pm$ 0.7 | 0.0 $\pm$ 0.0 |

Table 13: Ablation results, as mean percentage scores of three runs with random seeds. The numbers in parentheses are the MWE counts.  $\pm$  denotes standard deviation.

**MWE Definition** To validate the efficacy of the long MWE definition, we perform an ablation study comparing the long definition to the short definition. They are both a summary of the full definition described in Appendix A.2. As shown in Table 12, the long definition has 162 words while the short is further contracted to 57 words. We perform experiments with Llama-8B and Qwen-7B, using the tsv\_to\_tsv format and the hyperparameters described in Table 10 (same as the main experiments).

Table 13 presents the result. For both models, the long definition achieves higher F1 scores than the short by more than 12 points, indicating the effectiveness of a detailed definition.

## B.2 Evaluation Metrics

We use MWE-based (exact-match) precision, recall, and F1 score (Savary et al., 2023). Let  $G$  be the set of gold MWEs and  $H$  the set of predicted MWEs (hypothesis),

$$\text{Recall} = |G \cap H|/|G| \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Precision} = |G \cap H|/|H| \quad (2)$$

where each MWE is represented with the ID of the sentence and the IDs of its constituent tokens. F1 is the harmonic mean of precision and recall.

## C Computational Budgets

In experiments for MaW (Rule+BiEnc and Rule+DCA), we use a single NVIDIA RTX 2080Ti GPU with 11GB RAM. Each run of training and testing takes around 8 minutes. Consequently, the total GPU hours for MaW are estimated to be 0.8 hours.

In LLM fine-tuning, we use NVIDIA RTX 6000 GPU with 48GB RAM for smaller models (Llama-8B and Qwen-7B) and NVIDIA A100 PCIe with 80GB RAM for larger models (Llama-70B and Qwen-72B). Each run of training and testing takes around 66 minutes for smaller models and 588 minutes for larger models. Thus, the total GPU hours for fine-tuning experiments of smaller and larger models are estimated to be 6.6 hours and 58.8 hours, respectively.